



**SURVEILLANCE ADVISORY BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING AT 6:00 PM**



**APRIL 16, 2026**

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Simon Lee (Chair, Dist. 4)  
Mike Moreno (Vice Chair, Dist. 5)  
Russell Owen (Dist. 1)  
Tony Stewart (Dist. 2)  
Peggy Cohen-Thompson (Dist. 3)  
Alejandro Bras (At-Large)  
Krupa Naran (Dist. 6)

**HYBRID MEETING**  
[www.Cityofvallejo.net](http://www.Cityofvallejo.net)

**Vallejo Room (Lower-Level JFK Library)  
505 Santa Clara Street  
Vallejo, CA 94590**

<p><b>NOTICE:</b> Members of the Public will be able to participate in-person or remotely via Zoom</p>	<p>The Vallejo Room will be open to members of the public 30 minutes prior to the start of the meeting.</p>
<p><b>PUBLIC COMMENT:</b> Members of the Public may provide public comments during the Meeting in person or via ZOOM <a href="https://ZoomVallejoRoom.Cityofvallejo.net">https://ZoomVallejoRoom.Cityofvallejo.net</a>, or via phone, by dialing (669) 900-6833.</p>	<p>For additional instructions on how to speak remotely during public comment, please visit, <a href="http://www.cityofvallejo.net/publiccomment">www.cityofvallejo.net/publiccomment</a></p>
<p><b>VIEW THE MEETING:</b> There are four different ways you can view this public meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Person</li> <li>• Stream from the City website: <a href="http://www.cityofvallejo.net/Streaming">www.cityofvallejo.net/Streaming</a></li> <li>• Join the Zoom webinar: <a href="https://zoomvallejoroom.cityofvallejo.net/">https://zoomvallejoroom.cityofvallejo.net/</a></li> </ul>	<p>Scan QR code for live captions and translation in Spanish and Tagalog.</p> 
<p><b>Hybrid Options are available for members of the public to participate. To participate remotely</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Option to Join by Computer</u></b> From your browser go to <a href="https://ZoomVallejoRoom.CityofVallejo.net">https://ZoomVallejoRoom.CityofVallejo.net</a> to launch and join the zoom application. Meeting ID: 814 4681 4741# Meeting Password: 131313</p>	<p><b><u>Option to Join by Phone</u></b> Dial (669) 900-6833 Enter Meeting ID: 814 4681 4741# Meeting Password: 131313 Press *9 to digitally raise your hand from the phone. Press *6 to unmute/mute</p>
<p>Any supplemental writing related to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting that is distributed to all or a majority of all members of the Board less than 72 hours before the meeting will be posted concurrently on the City’s website at <a href="http://www.cityofvallejo.net/agendas">www.cityofvallejo.net/agendas</a> Written material distributed during the meeting, will be available at the meeting if prepared by the City or after the meeting if prepared by someone else. Such materials may be obtained from the Board Secretary</p>	
	<p>Vallejo Room is ADA compliant. Devices for the hearing impaired are available from the Staff Secretary. Requests for disability related modifications or accommodations, aids or services may be made by a person with a disability to the Staff Secretary’s office no less than 72 hours prior to the meeting by contacting via email <a href="mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net">Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net</a> or via phone at (707) 648-5200 as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof</p>

## AGENDA

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**3. ROLL CALL**

**4. COMMUNITY FORUM**

*Anyone wishing to address the Council on any matter for which another opportunity to speak is not provided on the agenda, and which is within the jurisdiction of the Board to resolve, is requested to submit a completed speaker card to the Board Secretary. When called upon, each speaker should step to the podium, state his /her name, and address for the record. Each speaker is limited to three minutes pursuant to Vallejo Municipal Code Section 2.20.300.*

**5. CONSENT CALENDAR AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**A APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING MARCH 19, 2026**

Recommendation:

Contact: Lance David, Board Secretary (707) 648-5408

[Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net)

**6. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE/BOARD SECRETARY**

**7. CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT**

**8. REPORT OF THE CITY COUNCIL LIAISON**

**9. REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE/BOARD**

**10. ACTION CALENDAR**

*NOTICE: Members of the public wishing to address the Council on Action Calendar Items are requested to submit a completed speaker card to the Board Secretary. Each speaker is limited to five minutes pursuant to Vallejo Municipal Code Section 2.02.420.*

**A REVIEW THE CURRENT WORK PLAN WITH THE SURVEILLANCE ADVISORY BOARD AND EVALUATE WHETHER ESTABLISHING DEDICATED AD HOC COMMITTEES FOR EACH WORK PLAN ITEM WOULD IMPROVE FOCUS AND EXECUTION.**

Recommendation: Review the current Work Plan with the Surveillance Advisory Board and evaluate whether establishing dedicated Ad Hoc for each Work Plan item would improve focus and execution.

Contact: Lance David, Board Secretary (707) 648-5408

[Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net)

**B GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ENABLED ANALYTICAL TOOLS AS THEY RELATE TO SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGIES ALREADY UNDER THE BOARD'S OVERSIGHT, INCLUDING WHETHER SUCH FEATURES CONSTITUTE A MATERIAL CHANGE REQUIRING BOARD REVIEW.**

Recommendation: VOTE TO AGENDIZE THE ITEM AND IT WILL BE ON THE NEXT AGENDA. (STEP 1 OF 2)

Contact: Lance David, Board Secretary (707) 648-5408

[Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net)

- C **REQUESTED THAT AN ITEM BE AGENDIZED TO DISCUSS WHETHER THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FACIAL RECOGNITION POLICY SHOULD BE AGENDIZED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD.**

Recommendation: Vote to Agendize the Item and it will be on the next agenda. (step 2 of 2)

Contact: Lance David, Board Secretary (707) 648-5408

[Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net)

- D **SURVEILLANCE MEDIA-RELATED ITEMS.**

Recommendation: Allowing Staff To Bring Forward Surveillance Media–Related Items For Discussion.

Contact: Lance David, Board Secretary (707) 648-5408

[Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net)

**11. INFORMATION CALENDAR**

- A **VALLEJO POLICE DEPARTMENT MONTHLY TECHNOLOGY USAGE REPORTS FOR DRONES, CELL SITE SIMULATOR, AND FLOCK ALPR CAMERAS, FLOCK RAVEN GUNSHOT DETECTION SYSTEM.**

**12. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**13. ADJOURNMENT**

**ADDITIONAL CITY INFORMATION**

Members of the public can:

- Like us on Facebook and Instagram ([@cityofvallejo](#))
- Sign up to receive City Communications via e-mail ([www.cityofvallejo.net/subscribe](http://www.cityofvallejo.net/subscribe))
- Sign up for emergency alerts at: [alertsolano.com](http://alertsolano.com)

I, Lance David, Board Secretary do hereby certify that I have caused a true copy of the above notice and agenda to be delivered to

Simon Lee (Chair, Dist. 4)  
Mike Moreno (Vice Chair, Dist. 5)  
Russell Owen (Dist. 1)  
Tony Stewart (Dist. 2)  
Peggy Cohen-Thompson (Dist. 3)  
Alejandro Bras (At-Large)  
Krupa Naran (Dist. 6),

at the time and in the manner prescribed by law and that this agenda was posted at City Hall, 555 Santa Clara Street, CA at 1:00 PM, April 13, 2026 .

