



# STAFF REPORT

AGENDA NO: 10d

MEETING DATE: April 17, 2023

**To: Honorable Mayor and City Council**

**Date: April 17, 2023**

**From: Michael A. Guina, City Attorney – (650) 558-7204**

**Subject: Consideration of a Surveillance Technology Ordinance**

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends the City Council receive the staff presentation, consider public comment, and then provide direction on whether to develop a Surveillance Technology Ordinance or provide additional information.

## **BACKGROUND**

At the April 4, 2022 meeting, the City Council discussed and authorized deployment of Automated License Plate Readers (ALPRs). As part of that discussion, the Council also considered whether to adopt a Surveillance Technology Ordinance as part of the ALPR program. Ultimately the Council decided not to proceed with the Surveillance Technology Ordinance as part of the ALPR deployment. However, Councilmember Beach asked and received support for a Future Agenda Item to continue the Surveillance Technology discussion. Staff presents this report in response to the Council's direction for a continued discussion. The minutes from the April 4, 2022 meeting are attached to this staff report.

## **DISCUSSION**

A Surveillance Technology Ordinance governs the procurement and oversight of Surveillance Technology. The City Council has complete discretion to define "Surveillance Technology," but the term can be defined as software, a device, or an electronic system used primarily to collect and retain data on an individual or group. Examples of Surveillance Technology could include ALPRs, gunshot detectors, facial recognition software, video cameras, as well as software designed to monitor social media or criminal activity.

A Surveillance Technology Ordinance could require the City Council to consider and adopt a Surveillance Impact Report and a Surveillance Use Policy (both described below) at a noticed public hearing prior to the acquisition, use, or sharing of data involving Surveillance Technology. Thereafter, if the City wished to continue deploying the approved Surveillance

Technology, an ordinance could also require the City Council to first consider and adopt an Annual Surveillance Report on the Surveillance Technology.

Under a potential Surveillance Technology Ordinance, before deploying or sharing data involving Surveillance Technology, the City could be required to take some or all of the following steps:

1. Prepare a proposed Surveillance Impact Report and a Surveillance Technology Use Policy.
  - A Surveillance Impact Report is a report that includes 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 and any known adverse impacts, including unanticipated costs, civil rights or civil liberties impacts, and failures in the technology.
  - A Surveillance Use Policy is a report that includes a description of some or all of the following:
    - purpose for the Surveillance Technology;
    - authorized uses of the technology and the rules and procedures for the use of the technology;
    - data collection, data access, data protection, data sharing, and data retention;
    - how the collected data may be accessed by members of the public;
    - training required for users of the Surveillance Technology;
    - auditing and oversight for compliance with the Surveillance Use Policy.
2. Prior to considering the Surveillance Impact Report and Surveillance Use Policy, the City would provide Notice of the Public Hearing at which the reports would be reviewed. Ordinances adopted by other jurisdictions provide for a 30-day notice period.

3. The City Council would hold a Public Hearing to consider the proposed Surveillance Technology in relation to the Surveillance Impact Report and the Surveillance Use Policy. In order to authorize use of the Surveillance Technology, the City Council would make findings regarding the need for the Surveillance Technology weighed against the costs and potential impacts to civil rights and civil liberties.
4. Thereafter, if the City wished to continue using the Surveillance Technology, staff would be required to submit an Annual Surveillance Report and request continued permission to use the Surveillance Technology. In granting the continued use, the Council must make the above findings regarding the need for the Surveillance Technology weighed against the costs and potential impacts.

The cities of Davis, Berkeley, Oakland, San Francisco, and San Diego, the County of Santa Clara, as well as BART have adopted a Surveillance Technology Ordinance.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

There is no fiscal impact in considering an ordinance. If the City Council proceeds with development of a Surveillance Technology Ordinance, there may be a fiscal impact based on the amount of staff time to prepare an ordinance, as well as preparation of any associated policies and/or reports.

