



**BURLINGAME CITY COUNCIL**  
**Unapproved Minutes**  
**City Council Study Session on April 6, 2026**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

A duly noticed meeting of the Burlingame City Council was held on the above date in person and via Zoom at 6:05 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Brownrigg, Colson, Pappajohn, Stevenson, Thayer

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**3. REPORT OF REMOTE PARTICIPATION**

There were none.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

**5. STUDY SESSION**

**a. CONSIDERATION OF SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY POLICY**

City Attorney Guina stated that at the April 17, 2023, meeting, Council considered whether to adopt a Surveillance Technology Ordinance. He explained that Council directed staff to prepare a policy instead of an ordinance.

City Attorney Guina stated that at the December 4, 2023, meeting, Council considered a proposed policy. At the time, Councilmember Colson and former Councilmember Ortiz expressed a willingness to adopt that version of the policy. He noted that the policy presented to Council didn't require written analysis for each proposed technology addressing its purpose, authorized use, data collection, and retention. However, Mayor Brownrigg and former Councilmember Beach expressed interest in a more robust policy. He explained that Council directed staff to develop a more robust policy.

City Attorney Guina stated that since that meeting, both Councilmembers Beach and Ortiz stepped off the Council, and two new Councilmembers joined. He explained that given the change in Council membership, staff is seeking updated direction and feedback before continuing additional development of a Surveillance Technology Policy.

City Attorney Guina discussed the City's existing surveillance technologies including video cameras outside of the Community Center, the Public Works Corp. Yard, and the Library. He added that the Police Department currently utilizes automated license plate readers (ALPRs) and body worn cameras.

City Attorney Guina stated that no jurisdictions in the County have adopted a Surveillance Technology Policy or Ordinance. He noted that several Bay Area jurisdictions including Davis, Berkely, Oakland, and San Francisco do have policies or ordinances in place.

City Attorney Guina discussed how a more robust Surveillance Technology Policy could include a Surveillance Impact Report. He explained that this report would include a description of some or all of the following:

- the surveillance technology and how it works
- the proposed purpose of the surveillance technology
- the proposed location(s) for deployment of the surveillance technology and crime statistics for the location(s)
- an assessment of any potential impact on civil liberties and civil rights, as well as any plans to safeguard rights of the public
- the costs of the surveillance technology and sources of funding
- how and where the data collected will be stored and handled
- the experience, if any, of other governmental agencies who have used the same or similar technology, including an analysis of the effectiveness of the technology, and any known adverse impacts from the technology, including unanticipated costs, civil rights or civil liberties impacts, and failures in the technology

He noted that this report would be an additional, potentially resource-intensive analysis beyond the base policy requirements.

Police Chief Vaswani stated that while the City has not adopted a Surveillance Technology Policy, the City does operate under internal policies (Lexipol based) and applicable State law/Constitutional privacy protections. He added that the Lexipol policy updates and testing ensure that officers stay current.

Police Chief Vaswani discussed his experience with a Surveillance Technology Ordinance in San Francisco. He stated that the program was resource intensive and required a full-time analyst. He added that private sector vendors of this type of technology are increasingly emphasizing data protection and retention in contracts.

Councilmember Thayer asked how the absence of a policy has affected law enforcement operations and the ability to protect residents. City Attorney Guina replied that the staff has deployed technologies and implemented departmental policies to ensure compliance with State and Federal law. He added that the deployment of ALPRs was discussed over several meetings in 2023.

Vice Mayor Pappajohn stated that adopting a formal policy would increase transparency by requiring public hearings or staff reports. She added that it would also create standardized rules. She noted that Palo Alto had a policy and thought it was a good example that the City could utilize.

Councilmember Colson asked whether a more robust policy would require adding staff. Police Chief Vaswani replied that in San Francisco, the Police Department hired full-time staff to handle impact reports.

Councilmember Colson asked how much of current technology procurement already comes to Council via budget requests. City Attorney Guina replied that anything over the threshold of \$50,000 would require Council approval.

Councilmember Colson asked how the City ensures compliance with State law. Police Chief Vaswani replied that Lexipol policy subscriptions, internal testing, professional bulletins, and the Police Chief Roundtable ensure compliance.

Councilmember Stevenson asked whether the annual military equipment review does what the proposed Surveillance Technology Policy would do. City Attorney Guina replied that the military equipment review and the proposed Surveillance Technology Policy would overlap. However, he added that the Surveillance Technology Policy would cover more than the military equipment review.

Councilmember Colson asked if the City has received any civil liberty complaints related to ALPR deployment. City Attorney Guina replied that no such claims or complaints have been filed.

Mayor Brownrigg stated that he believed there were three primary questions for the Council to provide direction on:

- Whether to continue developing a Surveillance Technology Policy
- If so, whether a Surveillance Impact Report should accompany the policy, and what elements the Council would require
- Whether to form a Council working group to assist staff in developing the policy.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the item up for public comment.

Nobody spoke.

Vice Mayor Pappajohn emphasized the transparency benefits of adopting a policy. She suggested annual reporting as a feasible accountability measure.

Councilmember Colson voiced concern about resource burden but expressed openness to a basic policy.

Councilmember Thayer voiced support to proceed with the development of a Surveillance Technology Policy.

Councilmember Stevenson noted that current operations and technology deployments appear to be working and also stressed resource concerns. He added that he would support a policy and wanted it to be very clear on how data would be handled.

Mayor Brownrigg directed staff to prepare a Surveillance Technology Policy and bring it back for consideration.

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Brownrigg adjourned the study session at 7:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meaghan Hassel-Shearer  
City Clerk