Dated: April 13, 2026



Lance David, Board Secretary

## AGENDA

### **Surveillance Advisory Regular Meeting 3.19.2026**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**-6:00 PM
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **ROLL CALL**- ALL BOARD MEMBERS ARE PRESENT, CHAIR LEE, VICE CHAIR MORENO, BOARD MEMBERS BRAS, OWEN, STEWART, COHEN-THOMPSON, NARAN.

STAFF PRESENT- BOARD SECRETARY LANCE DAVID, DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY RANDY RISNER, CAPTAIN BAUTISTA, LT HUFF, LT TAI, SGT CAITHAM.

4. **COMMUNITY FORUM**

*Anyone wishing to address the Board on any matter for which another opportunity to speak is not provided on the agenda, and which is within the jurisdiction of the Board to resolve, is requested to submit a completed speaker card to the Board Secretary. When called upon, each speaker should step to the podium, state his /her name, and address for the record. Each speaker is limited to three minutes pursuant to Vallejo Municipal Code Section 2.20.300.*

5. **CONSENT CALENDAR AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

- A **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR SPECIAL MEETING MARCH 19, 2026**

Recommendation: Approve Minutes From March 19, 2026 Meeting

Contact: Lance David, Board Secretary (707) 648-5408

[Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net)

MOTION BY BOARD MEMBER COHEN-THOMPSON SECOND BY BOARD MEMBER STEWART.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY WITH CHAIR LEE VOTE ABSTAIN.

6. **REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE/BOARD SECRETARY**-NONE
7. **CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT**-NONE
8. **REPORT OF THE CITY COUNCIL LIAISON**-NONE
9. **REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE/BOARD**-NONE
10. **ACTION CALENDAR**

*NOTICE: Members of the public wishing to address the Board on Action Calendar Items are requested to submit a completed speaker card to the Board Secretary. Each speaker is limited to five minutes pursuant to Vallejo Municipal Code Section 2.02.420.*

**A AD-HOC COMMITTEE UPDATES**

Recommendation: Receive updates from the Board's ad-hoc committees regarding their ongoing work, progress, and any recommendations under development.

Contact: Lance David, Board Secretary (707) 648-5408  
[Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net)

UPDATES WERE GIVEN BY BOARD MEMBERS OWEN & STEWART ON AD-HOC WORK PLAN.

**B SURVEILLANCE MEDIA-RELATED ITEMS**

Recommendation: Allowing Staff To Bring Forward Surveillance Media-Related Items For Discussion.

Contact: Lance David, Board Secretary (707) 648-5408  
[Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net)

QUESTIONS WERE ASKED OF VPD STAFF. CAPTAIN BAUTISTA & LT HUFF ANSWERED ALL QUESTIONS.

**C REQUESTED THAT AN ITEM BE AGENDIZED TO DISCUSS WHETHER THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FACIAL RECOGNITION POLICY SHOULD BE AGENDIZED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD**

Recommendation: Vote to Agendize the Item and it will be on the next agenda. (step 1 of 2)

Contact: Lance David, Board Secretary (707) 648-5408  
[Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net)

MOTION FROM BOARD MEMBER COHEN-THOMPSON SECOND BY CHAIR LEE. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**11. INFORMATION CALENDAR**

**A VALLEJO POLICE DEPARTMENT MONTHLY TECHNOLOGY USAGE REPORTS FOR DRONES, CELL SITE SIMULATOR, AND FLOCK ALPR CAMERAS, FLOCK RAVEN GUNSHOT DETECTION SYSTEM.**

QUESTIONS WERE ASKED BY BOARD MEMBERS. STAFF RESPONDED TO ALL QUESTIONS ASKED.

**12. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

REQUEST THAT FACIAL RECOGNITION STEP 2 OR 2.

BRING GENERATIVE AI & SURVEILLANCE-VICE CHAIR MORENO -STEP ONE OF TWO STEP PROCESS.

BRING BACK WORK PLAN TO CONSIDER CREATING SEPARATE AD-HOC FOR EACH WORK PLAN ITEM.

**13. ADJOURNMENT- 6:50 PM**



**DATE:** April 16, 2026  
**TO:** Surveillance Advisory Board Chair and Members of the Board  
**FROM:** Lance David, Board Secretary  
**SUBJECT:** **REVIEW THE CURRENT WORK PLAN WITH THE SURVEILLANCE ADVISORY BOARD AND EVALUATE WHETHER ESTABLISHING DEDICATED AD HOC COMMITTEES FOR EACH WORK PLAN ITEM WOULD IMPROVE FOCUS AND EXECUTION.**

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Review the current Work Plan with the Surveillance Advisory Board and evaluate whether establishing dedicated Ad Hoc for each Work Plan item would improve focus and execution.

**BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

On August 21, 2025, an Ad-Hoc Committee was established to develop a Work Plan for the Surveillance Advisory Board.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1.	2026 - 2027 VALLEJO
----	---------------------

**CONTACT**

Lance David, Board Secretary (707) 648-5408  
[Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net)

**2026 - 2027 VALLEJO  
SURVEILLANCE ADVISORY BOARD  
WORK PLAN**

# Table of Contents

1. Background
2. Purpose and Work Plan Overview
3. Core Commitments
4. Ordinance Review & Governance Enhancement
5. Policy Development Priorities
6. Community Engagement Framework
7. External Subject Matter Expert
8. Budget (FY 2026–2027)
9. Deliverables and Outcomes

# BACKGROUND

The City of Vallejo established the Surveillance Advisory Board (SAB) to provide oversight, transparency, and public accountability regarding the use of surveillance technologies by City departments, particularly the Vallejo Police Department.

As surveillance technologies and artificial intelligence (AI) tools continue to evolve, local governments face increasing responsibility to ensure these tools are used in a manner that is lawful, ethical, and aligned with community expectations.

The SAB recognizes that its current structure and policies must evolve to meet these demands. This work plan reflects a commitment to strong oversight, clarifying governance, and developing clear policies that protect civil liberties while supporting public safety.

## Purpose and Work Plan Overview

This work plan establishes a proactive framework for the Surveillance Advisory Board to guide the development of policies governing surveillance technologies.

1. Strengthen proactive oversight
2. Establish clear policies
3. Promote transparency
4. Ensure community input
5. Incorporate independent expertise

# Core Commitments

1. Develop key surveillance policies
2. Review and recommend SAB ordinance updates
3. Establish audit and accountability frameworks
4. Ensure transparency through public access
5. Engage the community
6. Incorporate subject matter expertise

## Ordinance Review & Governance Enhancement

The SAB will review the existing ordinance to expand proactive authority and strengthen its oversight role.