Exhibits:

- Minutes from April 4, 2022 City Council Meeting.



**BURLINGAME CITY COUNCIL**  
**Approved Minutes**  
**Regular City Council Meeting on April 17, 2023**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

A duly noticed meeting of the Burlingame City Council was held on the above date in person and via Zoom Webinar at 7:02 p.m.

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

The pledge of allegiance was led by two members of the San Bruno Scout Troop.

**3. ROLL CALL**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Beach, Brownrigg, Colson, Ortiz, Stevenson

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**4. REPORT OUT FROM CLOSED SESSION**

- a. **CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.8**  
**PROPERTY: 1200 -1340 OLD BAYSHORE HIGHWAY, BURLINGAME, CALIFORNIA**  
**AGENCY NEGOTIATORS: CITY MANAGER LISA K. GOLDMAN, CITY ATTORNEY MICHAEL GUINA**  
**NEGOTIATING PARTIES: CITY OF BURLINGAME; DW BURLINGAME VENTURE, LLC – DIVCOWEST**  
**UNDER NEGOTIATIONS: PRICE AND TERMS OF REAL ESTATE NEGOTIATIONS**

Councilmember Beach recused herself from this item due to an economic conflict of interest.

City Attorney Guina reported that direction was given, but no reportable action was taken.

**5. UPCOMING EVENTS**

Mayor Brownrigg reviewed upcoming events in the city.

**6. PRESENTATIONS**

**a. PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING EVA CHEN**

Teen Librarian Jenny Miner introduced Eva Chen, a Burlingame High School senior who recently won the Princeton Prize in Race Relations Certificate of Accomplishments.

In honor of National Poetry Month, Ms. Chen recited one of her own poems and a poem by Tonya Ingram.

Vice Mayor Colson asked for a copy of Ms. Chen's poem.

Councilmember Beach asked if Ms. Chen feels that poetry must be read out loud. Ms. Chen responded that she likes to feel the words and therefore often reads them out loud.

Mayor Brownrigg presented Ms. Chen with a proclamation that recognized her artistic achievements.

**7. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA**

Al Comolli representing Citizens for a San Mateo County Gun Buyback announced that the organization's next gun buyback event is scheduled for May 6 at 1050 Mission Road in South San Francisco.

**8. APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR**

Mayor Brownrigg asked the Councilmembers and the public if they wished to remove any item from the Consent Calendar. No items were removed.

Councilmember Ortiz made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar; seconded by Vice Mayor Colson. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

**a. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE MARCH 20, 2023 CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the March 20, 2023 Closed Session.

**b. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR THE APRIL 3, 2023 REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council approve the City Council Meeting Minutes for the April 3, 2023 Regular City Council Meeting.

- c. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH ON-CAMERA PRODUCTIONS FOR VIDEO COVERAGE OF CITY COUNCIL, PLANNING COMMISSION, AND TRAFFIC, SAFETY AND PARKING COMMISSION MEETINGS**

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council adopt Resolution Number 041-2023.

- d. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT WITH CONFERENCE TECHNOLOGIES, INC. FOR BACKUP POWER AND POWER CONDITIONERS FOR COUNCIL CHAMBER EQUIPMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$9,830.10**

City Clerk Hassel-Shearer requested Council adopt Resolution Number 042-2023.

## 9. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- a. **PUBLIC HEARING AND RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURLINGAME ADJUSTING THE STORM DRAINAGE FEE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023-24 BY 2.0% BASED ON THE CPI – SAN FRANCISCO AREA AS PUBLISHED ON MARCH 14, 2023**

Finance Director Yu-Scott stated that in 2009, the voters approved a storm drainage fee to fund the City's storm drain related capital improvement projects. She explained that the ordinance allows the City to adjust the rate annually by CPI, but not to exceed 2%. She noted that the February CPI is over 5%, and therefore staff recommends a 2% increase for FY 2023-24.

