

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:45:12 PM

From: Cimarron Burt <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 2:22 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Cimarron

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:45:59 PM

From: Odin Moe <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 2:33 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Odin

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:46:56 PM

From: Elizabeth Tep <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 2:32 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Elizabeth
Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:47:54 PM

From: Angela Morisette <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 2:40 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Angela
Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:49:13 PM

From: Deyton Drost <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 2:44 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Deyton

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:50:18 PM

From: Sally Blakesley <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 2:46 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Sally

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:51:39 PM

From: Avae Burfeind <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 2:55 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Avae

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:52:34 PM

From: Chris Schoenstedt <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 3:11 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Chris

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 7:15:53 PM

From: Jeremy Corey-Gruenes <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:58 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

Hi, there. I'm writing as a concerned citizen. I grew up in Mankato, went to grad school there, and have a daughter who currently reside there. I urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City

of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That's because crime isn't driven by a lack of surveillance—it's driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don't have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It's impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can't trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don't want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we're now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are

not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression, movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at->

[predicting-crimes.](#)

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at [https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977.](https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977)

Jeremy
Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:20:07 PM

From: Julia Hamann <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 7:54 AM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Julia

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:29:19 PM

From: Becky Dimock <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 8:01 AM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

Hello,

I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you, rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019

systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That's because crime isn't driven by a lack of surveillance—it's driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don't have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It's impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can't trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don't want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we're now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of "suspects" and "terrorists" has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression, movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in

constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, *Gizmodo*, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime->

[prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977.](#)

Becky

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 7:14:58 PM

From: Michael Rutkowski <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:44 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Michael
Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:34:13 PM

From: Jenny Corey-Gruenes <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 9:29 AM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned citizen to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Jenny

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:35:35 PM

From: Jake Flo <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 12:07 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Jake

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:53:00 PM

From: Mike Ferguson <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 3:11 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Mike

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:54:10 PM

From: Madeline Schoenstedt <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 3:17 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That's because crime isn't driven by a lack of surveillance—it's driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don't have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It's impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can't trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don't want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we're now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Madeline

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:56:17 PM

From: Ogheneochuko Regha <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 3:16 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Ogheneochuko

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:57:20 PM

From: Debra J <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 5:08 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Debra
Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 7:10:13 PM

From: Lily Sticha <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 5:10 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Lily

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 7:11:06 PM

From: Natalia Orocio <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 5:34 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Natalia

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 1:30:08 PM

From: Laura Harrison <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 8:38 AM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression, movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal

gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Laura
Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 1:29:23 PM

From: Kathy Kerekes <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 7:41 AM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of a neighboring community to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

Regular visits to Mankato for shopping and entertainment are part of our family routine but the information I have received makes me nervous about the safety and integrity of Mankato officials. I do not want to see ICE in our neighborhoods. I believe in the American dream and if Mankato needs leadership on this matter please look to Denver's successful integration of immigrants into their community. Also, Officer Baker has some problems that local leadership needs to attend to.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That's because crime isn't driven by a lack of surveillance—it's driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don't have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It's impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can't trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to

target. We don't want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we're now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of "suspects" and "terrorists" has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression, movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had "sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy" under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

- Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato's surveillance and AI technology use;
- Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;
- Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;
- Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, "CCTV

surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis," Criminology & Public Policy 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, The Markup, Oct. 2, 2023, available at

<https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-softwareterrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Kathy

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 7:13:27 PM

From: Ally Wallerius <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 5:47 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Ally

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 1:28:37 PM

From: Jennifer Bowen <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 6:28 AM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That's because crime isn't driven by a lack of surveillance—it's driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don't have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It's impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can't trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don't want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we're now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Jennifer
Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 12:14:59 PM

From: Soren Schaust <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 12:04 AM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

To the city counsel, and individual counselors -

Please do not skip this. I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City

of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That's because crime isn't driven by a lack of surveillance—it's driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don't have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It's impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can't trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don't want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we're now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are

not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression, movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at->

[predicting-crimes.](#)

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at [https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977.](https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977)

Soren

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 12:14:07 PM

From: Susan Reiter <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 10:49 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to DEMAND that you REJECT the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I DEMAND that you:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Susan

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 12:10:55 PM

From: Theresa Zeman <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 8:47 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

*I wish I was smart enough to have originally written this letter. But I'm still learning and it totally makes sense to me.

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using

AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That's because crime isn't driven by a lack of surveillance—it's driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don't have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It's impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can't trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don't want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we're now being told that our data will be used to locate

missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression, movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes,

The Markup, Oct. 2, 2023, available at

<https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-software-promised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Theresa

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 12:06:57 PM

From: Donnette Wheelock <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 8:16 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Donnette
Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 5:49:28 PM

From: Ava Corey-Gruenes <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Sunday, April 20, 2025 2:12 AM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I am writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and artificial intelligence (AI) in our public safety systems. The current plan to install new high-definition cameras, license plate readers, and AI-driven software, and join the Flock nationwide surveillance network raises serious concerns about civil liberties, community trust, and the future of public life in our city.