# Policy Development Priorities

The SAB will prioritize foundational policies governing surveillance technologies.

## A. Surveillance Technology Audit Policy

The SAB commits to developing a comprehensive audit policy addressing use standards, data practices, audit structures, and accountability.

The SAB commits to developing a comprehensive audit policy addressing:

- Standards for lawful and authorized use
- Data access, retention, and sharing practices
- Audit structure and frequency
- Identification and reporting of misuse or non-compliance
- Mechanisms for corrective action and accountability

## B. Facial Recognition Policy

The SAB commits to developing a policy governing the use or prohibition of facial recognition technology, evaluating legal, ethical, and community impacts.

This policy will evaluate:

- Legal and constitutional considerations
- Accuracy, bias, and reliability concerns
- Necessity relative to alternative tools
- Potential impacts on civil liberties and community trust

## C. Continuous Policy Review & Best Practices

The SAB commits to continuously reviewing emerging best practices, legal developments, and technological advancements to inform ongoing policy development.

This includes:

- Monitoring changes in federal, state, and local laws related to surveillance and data privacy
- Reviewing policies and frameworks adopted by other jurisdictions
- Evaluating advancements in surveillance and artificial intelligence technologies
- Updating existing policies to reflect new standards, risks, and community expectations

The SAB will ensure that its policy framework remains current, adaptive, and responsive to evolving conditions.

## D. Additional Policy Development Areas

In addition to the priority policies identified above, the SAB may explore and develop additional policies as needed to strengthen oversight and governance.

These may include, but are not limited to:

- Data retention and deletion policies
- Data sharing and inter-agency access policies
- Surveillance technology acquisition and approval processes
- Vendor and procurement standards
- Transparency and public reporting requirements

- Artificial intelligence and algorithmic accountability

The SAB will prioritize these areas based on community input, identified gaps, and emerging needs.

# Community Engagement Framework

## I. Purpose

Ensure residents of Vallejo are informed, empowered, and meaningfully involved in decisions related to surveillance technology. This plan prioritizes transparency, accessibility, equity, and accountability.

## II. Goals

1. Increase public understanding of surveillance technologies
2. Provide plain-language explanations of residents' rights
3. Create structured opportunities for public input
4. Ensure inclusion of marginalized communities
5. Integrate feedback into SAB recommendations

## III. Strategic Components

1. Plain-Language Materials Develop accessible materials explaining technologies and rights.
2. Annual Town Hall & Educational Workshop
  - a. Hybrid format (in-person and virtual)
  - b. Structured agenda with presentation, expert input, and Q&A;
3. Community Partnerships & Outreach
  - a. Leverage community organizations to increase participation.

#### **IV. Expected Outcomes**

1. Increased public awareness
2. Improved transparency and trust
3. Policies informed by community input
4. Balanced public safety and civil liberties

#### **V. Budget Considerations**

Staff and the Surveillance Advisory Board will identify costs associated with community engagement activities and coordinate the use of funds allocated by the Vallejo City Council to support SAB outreach, participation, and engagement efforts.

# External Subject Matter Expert Engagement

## **I. Purpose**

The purpose of this plan is to establish a clear, transparent, and structured process for the Surveillance Advisory Board (SAB) to identify, solicit, evaluate, and incorporate expert testimony related to surveillance technologies, municipal law enforcement practices, civil liberties, data governance, and oversight mechanisms. Expert testimony ensures that Board recommendations to the City Council are informed by independent, technically sound, and legally grounded analysis.

## **II. Scope**

This plan applies when the Surveillance Advisory Board (SAB) seeks expert input on matters including, but not limited to:

- a. Proposed acquisition of new surveillance technology
- b. Renewal or reauthorization of existing technology
- c. Audit findings or compliance-related concerns
- d. Data retention, access, and sharing policies
- e. Constitutional, legal, or civil rights implications
- f. Emerging technologies (e.g., drones, cell-site simulators, facial recognition)
- g. Best practices in municipal oversight and governance

### III. Standing Advisory Roster

To reduce delays, SAB may maintain a pre-approved advisory roster including: Academic institutions  
Civil liberties organizations  
Technology auditors  
Municipal governance experts  
Roster reviewed to be reviewed annually.

- a. Academic institutions
- b. Civil liberties organizations
- c. Technology auditors
- d. Municipal governance experts

## Compensation

The Surveillance Advisory Board (SAB) may provide compensation to subject matter experts through the following:

- **Travel Reimbursement:** Reimbursement for reasonable and necessary travel-related expenses, including mileage (at the approved rate), fuel costs, and tolls, in accordance with applicable City policies.
- **Vallejo Restaurant Stipend (\$50):** A \$50 stipend in the form of a meal or restaurant voucher at a Vallejo-based establishment.
- **Flexible Compensation Structures:** Alternative forms of compensation, such as honorariums or project-based payments, may be used as appropriate based on the scope of work, level of expertise required, and available funding and approval of the SAB.

All compensation will be administered in accordance with City policies and documented as part of SAB records.

# Budget (FY 2026–2027)

**The SAB seeks \$10,000 to support community engagement activities, subject matter expert compensation, and additional costs associated with the implementation of this work plan.**

These funds will support:

- Engagement of subject matter experts to provide technical, legal, and policy guidance
- Travel reimbursement and stipends to ensure equitable participation from a diverse range of experts
- Community engagement support, including materials, outreach, and accessibility needs
- Administrative coordination related to expert participation, documentation, and reporting

This investment will enable the SAB to develop informed, well-vetted policies that reflect best practices, legal standards, and community input. It also ensures that the Board can effectively carry out its oversight responsibilities in a transparent, inclusive, and accountable manner.

# Deliverables and Outcomes

1. Ordinance amendments
2. Audit policy
3. Facial recognition policy
4. Community engagement materials
5. Expert Support



**DATE:** April 16, 2026  
**TO:** Surveillance Advisory Board Chair and Members of the Board  
**FROM:** Lance David, Board Secretary  
**SUBJECT:** **GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ENABLED ANALYTICAL TOOLS AS THEY RELATE TO SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGIES ALREADY UNDER THE BOARD'S OVERSIGHT, INCLUDING WHETHER SUCH FEATURES CONSTITUTE A MATERIAL CHANGE REQUIRING BOARD REVIEW.**

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

VOTE TO AGENDIZE THE ITEM AND IT WILL BE ON THE NEXT AGENDA. (STEP 1 OF 2)

**BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

VICE CHAIR MORENO WOULD LIKE AN AGENDA ITEM ON GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ENABLED ANALYTICAL TOOLS AS THEY RELATE TO SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGIES ALREADY UNDER THE BOARD'S OVERSIGHT, INCLUDING WHETHER SUCH FEATURES CONSTITUTE A MATERIAL CHANGE REQUIRING BOARD REVIEW.