Councilmember Beach stated that it seemed like the impact would be about \$6 per parcel. Finance Director Yu-Scott replied in the affirmative.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the public hearing. No one spoke.

Councilmember Beach made a motion to adopt Resolution Number 043-2023; seconded by Councilmember Stevenson. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

- b. **INTRODUCTION OF AN ORDINANCE RENEWING THE BURLINGAME POLICE DEPARTMENT MILITARY EQUIPMENT USE POLICY; CEQA DETERMINATION: EXEMPT PURSUANT TO STATE CEQA GUIDELINES SECTIONS 15378, 15061(b)(3)**

City Attorney Guina stated that AB 481, a law that became effective January 1, 2022, requires law enforcement agencies to adopt a military equipment use policy ("Policy") prior to taking certain actions relating to the funding, acquisition, or use of military equipment as that term is defined by the statute. He explained that pursuant to AB 481, the Policy must be adopted by ordinance at a regular meeting of the governing body for that law enforcement agency.

City Attorney Guina stated that on May 2, 2022, the City Council adopted Ordinance Number 2005, which included Burlingame Police Department's Military Equipment Use Policy and a list of military equipment.

City Attorney Guina stated that the Burlingame Police Department does not possess any tactical equipment from the military, nor does it possess any equipment that was designed for military use. He explained that the police department does possess some types of police equipment that fall under the broad definition of military equipment in AB 481, including the following:

- AR-15 semiautomatic rifle capable of firing 5.56 mm projectile bullets
- M4 select fire rifle
- 40 mm less lethal launchers and kinetic energy munitions
- pepperball FTC pepperball less lethal pepperball launchers and pepperball munitions

City Attorney Guina stated that pursuant to AB 481, because the police department participates in the North County Regional SWAT, the military equipment that is used by that SWAT team must be included. He explained that the North County Regional SWAT utilizes the following military equipment:

- Drones
- Mine resistant ambush protected vehicles
- Wheeled vehicles with breaching apparatus
- Battering rams/slugs
- AR-15
- Flashbang grenades, tear gas, pepper balls
- Long range acoustic device

He noted that the above listed equipment is owned by other cities.

City Attorney Guina stated that AB 481 requires the City to adopt an annual military equipment report for each type of military equipment approved by the governing body within one year of approval, and annually thereafter for as long as the military equipment is available for use. He added that the annual report is required to be made publicly available on the police department's website.

City Attorney Guina stated that within 30 days of submitting and publicly releasing the annual military equipment report, the law enforcement agency must hold at least one well-publicized and conveniently located community meeting. He explained that the meeting is to allow the general public to discuss and ask questions regarding the annual report and the law enforcement agency's funding, acquisition, or use of military equipment. He noted that the police department prepared its 2022 annual report and posted it on the department's website on April 6. Following the public release of the report, on April 11, 2023, Chief Matteucci, Captain Boll, and City Attorney staff held a meeting at the Community Center that was open to the general public.

City Attorney Guina stated that AB 481 requires that the Council may only renew the ordinance if it determines all of the following:

- The military equipment is necessary because there is no reasonable alternative that can achieve the same objective of officer and civilian safety;
- The proposed Policy will safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties;
- If purchasing equipment, the equipment is reasonably cost-effective compared to available alternatives that can achieve the same objectives of officer and civilian safety; and

- Prior military equipment complied with the Policy that was in effect at the time, or if prior uses did not comply with the Policy, that corrective action has been taken to remedy nonconforming uses and ensure future compliance

Vice Mayor Colson asked if partner agencies acquire large tactical equipment during the year, would it be covered in the next report. City Attorney Guina replied in the affirmative.

Vice Mayor Colson asked if the City helps make the decision on whether to purchase equipment in a partnership. Police Chief Matteucci stated that for North County SWAT, while the City doesn't have a say in what other cities purchase, the City does have a say in what equipment is used in Burlingame.

