

August 31, 2026

Subject: Formal Request for Removal of Jim Reeves from the Visalia Citizens Advisory Committee

Dear Members of the Visalia City Council:

I am writing to formally request that a member of the Visalia City Council recommend the removal of **Jim Reeves from the Visalia Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)** and that a majority of the Council concur with that recommendation pursuant to the City's established rules governing commissioners and committee members.

Those rules provide:

"Commissioners and Committee members may be removed from office, upon the recommendation of any member of the City Council, and with the concurrence of a majority of the City Council, for breach of duty, for conduct unbecoming a public official of the city, for violation of the city's code of ethics, or for any cause deemed warranted by a majority of the City Council."

I believe Mr. Reeves' recent conduct warrants the Council's consideration under this standard for **two related but independently significant reasons: the judgment demonstrated in his publication of information involving a City attorney and her family, and the increasingly problematic intersection between his personal advocacy campaign against a City program and his position as a City-appointed committee member.**

Publication of Information Involving a City Attorney and Minor Children

As part of Mr. Reeves' campaign against the City's use of Flock Safety cameras, he submitted Public Records Act requests and subsequently published material identifying a City attorney involved in responding to the matter.

That attorney is also the mother of minor children.

Those children have absolutely nothing to do with Flock cameras, City policy, Mr. Reeves' records requests, or his disagreement with the City of Visalia.

This is not an abstract safety concern. Attorneys and other legal professionals routinely interact with disgruntled litigants and individuals harboring grievances against government.

In May 2026, Fresno City Attorney Andrew Janz and his family experienced a frightening incident at their residence. According to published reports, at approximately 3:30 a.m., a man wearing gloves and carrying a knife appeared at Janz's home, entered the backyard and banged on a rear door while Janz and his family—including his young daughter—were inside. Janz said he believed the incident was connected to the man's previous litigation involving the City.

I am **not suggesting that Mr. Reeves intended physical harm to anyone**, nor am I equating his conduct with that incident.

The Janz case does, however, demonstrate why identifying information concerning government attorneys and their families should be handled with judgment. In today's digital environment, a name can quickly be connected to social-media profiles, family relationships, photographs, property information and other publicly available information.

Information does not have to be confidential to create a safety concern when separate pieces of information can be collected, connected and amplified.

A City appointee should understand that distinction.

Mr. Reeves' Personal Advocacy and His City-Appointed Role

The Council should also consider Mr. Reeves' simultaneous roles as an outspoken opponent of the City's Flock program and an appointed member of the Citizens Advisory Committee.

To be clear, **opposition to City policy does not itself constitute a conflict of interest**, and this request is not an attempt to punish Mr. Reeves for expressing an unpopular or critical viewpoint.

CAC members should be willing to question City government.

The concern is the manner in which Mr. Reeves' personal advocacy campaign increasingly intersects with the position of public trust he occupies by appointment of the City Council.

Mr. Reeves has actively pursued his campaign through Public Records Act requests and his publishing platform while simultaneously serving on a City advisory body. That activity has now resulted in the publication of identifying information concerning a City attorney whose professional duties placed her in the path of his campaign and whose minor children are entirely uninvolved.

At minimum, these circumstances create a legitimate question regarding **the appearance of conflicting roles and whether Mr. Reeves has demonstrated the judgment, impartiality and professionalism expected of a City appointee.**

There is an important distinction between independently challenging government and pursuing a personal advocacy campaign in a manner the Council determines is inconsistent with the responsibilities accompanying a City appointment.

Removal Does Not Silence Mr. Reeves

Removing Mr. Reeves from the CAC would not restrict his constitutional rights.

He would remain completely free to oppose Flock cameras, submit Public Records Act requests, operate his blog, criticize the City, address the Council during public comment and advocate for whatever policies he chooses.

What is at issue is not his right to speak. It is whether he should continue occupying a position of public trust appointed by the City Council.

The City's removal policy expressly recognizes that distinction by permitting removal for "conduct unbecoming a public official" and, more broadly, "any cause deemed warranted by a majority of the City Council."

Requested Action

Accordingly, I respectfully request that **a member of the City Council recommend Mr. Reeves' removal from the Citizens Advisory Committee and that the Council place the matter on an appropriate agenda for consideration.**

I further request that the Council consider whether:

1. Mr. Reeves' conduct surrounding the publication of identifying information involving a City attorney and the resulting concerns for uninvolved minor children demonstrates the judgment expected of a City appointee;
2. The intersection of his personal campaign against a City program, his publishing activities and his simultaneous service on a City advisory body creates an appearance of conflicting roles inconsistent with continued service; and
3. Taken together, these circumstances constitute **conduct unbecoming a public official, a violation of any applicable City ethics standards, and/or other cause warranting removal** under the Council's established rules.

This request is not about suppressing criticism of the City or defending Flock cameras.

It is about **judgment, responsibility and accountability for an individual entrusted with a City appointment.**

Mr. Reeves is free to continue his campaign against the City of Visalia. The City Council is equally entitled—and, I believe, obligated—to determine whether the manner in which he has conducted that campaign remains compatible with the privilege and responsibility of serving as one of its appointed committee members.

I respectfully request that the Council exercise the authority provided under its own rules and remove **Jim Reeves from the Visalia Citizens Advisory Committee.**

Respectfully,

Jason A. Bailey, MBA

Visalia, California