**ATTACHMENTS**

None

**CONTACT**

Lance David, Board Secretary (707) 648-5408  
[Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net)



**DATE:** April 16, 2026  
**TO:** Surveillance Advisory Board Chair and Members of the Board  
**FROM:** Lance David, Board Secretary  
**SUBJECT:** **REQUESTED THAT AN ITEM BE AGENDIZED TO DISCUSS WHETHER THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FACIAL RECOGNITION POLICY SHOULD BE AGENDIZED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD.**

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Vote to Agendize the Item and it will be on the next agenda. (step 2 of 2)

**BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

Board Member Owen has requested that an item be agendized to discuss whether the development of a facial recognition policy should be agendized for consideration by the board.

**ATTACHMENTS**

None

**CONTACT**

Lance David, Board Secretary (707) 648-5408  
[Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net)



**DATE:** April 16, 2026  
**TO:** Surveillance Advisory Board Chair and Members of the Board  
**FROM:** Lance David, Board Secretary  
**SUBJECT:** **SURVEILLANCE MEDIA-RELATED ITEMS.**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Allowing Staff To Bring Forward Surveillance Media–Related Items For Discussion.

**BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

Staff Would Like The Opportunity To Bring Forward Any Surveillance Media–Related Items To The Board For Discussion.

Board Member Bras has brought these articles to discuss.

- <https://sfstandard.com/2026/03/25/sf-surveillance-state-crime-drones-billionaires/>
- <https://www.sfgate.com/news/bayarea/article/sf-supes-raise-concerns-over-sfpds-gps-tracking-22070098.php>
- <https://www.ktvu.com/news/san-jose-consider-revising-flock-surveillance>
- [https://www.smdailyjournal.com/news/local/burlingame-council-supports-exploring-citywide-surveillance-technology-policy/article\\_72e78ed4-748c-410b-85bd-bb35f3ab661d.html](https://www.smdailyjournal.com/news/local/burlingame-council-supports-exploring-citywide-surveillance-technology-policy/article_72e78ed4-748c-410b-85bd-bb35f3ab661d.html)

**ATTACHMENTS**

1.	Burlingame council supports exploring c...licy _ Local News _ smdailyjournal
2.	Flock surveillance cameras will stay in..
3.	San Francisco once led the fight agains..
4.	SF_ Supes Raise Concerns Over Sfpds Gps Tracking Technology

**CONTACT**

Lance David, Board Secretary (707) 648-5408  
[Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:Lance.David@cityofvallejo.net)

https://www.smdailyjournal.com/news/local/burlingame-council-supports-exploring-citywide-surveillance-technology-policy/article\_72e78ed4-748c-410b-85bd-bb35f3ab661d.html

FEATURED

# Burlingame council supports exploring citywide surveillance technology policy

By Holly Rusch, Daily Journal staff  
Apr 10, 2026



[f](#)
[X](#)
[@](#)
[✉](#)
[🖨](#)
[📄](#)
[🔖](#)
[in](#)

Amidst ongoing, national conversations around public surveillance and data safety, a majority of Burlingame councilmembers said they'd be in support of exploring a citywide surveillance technology policy that would define data access and protection rules.

Flock Safety, an automated license plate reader vendor that records data typically used in law enforcement operations, has been a particular point of concern in data safety discussions.

In nearby Mountain View, for example, federal and state law enforcement agencies accessed the ALPR data in violation of city policy, spurring community concern and an end to the program. Other local municipalities, like Santa Clara and Santa Cruz, have also cut ties with the company.

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. [Privacy Policy](#)  
Burlingame has 17 ALPR cameras in place managed by its police department. It has its own policies in place to guide data protection and also adheres to state law, which prohibits data-sharing with out-of-state agencies. The city does not have a policy of its own to guide data use purpose, collection and use, **Accept** **Deny Non-Essential** **Deny All** **Essential** said.

For Mayor Michael Brownrigg, that lapse in local legislation is unacceptable, he said.

“I am confident our department is treating this data sensitively. Unfortunately, the world isn’t Burlingame,” he said. “I just don’t think in this environment nationally, you can look around and say, ‘I trust every law enforcement agency in the country.’ I don’t anymore. I can’t, after Minneapolis. I just can’t.”

Brownrigg, alongside Councilmember Desiree Thayer and Vice Mayor Andrea Pappajohn, were all proponents of the policy, highlighting the benefit of public transparency regardless of whether the city would be creating new regulation or simply restating existing rules.

“I would be interested in pursuing a policy. I understand we would be the first in the county putting something together, but I don’t think that should prohibit us from doing so,” Thayer said.

Councilmember Donna Colson said she was supportive of a baseline technology surveillance policy when it was first introduced to the council in 2023, but felt that the council’s prolonged discussion and eventual decision to put off the policy at the time was political.

The Burlingame Police Department already does “a really good job,” Colson said, adding she was concerned with bogging down officers with convoluted data management rather than having them out on the streets if the city moved forward with a tandem technology impact report to accompany the surveillance policy.

“I want my police on the ground policing,” she said. “I don’t want them sitting in an office collecting data, analyzing data, looking at data, when we haven’t had a problem.”

Residents have not expressed major concerns about the ALPRs, Councilmember Peter Stevenson said.

“I think we do a good job in our police. I don’t hear from my neighbors or residents, ‘why do we have those cameras,’ or ‘why do we do that?’” he said. “Quite the opposite, [they’re] quite enthusiastic about how this technology has actually caught people that have violated the law.”

Despite tepid interest from Colson and Stevenson, with a majority of councilmembers in support, staff will be moving forward with a potential future policy.

It’s important for the city to engage proactively with data security issues, Brownrigg emphasized, particularly given the impact that artificial intelligence will have on them not just in Burlingame, but nationally and around the globe.

“One of the scariest things about what’s happening nationwide and actually, globally, is a whole lot of data gets collected by the government, a whole lot, and most of it never gets looked at by anybody, because no one has the time,” he said. “AI is going to make time.”

[holly@smdailyjournal.com](mailto:holly@smdailyjournal.com)

(650) 344-5200 ext. 105



MORE INFORMATION

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. [Privacy Policy](#)



East Palo Alto City Council removes Flock camera contract item from agenda

Half Moon Bay to review license plate readers use

Holly Rusch, Daily Journal staff

Daily Journal staff

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. [Privacy Policy](#).

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. [Privacy Policy](#).

# Flock surveillance cameras will stay in San Jose, but vote enacts revisions

By KTVU Staff and Jesse Gary | Published March 10, 2026 7:25am PDT | San Jose | KTVU FOX 2 |

## People in San Jose are pushing back against Flock surveillance technology

The message was clear outside of San Jose City Hall on Tuesday. People are pushing back against the use of the license plate cameras. Now city leaders are considering revisions to its Flock camera system.

---

### The Brief

- San Jose officials unanimously approved revisions Tuesday to the city's automated license plate reader program, scaling back some aspects of the surveillance system.
- Under the proposed revisions, the length of time license plate data is stored would be reduced from one year to 30 days.
- The police chief is also seeking to prohibit placement of Flock cameras near houses of worship and clinics that offer reproductive services.