Councilmember Stevenson asked why the annual report does not include the equipment of other law enforcement agencies like the Sheriff's Office that may act in the city. Police Chief Matteucci stated that other agencies may come into the city, but they must first ask permission to engage in the city. He explained that it wouldn't make sense to list all equipment that might possibly be used in the city by other agencies.

Councilmember Beach asked who funds the SWAT team. Police Chief Matteucci stated that each City funds its own officers and equipment.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the public hearing. No one spoke.

Councilmember Ortiz made a motion to bring back the proposed ordinance for a second reading; second by Councilmember Stevenson. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

## **10. STAFF REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

### **a. CONSIDERATION OF TWO APPOINTMENTS TO THE MEASURE I CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

City Manager Goldman stated that due to the expiring terms of Stephanie Lee and Sandeep Shroff, the Measure I Citizens' Oversight Committee has two vacancies. She noted that the vacancies were publicized, and staff notified past applicants. She explained that the City received two applications as of the application deadline of Friday, February 24, 2023. She added that committee members Stephanie Lee and Sandeep Shroff did not re-apply, and therefore the City extended the deadline.

City Manager Goldman stated that on April 11, 2023, the City Council interviewed applicants Todd Gemmer and Peter Roddy. She explained that the appointees' terms will be for three years, ending on February 20, 2026.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the item up for public comment. No one spoke.

The Council filled out their ballots, and the City Clerk tabulated their ballots.

Congratulations to Peter Roddy and Todd Gemmer.

**b. CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

City Manager Goldman stated that due to the expiring term of Commissioner Gaul, the Planning Commission currently has one vacancy. She explained that the vacancy was publicized, and notice was sent to past applicants. She noted that the City received one application as of the deadline. However, because Commissioner Gaul elected not to re-apply, the deadline was extended. As of the extended deadline of March 17, there were two applications.

City Manager Goldman stated that on April 11, 2023, the City Council interviewed applicants Adam Glick and Walker Shores. She explained that the appointee's term will be for four years, ending on April 7, 2027.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the item up for public comment. No one spoke.

The Council filled out their ballots, and the City Clerk tabulated their ballots.

Congratulations to Walker Shores on his appointment to the Planning Commission.

The Council thanked both candidates for applying.

**c. APPOINTMENT OF A DIRECTOR TO THE BOARDS OF THE BAY AREA WATER CONSERVATION AGENCY AND THE BAY AREA REGIONAL WATER FINANCING AUTHORITY**

*At the Mayor's discretion this item was moved to after 10d "Consideration of a Surveillance Technology Ordinance".*

DPW Murtuza stated that to serve as a Director on both boards, the appointee must be a resident and registered voter of the City, but the individual does not need to be a City Councilmember. He noted that the term for this appointment will be for four years, effective July 1, 2023 and expiring June 30, 2027.

DPW Murtuza stated that although not a requirement, an advantage of appointing a currently serving or former elected member of Council to the boards is the stature that the Councilmember's presence gives BAWSCA in its dealings with San Francisco, regulatory agencies, and legislators.

Mayor Brownrigg asked the Council to first consider whether the Council agreed it should be a current Councilmember.

The Council agreed.

The Council discussed the benefits of appointing Councilmember Stevenson as Director to the Board of the Bay Area Water Conservation Agency and the Bay Area Regional Water Financing Authority.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the item up for public comment. No one spoke.

Vice Mayor Colson made a motion to appoint Councilmember Stevenson as a Director to the Boards of the Bay Area Water Conservation Agency and the Bay Area Regional Water Financing Authority; seconded by Councilmember Ortiz. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 5-0.