Systems like the ones proposed—especially when coupled with AI and automated identification—are prone to error, reinforce racial bias, and are often deployed disproportionately in marginalized communities. They also create chilling effects on free expression, movement, and protest, as residents become aware they are being constantly watched. While city leaders have stated that the technology will be used responsibly, the truth is that once installed, the infrastructure of surveillance tends to expand. Today it is “missing persons,” tomorrow it is protestors or students. ICE has already kidnapped one student at MNSU—we don’t want them abducting more. Once this network is established, its scope can be widened at any time, often without public input or oversight.

Moreover, this plan involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already facing legal scrutiny. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against Norfolk, Virginia (over its use of Flock cameras) stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. With over 170 cameras in that city, residents are suing to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

If Mankato moves forward, the city risks replicating these same harms and could expose

itself to similar litigation.

Mankato does not need a “digital breadcrumb trail” following its residents. We need investments in community well-being—housing, food, education, childcare, and physical and mental healthcare—not in tools of suspicion and control.

I urge you to:

- Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology;
- Decline to partner with Flock Technologies and any nationwide surveillance network;
- Hold public hearings to ensure transparency, community feedback, and democratic oversight before any future surveillance or policing technology is considered;
- Commit to a citywide policy that limits surveillance and ensures the right to privacy for all Mankato residents.

We deserve a city where safety is rooted in trust, care, and community—not in algorithmic suspicion and invasive monitoring. Please do everything within your power to halt this expansion and prioritize non-carceral investments in public safety that do not put our constitutional rights at risk.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Ava Corey-Gruenes
ava.corey.gruenes@gmail.com
1400 Warren Street, Apt C9
Mankato, Minnesota 56001

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:04:55 PM

From: Jameel Haque <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Sunday, April 20, 2025 10:12 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Jameel

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 6:15:40 PM

From: Margaret Dimock <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 2:06 AM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Margaret
Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Monday, April 21, 2025 7:17:47 PM

From: Alex Glaser <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 7:01 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Alex

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Wednesday, April 23, 2025 2:21:40 PM

From: Maria R. Larson <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 23, 2025 9:24 AM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Maria

Minnesota

I

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Wednesday, April 23, 2025 2:25:02 PM

From: Laura Lehmann <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 23, 2025 9:53 AM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato and a student at MNSU to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Laura

Minnesota

|

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Wednesday, April 23, 2025 2:18:34 PM

From: Liz Zaruba <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 23, 2025 8:47 AM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Liz

Minnesota

I

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Wednesday, April 23, 2025 2:02:01 PM

From: Linda Johnson-Dulas <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 9:29 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Linda

Minnesota

I

From: [Laven, Mike](#)
To: [Arntz, Susan](#)
Subject: FW: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato
Date: Wednesday, April 23, 2025 2:05:12 PM

From: Bradley Widness <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 10:07 PM
To: Laven, Mike <mlaven@mankatomn.gov>
Subject: Reject the Expansion of Surveillance and AI Policing in Mankato

Caution: Think Security – This email originated from an external source. Be cautious with any links or attachments.

This Message has originated outside your organization.

Head of city council Mike Laven,

I hope you're doing well. I'm writing as a concerned resident of Mankato to urge you to reject the proposed expansion of surveillance technology and use of artificial intelligence (AI) by Mankato Public Safety. In the current political climate, the last thing we need is to give local law enforcement agencies—who have publicly stated they will collaborate with ICE—increased surveillance powers to track residents' movements and activities without warrants or reasonable suspicion of a crime. Instead of investing in invasive surveillance, we should be investing in what actually keeps communities safe: stable housing, food access, quality education, childcare, and healthcare.

I wanted to send my letter directly to you (an elected city official), rather than through Mankato Public Safety. I hope you can include my letter in all applicable reports as relevant feedback received during the public comment period.

For detailed information on the flaws of surveillance systems nationwide, please read the ACLU's guide for policymakers, "Seeing Through Surveillance: Why Policymakers Should Look Past the Hype." This comprehensive 50-page report provides thorough research on the issues and ineffectiveness of surveillance technology and outlines effective and evidence-based alternatives to promote public safety.

Beyond the troubling implications of increasing surveillance on a national level, as outlined in the report, I have serious concerns about what will happen on a local level if the current proposal is approved. Installing more cameras around the city and on police vehicles, using AI analytics to constantly monitor residents' movements, and joining Flock's nationwide surveillance network (the use of which has already led to a pending lawsuit against the City of Norfolk, Virginia) will not make us safer. I am also seriously alarmed by local law

enforcement agencies' stated intent to collaborate with ICE if asked.

Here are several reasons why I strongly oppose this expansion:

→ Surveillance has “no significant effects” in combatting violent crime, according to a 2019 systemic review covering 40 years of video surveillance (1). That’s because crime isn’t driven by a lack of surveillance—it’s driven by unmet needs. People make desperate choices when they don’t have food, housing, or access to care. The way to reduce crime is to meet these basic needs, not to monitor people more closely. Surveillance tools do nothing to address the root causes of harm, making them an ineffective and wasteful public safety strategy.