---

**SAN JOSE, Calif.** - San Jose City Council voted unanimously on Tuesday to revise the city's automated license plate reader program that scales back some aspects of the surveillance system amid growing privacy concerns that have led other Bay Area cities to abandon the technology altogether.

Unlike Mountain View, which terminated its contract with Flock Safety over privacy objections, San Jose will retain the camera network and the contract will remain in place until June. However, Police Chief Paul Joseph's proposal called for significant changes to how the system operates.

Under the approved revisions, the length of time license plate data is stored would be reduced from one year to 30 days. Joseph also sought to prohibit placement of Flock cameras near houses of worship and clinics that offer reproductive services.

San Jose's network of Flock cameras is 500 strong.

The proposals reflect broader national scrutiny over automated license plate readers (ALPR), which law enforcement agencies say are valuable crime-fighting tools but which critics argue enable mass surveillance of residents going about their daily lives.

## Anti-Flock surveillance movement

A large group of anti-Flock license-plate reader cameras gathered outside City Hall ahead of the City Council meeting.

At the meeting, Chief Joseph listed crimes solved using ALPRs. He said the impact of the cameras on the police department's public safety efforts is unquestioned. But he said that's only part of the equation.

Critics of the cameras argue they capture data from passing vehicles, which then can be shared and used by people outside the system's intended audience.

"We are repeatedly told that these cameras are an important tool to stop crime, but its abuses are being ignored," said Huy Tran with SIREN (Services, Immigrant Rights & Education Network).

FLOCK is either altering the settings without permission or is technically making mistakes to where non-California entities are able to access California data," said Brian Hofer the executive director with Secure Justice.

But not everyone agreed. One man who is for the cameras likened the argument to throwing the baby out with the bath water.

"So there is definitely is a trade-off between privacy and security," said Dr. Melissa Michelson, Menlo College Political Scientist. "But sometimes people feel the line is being crossed."

## What does Flock say?

In an email sent to KTVU in February and reaffirmed on Tuesday, a Flock representative in part said, "A small number of communities have chosen not to renew their contracts. When a tool that is actively helping solve violent crimes, locate suspects, and find missing people is removed, public safety does not improve – it moves backwards," Paris Lewbel with Flock said.

### The Source

City council agenda, prior reporting.

This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed. ©2026 FOX Television Stations

**News**

# San Francisco once led the fight against police surveillance. Now it's a laboratory for it

Crime is down. Drones are up. And the city that once banned facial recognition has largely stopped asking questions about surveillance tech.




Surveillance feeds from around San Francisco are monitored at SFPD's Realtime Investigations Center. | Noah Berger for The Standard

By **Cyrus Farivar**

News Editor

Published Mar. 25, 2026 • 6:00am

 Share

In 2019, the Board of Supervisors passed a landmark law making San Francisco the first major U.S. city to block the use of facial recognition technology by law enforcement. The measure was hailed as a victory for anti-surveillance activists and a signal of the city's leadership on civil liberties amid growing tech encroachment.

But then crime exploded during the pandemic, "bipping" became common slang, and a rash of flash-mob-style robberies went viral on social media. Public safety in San Francisco became a top story for Fox News and the top issue for voters. The fury was enough that for the first time ever in San Francisco, the district attorney, Chesa Boudin, was recalled in 2022.

Now, with residents more fed up with crime than fired up about privacy, San Francisco has become a city where police surveillance has exploded, major crime categories are falling, and few are making noise about the issue.

"The SF that would reject surveillance is gone and dead," said James Lance Taylor, chair of the politics department at the University of San Francisco.

In late 2023, venture capitalist Ron Conway and Ripple cofounder Chris Larsen joined the San Francisco Police Officers Association and then-Mayor London Breed to put Proposition E on the March 2024 ballot. The measure promised to provide police with the "tools and rules they need to enforce laws."



Chris Larsen, cofounder and executive chairman of Ripple, has been one of the major funders of the the surveillance expansion. | Courtesy Ripple

Breed said the measure would give officers new enforcement tools, including expanded pursuit powers for crimes like retail and auto theft. The ACLU of Northern California called it “ill-conceived and irresponsible,” warning that it could erode democratic oversight of the police.

The bill passed with more than 54% of the vote. Since then, with the help of millions in private funding — largely from Larsen — the SFPD has installed 400 AI-powered Flock license plate readers, launched a high-tech surveillance “Real-Time Information Center,” and gone all-in on drones.

Last month, the SFPD recorded a record 700 drone flights — an average of 25 per day. In February 2025, it recorded 93. Between 2024 and 2025, the cost of the department’s drone program jumped by more than 1,200%. An increasing number are being used for

Drone as First Responder, or DFR, programs, in which the devices are deployed to crimes before any human personnel.

For a point of comparison, SFPD’s drone fleet of 98 devices is more than double that of the Los Angeles Police Department, which has nine drones and just received approval to add 24. Los Angeles has nearly five times as many residents as San Francisco.

The SFPD’s drone capabilities go beyond the “tactical drones” that can be launched from a patrol car, according to Capt. Stephen Jonas, acting commander of the Investigations Bureau, which oversees that fleet. The department has established eight drone bases across the city that can put a hovering camera over nearly any crime scene within minutes. Jonas declined to provide the location of the bases, citing security concerns.

“Strangely, this supposed far-left Bay Area is doubling down on Flock and DFR,” said Brian Hofer, executive director of Secure Justice, an anti-surveillance nonprofit. “It feels like the upside-down world a little bit.”

### **Nobody’s complaining**

Other than an annoying whine overhead, most San Franciscans are likely and perhaps blissfully unaware that the police are using a wider array of surveillance tools daily.

“I don’t think that people are raising a fuss that there is a private entity hosting the real-time crime center,” Hofer said. “The average person [is] grateful that crime has dropped from the pandemic, so if this technology has contributed to some of that, that’s great.”

More about **Surveillance**




EXCLUSIVE

**Mapped: Our new tool shows the AI surveillance cameras along your commute**

SFPD data show about 51,000 major crimes in 2023. A year later, the figure was down more than 25% to fewer than 37,000, and last year it dropped again to about 28,500. Larceny, including shoplifting, fell by nearly half from 2023 to 2025. Car theft dropped more than 54%, and burglaries declined by more than 33%.

“Tools like drones, ALPR, and public safety cameras allow officers to quickly and safely make arrests in cases that were historically challenging to solve,” Evan Sernoffsky, a spokesperson for the SFPD, said in an email.

He highlighted that in 2022, there were 23,454 auto burglaries in San Francisco compared to 5,380 last year.



An SFPD worker monitors a live drone feed at the Realtime Investigations Center. | Noah Berger for The Standard

Larsen declined to comment. But he recently told ABC7 he became involved in funding police surveillance tech because of his belief that the city's success is predicated on

public safety.