**d. CONSIDERATION OF A SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY ORDINANCE**

*At the Mayor's discretion this item was moved to before 10c "Appointment of a Director to the Boards of the Bay Area Water Conservation Agency and the Bay Area Regional Water Financing Authority".*

City Attorney Guina stated that at their April 4, 2022 meeting, the City Council discussed and authorized deployment of Automated License Plate Readers ("ALPRs"). He explained that as part of the discussion, the Council also considered whether to adopt a surveillance technology ordinance as part of the ALPR program. He noted that ultimately, the Council decided not to proceed with the surveillance technology ordinance as part of the ALPR deployment. However, Councilmember Beach asked and received support for a Future Agenda Item to continue the Surveillance technology discussion.

City Attorney Guina explained that a surveillance technology ordinance governs the procurement and oversight of surveillance technology. He stated that the Council has complete discretion to define "surveillance technology," but the term can be defined as software, a device, or an electronic system used primarily to collect and retain data on an individual or group. He gave examples of surveillance technology including ALPRs, gunshot detectors, and facial recognition software.

City Attorney Guina stated that a surveillance technology ordinance could require the Council to consider and adopt a surveillance impact report and a surveillance use policy prior to the acquisition, use, or sharing of data involving surveillance technology. He added that the ordinance could require the Council to have an annual review of the City's surveillance technology.

City Attorney Guina reviewed what could go into a surveillance use policy:

- Purpose of the surveillance technology
- Authorized uses of the technology and the rules and procedures for the use of technology
- Data collection, data access, data protection, data sharing, and data retention
- How the collected data may be accessed by members of the public
- Training required for users of the technology
- Auditing and oversight for compliance with the policy

City Attorney Guina reviewed what could go into a surveillance impact report for each type of technology proposed:

- The surveillance technology and how it works
- The proposed purpose of the technology
- The proposed location(s) for deployment of the 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 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 and any known adverse impacts, including unanticipated costs, civil rights or civil liberties impacts, and failures in the technology

City Attorney Guina stated that the ordinance would require an annual surveillance report.

City Attorney Guina stated that the cities of Davis, Berkeley, Oakland, San Francisco, and San Diego have adopted a surveillance technology ordinance.

Councilmember Ortiz asked if the annual report would be brought to Council. City Attorney Guina replied in the affirmative.

Vice Mayor Colson stated that no other city in San Mateo County that have ALPRs have surveillance ordinances. She asked if any other city in San Mateo County has ALPR policies. City Attorney Guina replied that each city that has ALPRs also has policies in place for the ALPRs.

Vice Mayor Colson asked if the City does adopt an ordinance what the difference in enforcement is for an ordinance versus a policy. City Attorney Guina replied that the ordinance has the force of law and requires the City to do certain things. He explained that a policy creates guiding principles that should be considered.

Councilmember Stevenson asked if the policy that was written for ALPRs is adequate to cover other surveillance technology. City Attorney Guina replied in the negative. He stated that it focuses on ALPRs.

Mayor Brownrigg opened the item up for public comment.

Secure Justice Executive Director Brian Hofer stated that he has worked with municipalities across the country on their surveillance technology ordinances. He discussed the importance of the annual report that is included in surveillance technology ordinance. He explained that while some types of technology might not have privacy concerns, there is a taxpayer component that should require annual reviews of whether the technology is necessary.

Mr. Hofer stated that the ordinance helps to create greater transparency, ensures community input, and creates legal protections. He noted that he has templates that the City could use to customize its own ordinance.

Mayor Brownrigg asked if a surveillance technology ordinance would help the City preemptively address questions regarding future technology and how it might negatively impact groups. Mr. Hofer replied in the affirmative. He explained that a surveillance technology ordinance gives the City the tools to evaluate technology prior to purchasing and using it.

Councilmember Beach asked what technology would be applicable to this ordinance. Mr. Hofer stated that fixed cameras, GPS trackers, and potentially body worn cameras. He noted that these ordinances assist the City in narrowing how these types of technology are used and what the retention policy is for the data collected. He warned about commingling data with other agencies.

Mayor Brownrigg closed public comment.

Councilmember Ortiz stated that when the Council decided to move forward with ALPRs, this policy was discussed. He noted that he was in favor of adopting a policy in order to create guardrails for future technology.