→ AI surveillance systems are error-prone: AI technology often yields inaccurate and biased responses, with one investigation of 23,631 surveillance software predictions showing a success rate as low as 0.1% (2). AI creates a false sense of neutrality and objectivity, leading to misplaced trust in flawed data and harming people wrongly flagged by these systems. The ACLU of Northern California reports that several people in their state have been wrongly held at gunpoint by law enforcement agents due to surveillance system errors (3). AI surveillance systems represent a danger to our community and a liability for the city.

→ These systems are often biased against and deployed disproportionately in vulnerable communities, thus having disproportionate detrimental effects on those same communities. An analysis of 9 million crime predictions generated by Predpol (the precursor to Geolitica) showed a significant bias, with predictions overwhelmingly focusing on Black, Latino, and low-income neighborhoods. This resulted in patrols being relentlessly directed back to the same impoverished neighborhoods while ignoring wealthy, predominantly white communities. (4)

→ It’s impossible to guarantee the security of surveillance data over time: No one is capable of offering accurate assurances of long-term data security. Consider how quickly ICE gained access to Social Security and IRS records to track and detain people. These agencies have always promised not to share private information with law enforcement, in large part to encourage undocumented immigrants to pay taxes without any real benefit to themselves. Unfortunately, they failed to understand how easily private data can be seized and repurposed with ill intentions. For these reasons, we can’t trust any promises from Mankato Public Safety regarding how this data will be used or kept safe.

→ Attacks by ICE against our community members will only increase with additional surveillance. Local law enforcement has stated they will collaborate with ICE, which has already unlawfully detained one student at MNSU. We are scared and concerned for our vulnerable friends, family members, and neighbors who local law enforcement plans to target. We don’t want any more members of our community to be taken.

→ Surveillance tech silences free speech and protest: AI surveillance tech is easily leveraged against political dissenters, and is currently being used by the federal government for that exact purpose. While we’re now being told that our data will be used to locate missing persons and criminal suspects, we have already seen how the definition of “suspects” and “terrorists” has been expanded to include protesters and students who are not guilty of any crime. These technologies create chilling effects on free expression,

movement, and protest, as residents become aware that their facial characteristics, personal gait, travel patterns, daily whereabouts, and home locations are all data points being constantly analyzed, stored, and made accessible for use by law enforcement agencies. The expansion of this technology will further discourage people from participating in constitutionally protected protests and other free speech activities.

→ The company providing cameras and AI software faces ongoing lawsuits: This proposal involves partnering with Flock Safety, a private company whose surveillance systems are already the source of ongoing lawsuits. Just this February, a federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against the town of Norfolk, Virginia over its use of 170 Flock cameras stated that residents had “sufficiently alleged a violation of both their subjective and reasonable expectations of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment. Residents of Norfolk are suing their city to have the system dismantled and the collected data erased.

→ The City of Mankato risks being sued if it implements this proposal: If Mankato moves forward with this proposal, the city risks replicating these same problematic scenarios and inevitably exposing itself to similar litigation. Local groups have already indicated their intent to pursue civil litigation if this proposal is approved. It would be foolish for the city to take on such legal and financial liability for a system with little discernible benefit.

I urge you to:

→ Reject the proposed \$130,000 expansion of Mankato’s surveillance and AI technology use;

→ Decline any future partnership with Flock Technologies and any other surveillance networks;

→ Commit to a citywide policy to limit surveillance of residents and ensure privacy rights for all;

→ Bar all Mankato city employees (including law enforcement) from collaborating with ICE under any circumstances. This has been done in many other cities and can be done here.

We deserve a city that understands safety is built by ensuring everyone has the resources they need to care for themselves and their community. This means supporting social programs that help us meet our basic needs—not subjecting us to ineffective and invasive surveillance technology. You have the power to stop this expansion and prioritize programs that actually keep people safe. There is no valid reason to do otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

(1) Eric L. Piza, Brandon C. Welsh, David P. Farrington, & Amanda L. Thomas, “CCTV surveillance for crime prevention. A 40-year systematic with meta-analysis,” *Criminology & Public Policy* 18, no. 1 (2019). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1275&context=jj_pubs

(2) Aaron Sankin & Surya Mattu, Predictive Policing Software Terrible At Predicting Crimes, *The Markup*, Oct. 2, 2023, available at <https://themarkup.org/predictionbias/2023/10/02/predictive-policing-software-terrible-at-predicting-crimes>.

(3) <https://www.aclunc.org/SeeThroughTheHype>

(4) Aaron Sankin, Dhruv Mehrotra, Surya Mattu, Dell Cameron, Annie Gilbertson, Daniel Lempres, & Josh Lash, Crime Prediction Software Promised to Be Bias-Free. New Data Shows It Perpetuates It, Gizmodo, Feb. 12, 2021, available at <https://gizmodo.com/crime-prediction-softwarepromised-to-be-free-of-biases-1848138977>.

Bradley
Minnesota

|