“If you don’t have that, then businesses don’t come, tourists don’t come, even locals stay where they live, and that was hurting San Francisco, so we had to fix that first,” Larsen said.

*Listen to* **Pacific Standard Time**

FRIDAY, APR. 3

**PST: The end of BART? Inside the Bay Area’s transit crisis**

Listen



FRIDAY, MAR. 27

**PST: Why SF’s crime rate has plummeted — and who’s taking credit**


Listen



FRIDAY, MAR. 20

**PST: Our pod on parenting in SF — outrageously expensive, but also amazing**

Listen



FriscoLive415, the anonymous bike-riding social media figure known for his close monitoring of police scanner traffic and videos from crime scenes, attributes the changing attitudes in part to a persistent SFPD campaign to show the role of drones in apprehending suspects.

“I was listening to scanners all day, and I could hear how the Flock cameras were instrumental in catching people,” he said. “I’ve noticed a very interesting shift in how the citizenry is willing to go along with these surveillance technologies.”

Criminal justice experts put San Francisco's declining crime in context with nationwide trends. According to a January [study by the Council on Criminal Justice](#), homicides were down across 40 large American cities between 2024 and 2025 and are trending toward all-time lows. Residential burglaries have fallen by 15% since 2010.



---

technology, said it's too soon to attribute the drop in serious crimes in recent years to the rapid rise in surveillance technology.

“It’s all just a massive uncontrolled experiment. Police departments do not have research divisions,” Crump said. “They do not study in any rigorous way what the impact of surveillance technology is.”

But randomized studies and controlled experiments are one thing. Public opinion is another.

The result, at least by one measure, is that the surveillance debate has effectively won itself: The Chamber of Commerce's [latest CityBeat poll found affordability](#) leapfrogging crime as San Francisco voters' top issue for the first time since before the pandemic — a signal that public safety anxiety, the force that drove the whole expansion, has receded enough that something else has room to breathe.

“Most people are not [EFF](#), data privacy types, no matter how much you warn them about it,” said Jason McDaniel, a professor of political science at San Francisco State. “People don’t really have strong opinions one way or the other, until suddenly when it becomes relevant.”



SFPD's drone fleet has grown massively in the last two years. | Morgan Ellis/The Standard

If there's a political avatar for San Francisco's early discomfort with surveillance technology, it's former Supervisor Aaron Peskin. The progressive lawmaker proposed the city's facial recognition ban.

He has the same concerns today about overreach as he did back then: That surveillance tools deployed for one purpose could easily be misused for another.

It's not entirely theoretical. As The Standard reported last year, SFPD's license plate reader data was accessed 1.6 million times by out-of-state and federal agencies, likely in violation of California law. At least 19 of those searches were marked as related to Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

"San Francisco has been the ground-zero testing ground," Peskin said. "We have an outside responsibility to make sure that it is not used against us by our own government."

**Filed under**

Crime Drones Law Enforcement News Property Crime SFPD Surveillance

**More News**



**Rivals urge Swalwell to drop out of governor’s race, resign amid assault allegations**



**To protect and prosecute: The tough-love doctrine of Brooke Jenkins**



**Amid recent spike in homicides, SF calls for 24-hour ‘ceasefire’**



**Long lenses, longer faces: Crowds awaiting ‘California Henge’ sunrise snap clouds instead**

By **Cyrus Farivar**

BREAKING

# Suspect's photo obtained in Molotov cocktail attack on Sam Altman's home

A 20-year-old man was arrested after also making threats at OpenAI's headquarters.

2 free posts left  
 Already a subscriber? [Sign in now](#)

a priority.

## Two men arrested after fatal shooting in SoMa

Edwin Depaz Maldonado, 19, was booked for murder after a Friday night shooting at 3rd Street and Harrison Street.

### Most read **today**



POWER PLAY

**The first casualties of Lurie's layoffs — and where cuts may come next**



**Amazon's One Medical fired a doctor who raised safety concerns, lawsuit says**



ANALYSIS

**How Raheem Morris can unlock the full potential of the 49ers' defensive backs**





### Pelosi, Lurie endorse SF's lifetime term-limit ballot measure



### Philz corporate overlords want Pride flags to come down. SF baristas say hell no



- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

About Us

Staff

Standards & Ethics

Newsletters

RSS Feeds

Jobs

Contact Us

Tips

Advertising Inquiries

Sign In

Paid Subscription

Subscription FAQs



TOP STORY

New details released on disappearance of Bay Area coffee shop owner

---

NEWS | BAY AREA & STATE

# SF: Supes Raise Concerns Over Sfpds Gps Tracking Technology

By Bay City News Service  
March 10, 2026





HORIZONTAL - San Francisco police car SFPD for stories with crime or police as logo or placeholder. (Special to Bay City News/ChameleonsEye)  
ChameleonsEye/Special to Bay City News/ChameleonsEye

**Listen Now:**

**SF: Supes Raise Concerns Over Sfpds Gps Tracking Technology**


About 5 Minutes

1x

Everlit

Two San Francisco supervisors on Tuesday raised concerns over GPS tracking technology used by the police department, leading the Board of Supervisors to delay its vote on approving the department's surveillance technology policy.





Supervisors Connie Chan and Shamann Walton questioned the use of "StarChase," a new GPS technology being used by more law enforcement agencies around the world as a way to avoid having to carry out vehicle pursuits.

**ADVERTISEMENT**  
Article continues below this ad

The tech involves a projectile device which contains a GPS tag that is attached to the front of a police cruiser. When activated by an officer, the tag is released and affixes to a suspect's vehicle.

Police chases in San Francisco have led to dangerous outcomes. In February, a bystander driver was injured when a police car crashed into their car during a pursuit. Last year, a car crashed into a parklet at a bar during a police chase, ending in several people being injured.

"StarChase is a pursuit mitigation tool," said SFPD government affairs manager Carl Nicita at the meeting. "It's not a pursuit enhancement tool. Its overall goal is to reduce dangerous, high-speed pursuits within the city."

As part of Proposition E, which voters approved in November 2024, the department is allowed to acquire and use new surveillance technologies for up to one year as a pilot. After one year, the Board must take action on approving a surveillance technology policy that would allow the department to continue using the new technology.

The department was hoping that the Board would approve its surveillance technology policy on Tuesday, but the Board unanimously agreed to wait on making a decision so that concerns from Chan and Walton could be addressed.

Chan and Walton questioned whether the use of StarChase could infringe on Fourth Amendment Rights, which protects people against unreasonable searches and seizures.

"There are concerns about warrantless trackers, lack of data, cost concerns, reliability, and of course always the protections of civil liberties," Walton said at the meeting.

"I have some questions about that technology itself," Chan said. "I would like to have some more time to better understand the technology."

---

**ADVERTISEMENT**

Article continues below this ad

---

Dozens of civil liberties groups also wrote to the Board in a joint letter, urging it to vote against the policy. The letter argued that the use of StarChase technology can violate Fourth Amendment rights, and that SFPD has no empirical evidence on the effectiveness of StarChase.