Vice Mayor Colson stated that she was in favor of a policy not an ordinance. She asked if the City currently uses facial recognition software. City Attorney Guina replied in the negative.

Vice Mayor Colson asked what types of surveillance technology the City uses other than ALPRs. City Attorney Guina replied that the City has cameras.

Mayor Brownrigg asked if he was correct that the ordinance wouldn't regulate a particular type of surveillance technology; instead, it would provide the Council, public, and staff with the structure on how to review future purchases. City Attorney Guina replied in the affirmative.

Vice Mayor Colson noted that if facial recognition software was brought to the Council, she would vote it down. She added that she didn't think this proposed ordinance was needed as the City wasn't utilizing surveillance technology, unlike a bigger city.

City Attorney Guina noted that the police department does have a policy in place for body worn cameras and the retention of the data obtained.

Councilmember Ortiz asked if an individual could sue the City if it wasn't upholding a policy. City Attorney Guina stated that people can sue on policies and ordinance violation. He noted that the ordinance has the trappings of law, while a policy doesn't have that same weight.

Councilmember Beach stated that what she likes about this ordinance is that it says surveillance technology is important enough and of a concern that the City wants to go the extra mile on how it is implemented in the City. She thought the type of impact reports that would come from this type of ordinance would look more carefully at civil liberties.

The Council discussed the pros and cons of ordinances versus policies for surveillance technology.

Mayor Brownrigg stated that if the City wanted to repeal an ordinance, it would take a lot more process and action than if a policy is terminated. He added that he liked all of the processes and protocols that are put into surveillance ordinances to outline how the City and staff goes about thinking of future technology.

Vice Mayor Colson stated that she thought a policy would assist the City with reviewing future surveillance technology. She noted that she believed other cities in the Bay weren't adopting surveillance technology ordinances because they aren't thinking about purchasing facial recognition software and other technology. She added that the City's ALPR policy was working and had assisted the City. She explained that her opinion would be to create a policy and then see if later down the line it needed to be turned into an ordinance.

Councilmember Stevenson stated that he thought an ordinance or a policy would be equally effective.

Councilmember Beach stated that she thought the Council would have had a more well-informed decision on ALPRs if a surveillance technology ordinance was in place at the time. She voiced concerns about ensuring transparency when purchasing surveillance technology and utilizing another jurisdiction's technology. She thought that adopting an ordinance would allow for better discussions and transparency.

Councilmember Ortiz asked if the City's current ALPR policy requires an annual report. Police Chief Matteucci stated that he would need to get back to Council with whether an annual report is required. However, he noted that if it isn't required, he could amend the policy. He added that he does send monthly reports to Council on ALPRs.

Police Chief Matteucci stated that policies and ordinances are only good if they are followed. He discussed how serious the police department takes its policies. He explained that any use of force in the police department has to follow a thorough review in accordance with the department's policy.

Mayor Brownrigg suggested having staff develop a policy for surveillance technology.

City Attorney Guina stated that the policy could include as much detail as the Council wants. He gave the example of including how the policy is amended.

Councilmember Beach stated that she hopes that in the future the City adopts an ordinance. However, she noted that what she cares the most about is that the City is thinking in these terms before the next technology is purchased or utilized.

Mayor Brownrigg and the Council agreed that the first step was to start with a robust policy.

## **11. COUNCIL COMMITTEE AND ACTIVITIES REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Council reviewed their committee appointments.

## **12. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

There were no future agenda items.

## **13. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The agendas, packets, and meeting minutes for the Planning Commission, Traffic, Safety & Parking Commission, Beautification Commission, Parks & Recreation Commission, and Library Board of Trustees are available online at [www.burlingame.org](http://www.burlingame.org).

**14. ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Brownrigg adjourned the meeting 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
/s/  
Meaghan Hassel-Shearer  
City Clerk