In a presentation to last week's meeting with the Rules Committee, a Board of Supervisors committee that reviews proposed ordinances and charter amendments, SFPD Lt. Brent Bradford said that the technology has been used successfully 17 times by the department.

"The cases in which StarChase have been deployed cover a variety of criminal activity, including street level robberies and auto burglaries as well as stolen automobiles," Bradford said. "Having the ability to use technologically advanced tools such as the StarChase allows the police department to successfully apprehend subjects while not placing the public in risk while initiating high-risk vehicle pursuits."

At Tuesday's Board meeting, Nicita said that warrantless trackers on vehicles would only be allowed in "exigent circumstances" if the Board approved the department's surveillance technology policy. An exigent circumstance

is defined as an emergency that requires swift action to prevent imminent danger.

---

**ADVERTISEMENT**

Article continues below this ad

---

"In other scenarios, the department would request a warrant, obviously approved by a judge to continue tracking," Nicita said. "But in exigent circumstances, including hot pursuits of vehicles, the department would be allowed under the policy."

The policy would prohibit officers from using StarChase trackers to harass, intimidate, or discriminate against people on the basis of race, religion, gender and other personal identifiers. The surveillance technology would also not be allowed to be used for immigration enforcement or non-law enforcement purposes.

StarChase technology has been used by dozens of law enforcement agencies in the country. Locally, it has been implemented by agencies like the San Pablo Police Department, Pittsburg Police Department, and South San Francisco Police Department.

Oakland Police Department previously used StarChase, but in 2024, the department decided not to renew its contract with the company, alleging the devices often did not successfully attach to suspect vehicles.

---

**ADVERTISEMENT**

Article continues below this ad

---

Got a tip? Send us the scoop.

DO IT NOW

The Board agreed to delay its decision on SFPD's policy until the March 24 meeting.

"I appreciate the potential two weeks' continuance, allowing us to have more in-depth conversation," Chan said.

Copyright © 2026 Bay City News, Inc. All rights reserved. Republication, rebroadcast or redistribution without the express written consent of Bay City News, Inc. is prohibited. Bay City News is a 24/7 news service covering the greater Bay Area.

March 10, 2026

### Around The Web

Powered by **REVCONTENT**

**2026 Limited-Time Sale: The Embroidered 250th Anniversary Cap**

By **250th Anniversary**

**One Tech Exec Says SpaceX is The Most Mispriced Company He's Ever Analyzed**

By **Brownstone Research**

**Getting Rid of Moles & Skin Tags Has Never Been Easier! (Just Do This)**

By **SELF**



**Trending Now: 250th Anniversary Flag Wreath for Your Independence Day Decor**

By **Peoasis**

**Social Security. Recipients Under \$2,384/mo Get These Benefits**

By **HealthyWallet**

**7 Things Changing for Seniors On Social Security In 2026**

By **Super Saving Online**

### Cesar Millan Reveals What Honey Does To Your Aging Dog

By **HealthClubJournal**

### Restaurants In Vallejo With Good Senior Discounts

By **TheWalletGuru**

### 1 Odd Trick Restores Your Eyes To Perfect 20/20 Vision

By **101LifeHacks**

#### Let's Play



Cross|word



Pile-Up Poker



Typeshift



Really Bad Chess



Flipart



Top ^



About



Contact



Services



Quick Links



HEARST newspapers © 2026 Hearst Communications, Inc. [Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Notice](#) | [CA Notice at Collection](#) | [Your CA Privacy Rights \(Shine the Light\)](#) |

DAA Industry Opt Out |

[Your Privacy Choices \(Opt Out of Sale/Targeted Ads\)](#)



**DATE:** April 16, 2026  
**TO:** Surveillance Advisory Board Chair and Members of the Board  
**FROM:** Jerome Bautista, Police Captain  
**SUBJECT:** **VALLEJO POLICE DEPARTMENT MONTHLY TECHNOLOGY USAGE REPORTS FOR DRONES, CELL SITE SIMULATOR, AND FLOCK ALPR CAMERAS, FLOCK RAVEN GUNSHOT DETECTION SYSTEM.**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Surveillance Advisory Board to receive technology usage reports on a monthly basis. No action is needed. This is an informational item.

**BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

Background and discussion

Per established direction from the board, the police department to present deployed technology reports on a monthly basis as an information item only. No action is required from the board. The board receives reports on the following technologies on a monthly basis:

- Automated License Plate Readers (ALPR)
- Cell site simulator(CSS) Deployment
- Raven gunshot detection technology
- Drone Flight log - UAS YTD

**ATTACHMENTS**

1.	ALPR March - 2026
2.	March 2026 CSS DEPLOYMENT LOG_Redacted
3.	Raven _ Shots Fired Matches March 2026
4.	Raven Analytics March 2026
5.	UAS YTD 2026

**CONTACT**

Jerome Bautista, Police Captain (707) 648-4461  
Jerome.Bautista@cityofvallejo.net



# ALPR 2026

## January - March 2026



**LAW ENFORCEMENT USE ONLY**

**License Plate Readers Overview**

January - March 2026

**Vehicle Recoveries  
with use of LPR**

**14**

**Cases Assisted by LPR**  
(Identifying suspect veh/Location  
History, etc.)

**69**

**Arrests with  
the use of LPR**

**15**

**Hot List LPR Reads**  
(Stolen Veh/Stolen Plate/Bolo/Alerts)

**27,505**

**Offenses of Arrests**

**Offenses Associated with Arrests**

- Human trafficking
- False Imprisonment
- Stolen Vehicle
- Burglary
- Stolen Vehicle
- Rape
- Assault – Aggravated
- Warrant – Felony
- Car Jacking
- Possession of Stolen Vehicle

**LPR Hot List Reads**

LPR Hot List Reads	Amount
Stolen Plate	13,908
Stolen Vehicle	344
Felony Vehicles	36
Custom Alerts (Ofc Safety/BOLO)	13,217
<b>Total</b>	<b>27,505</b>



## Vallejo Police Department Cell Site Simulator (CSS) Deployment Log Calendar Year 2026

The Vallejo Police Department recognizes the public interest in ensuring that cell site simulator technology is appropriately used and monitored and seeks to be transparent with its usage. Please note that the cell site simulator is merely an investigative tool to find a cell phone. Results from the cell site simulator alone are never used establish probable cause for an arrest or search.

A deployment is defined as any time the cell site simulator is turned on and used to find a target phone. The cell site simulator might be deployed several times to find the same phone even if previously successfully located. Each deployment in the log is not necessarily a separate phone that was searched for. An arrest is not necessarily effected even if a phone is located. There are many factors that determine when and arrest will be effected.

Authorized Purpose Codes:

- (A) Locate missing persons
- (B) Locate at-risk individuals
- (C) Locate victims of mass casualty incidents
- (D) Assist in felony investigations
- (E) Apprehend fugitives

**\*\*In the event a search warrant is (N\*) NOT obtained due to special circumstances, an explanation will be provided in a separate attachment\*\***

#	DATE	Operator/ Affiant	Case Number	Crime Code	Search Warrant Obtained Y/N and PRIOR or POST Deployment  EXIGENT indicates CSS was used during Exigent Circumstance.	Located (Y/N)	Arrest Made (Y/N)	Purpose Code	Agency Assist (Y/N)
	<b>JANUARY</b>								
	None								
	<b>FEBRUARY</b>								
1	██████	Tonn/S. Diaz	██████	664/187 PC	Y (Not Exigent)	Y	Y	E	N
	<b>MARCH</b>								
2	██████	Horton/Tonn	██████	MP	Y (Not Exigent)	N	N/A	A	Y
3	██████	Horton/Coco DAI Aaron Ross	████	MP	Y (Not Exigent)	Y	N/A	A	Y
	<b>APRIL</b>								
	<b>May</b>								
	<b>JUNE</b>								
	<b>JULY</b>								
	<b>AUGUST</b>								
	<b>SEPTEMBER</b>								
	<b>OCTOBER</b>								
	<b>NOVEMBER</b>								

	<b>DECEMBER</b>								

Incident Number	Date	Month	Date & Time	Type	INC LOCATION	BEAT
202601030001	1/3/2026	Jan	1/3/26 12:10 AM	Raven Alert	700 BLOCK ILLINOIS ST	5
202601030002	1/3/2026	Jan	1/3/26 12:10 AM	Shots Fired	1000 BLOCK INDIANA ST	5
202601220009	1/22/2026	Jan	1/22/26 1:07 AM	Raven Alert	1900 BLOCK OHIO ST	5
202601220010	1/22/2026	Jan	1/22/26 1:08 AM	Shots Fired	00 BLOCK MARIPOSA ST	5
202601220011	1/22/2026	Jan	1/22/26 1:08 AM	Shots Fired	1900 BLOCK LOUISIANA ST	5
202601240026	1/24/2026	Jan	1/24/26 3:42 AM	Raven Alert	1600 BLOCK SACRAMENTO ST	6
202601240027	1/24/2026	Jan	1/24/26 3:43 AM	Shots Fired	1500 BLOCK SACRAMENTO ST	6
202601240028	1/24/2026	Jan	1/24/26 3:43 AM	Shots Fired	1700 BLOCK ARKANSAS ST	6
202601240195	1/24/2026	Jan	1/24/26 6:03 PM	Raven Alert	1200 BLOCK LOUISIANA ST	5
202601240196	1/24/2026	Jan	1/24/26 6:04 PM	Shots Fired	1200 BLOCK OHIO ST	5
202601240198	1/24/2026	Jan	1/24/26 6:07 PM	Shots Fired	1200 BLOCK OHIO ST	5
202601310119	1/31/2026	Jan	1/31/26 3:04 PM	Shots Fired	BRANCIFORTE ST/LOUISIANA ST	6
202601310120	1/31/2026	Jan	1/31/26 3:04 PM	Raven Alert	200 BLOCK LOUISIANA ST	6
202602090129	2/9/2026	Feb	2/9/26 2:58 PM	Shots Fired	2400 BLOCK SONOMA BL	6
202602090130	2/9/2026	Feb	2/9/26 2:59 PM	Raven Alert	2400 BLOCK SONOMA BL	5
202602120212	2/12/2026	Feb	2/12/26 9:02 PM	Raven Alert	200 BLOCK CAROLINA ST	6
202602120213	2/12/2026	Feb	2/12/26 9:03 PM	Shots Fired	BRANCIFORTE ST/FLORIDA ST	6
202602180247	2/18/2026	Feb	2/18/26 11:08 PM	Shots Fired	300 BLOCK CLEARPOINTE DR	3
202602180251	2/18/2026	Feb	2/18/26 11:09 PM	Raven Alert	100 BLOCK LINCOLN RD W	4
202602230169	2/23/2026	Feb	2/23/26 4:28 PM	Raven Alert	700 BLOCK LOUISIANA ST	5
202602230171	2/23/2026	Feb	2/23/26 4:29 PM	Shots Fired	OHIO ST/BROADWAY ST	5
202603150245	3/15/2026	March	3/15/26 10:59 PM	Raven Alert	200 BLOCK MENDOCINO ST	5
202603150246	3/15/2026	March	3/15/26 11:01 PM	Shots Fired	1800 BLOCK LOUISIANA ST	5
202603260243	3/26/2026	March	3/26/26 10:19 PM	Raven Alert	2400 BLOCK SONOMA BL	6
202603260244	3/26/2026	March	3/26/26 10:23 PM	Shots Fired	SONOMA BL/TENNESSEE ST	5



# Raven Audio Alert Statistics

## January - March 2026



**Total Alerts**

**1,444**

**Multiple  
Gunshot Alerts**

**640**

**Single Gunshot  
Alerts**

**79**

**Total Gunshot  
Alerts**

**719**

**Sideshow Alerts**

**106**

**Firework Alerts**

**619**

**Beta Test Data**

**Confirmed Shootings Criteria**

- GSW victim located/Identified
- Evidence of shooting (casings/bullets)
- Seen/Heard by witness
- Captured by surveillance

**Unconfirmed Shootings Criteria**

- Unable to Locate (UTL)
- No evidence of shooting
- Outside Jurisdiction/Referred to Other Agency
- Fireworks

**Shots Fired Calls for Service**

**Shots Fired: 114**

**Raven Shots Fired Alerts: 305**



# Vallejo Police Department – 2026 Year to Date Flight Log



Date	Time	Aircraft	Call for Service	Case/Inc	Flight Time	Air Space	Day/Night
1/6/2026	1526	Mavic 3	subject w/ with Gun	26-140	13	G	Day
1/7/2026	250	Enterprise	Patrol	NA	13	G	Night
1/17/2026	150	Enterprise	246 PC	26-521	24	G	Night
1/17/2026	2321	Enterprise	Patrol	NA	6	G	Night
1/21/2026	1302	Mavic 3	602L PC	2601210106	4	G	Day
3/2/2026	600	Avata	Warrant Service	26-2231	15	G	Day
3/3/2026	610	Enterprise	Warrant Service	26-2231	23	G	Day
3/3/2025	610	Mavic 3	Warrant Service	26-2231	17	G	Day
3/3/2026	610	Avata	Warrant Service	26-2231	15	G	Day
3/22/2026	203	Enterprise	20001 CVC	26-2917	6	G	Night
3/28/2026	120	Enterprise	245 PC	26-3160	3	G	Night
3/29/2026	351	Enterprise	422 PC	26-3185	15	G	Night
3/29/2026	400	Enterprise	422 PC	26-3185	8	G	Night
3/29/2026	2336	Enterprise	417 PC	26-3204	8	G	Night
4/4/2026		Enterprise	187 PC		25	G	Night