

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT
CITY OF EUGENE
WORK SESSION
DATE, 2026
TIME 12:00 P.M.

Captioning Provided by:
LNS Captioning
www.LNSCaptioning.com
Phone: (503) 446-4555

* * *

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This is NOT the official record of the proceedings.

* * *

>> Mayor Knudson: Welcome to the work session, thank you for joining us in this hybrid meeting format. For work sessions there's no opportunity for public comment and those wishing to access the meeting can watch the livestream available on the website, broad past on Comcast channel 22 or calling in to one of the phone numbers listed for the meeting on the public webcast and meeting materials page on the city of Eugene website. Thank you for joining us today. I call the June 17, 2026 work session of the Eugene City Council to order. I will turn now to the city manager to introduce the first topic, work session on mass century very lance policy discussion.

>> Jenny Haruyama: Thank you, we'll look at examples used by the cities and government policies and approaches. This is for the Council to provide feedback around values and principles as it relates to how staff accesses emerging technology and existing technology today's conversation is just information only. And it is a response to work poll requested by a Councilor.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you.

>> Matt: All right, good afternoon, I am assistant city manager Matt Rodrigues. We will discuss surveillance technologies, policies that govern the technologies and potential consideration should Council wish to develop a surveillance technology policy. This is informational and exploratory discussion. We're not seeking a decision today but rather feedback on principles and potentially

policies that may guide future work. We'll begin with a brief overview of today's objectives, review the city's current use of camera based technologies and policies that govern them. We'll discuss emerging technologies, review recent state legislation related to you a to mated license plate recognition, summarize how other cities have approached surveillance technology policies, discuss policy design considerations, and walk through a few examples. Today's objectives are three fold. The overview I shared in the agenda. And, well, actually that's the first two. With the third being obtain Council feedback on the values, principles and/or policy that should guide future deployment and surveillance technologies. We'll begin by establishing a base line understanding of the camera based technologies currently in use. Staff conducted an initial inventory and identified six categories of camera based security technologies used across city departments. Access to these systems is limited to authorized users and governed by established retention and access protocols. Facial recognition is not used in any of the city's current implementations of the technologies. Because this is the city's first coordinated inventory effort the inventory may continue to be refined as rye digital information is gathered. We'll start with security cameras which there are three varieties.

The first fixed security cameras represent the largest category of camera based technologies used by the city. The primary purpose is facility and infrastructure monitoring, examples include securing city buildings and facilities, monitoring traffic operations, supporting traffic signal functionality and monitoring wastewater treatment processes. Most are used for operational or security purposes. These systems record video only and do not capture audio. Some uses such as traffic operations are for realtime observation with no data recording. Data that is recorded is typically stored on city of Eugene equipment and we have approximately 700 cameras in 26 locations citywide. Portable cameras are the second type. Serve a similar purpose but greater flexibility. Though can be relocated as operational needs change although they're typically mounted in a way that requires significant effort to relocate them. Public works primarily uses these systems to monitor certain parks facilities while Eugene Police Department uses them as a crime prevention and public safety tool in accordance with established departmental policies. Like fixed cameras they record video only and data is typically stored on city of Eugene equipment. We have approximately 6 camera units in 5 locations citywide. Mobile security cameras are the third category. They are typically trailer-mounted and can be rapidly deployed to specific security concerns or operational needs. These systems provide a temporary presence and allow departments to respond to changing conditions without installing permanent infrastructure. Currently these systems are used by public works and EPD and deployments are based on operational need and governed by existing departmental policies. These systems record video only.

Data is typically stored on city of Eugene equipment and 10 camera units deployed based on need. Camera security screening technology systems differ from traditional cameras. Primary purpose is another observation but security screening. They combine video technology, metal detection, and machine learning to identify

potential concealed weapons. Video and systems are used at two locations, the Holt center and city hall Council chambers. These systems are especially effective at security screening while maintaining a steady flow of people in large events. The systems capture still images rather than continuous video and do not record audio. Data is stored in the cloud. We have six city-owned units at two locations citywide. In addition the city owned installations this is used at the Cuthbert by the venue operator. Small unmanned aerial systems known as drones provide specialized capabilities that can improve safety and efficiency. Public works uses drones for infrastructure inspections, construction monitoring and assessments of natural systems. EPD uses for public safety and limited and governed by state law.

City policy and departmental policy. For law enforcement purposes EPD must obtain a warrant unless specific legal exceptions apply. Additionally EPD uses drone systems to assist EUGENE-Springfield fire when needed. They collect data only and data stored in the cloud, the city owns approximately 27 drones which are deployed based on need. In-car video systems are installed in police patrol vehicles and intended to document interactions between officers and members of the public. These recordings can provide objective evidence during investigations, assist with complaint resolution, support officer accountability, and improve transparency regarding police community interactions. The use is governed by state law and department policy. These systems are used in approximately 125 EPD vehicles and record video and audio with cloud-based data storage. Body worn cameras serve a similar purpose but provide a closer perspective on officer interactions. The cameras are deployed to all sworn personnel and operate under both Oregon law and departmental policy. As with in-car video the intent is to improve transparency, accountability, evidence collection and public trust while creating an objective record of interactions. Currently the department has approximately 250 body worn camera units worn by sworn personnel recording video and audio with cloud based data storage. The city currently uses automated license plate recognition technology, also known as ALPR for parking management purposes. To be clear EPD does not currently use ALPR. Two different types of ALPR systems are used, first are fixed ALPR systems installed on poles, on buildings, or other fixed locations. Currently the systems are used by the planning and development department parking services team at two downtown parking garages. At the Eugene airport parking facilities. These systems support parking operations and facility management and these technologies are not connected to law enforcement systems. However at the airport the ALPR is included in the TSA approved airport security program. These systems record video only and data is stored in the cloud.

The planning and development parking services team uses vehicle mounted ALPR technology to improve parking management and enforcement efficiency. These systems assist staff in identifying parking violations and unpaid parking violations. As with the fixed systems the technologies are not used by EPD and not connected to law enforcement. Use of the vehicle based ALPR is governed by a data policy specific to parking operations. The systems record video only and data stored in the cloud. These systems are installed in approximately 14 parking service

vehicles. That concludes the technologies we currently have in use. I'm going to speak a little bit about emerging technologies and I'll start with E. D emerging technology -- EPD emerging technologies policy. That established policy has evaluation criteria that must be looked at before new technologies are adopted. Including a number of evaluation criteria that have to be addressed before a new technology is obtained by the department. An example of a new technology that is being explored is automated red light and speed safety cameras which are not currently used in Eugene. However they are identified in the city's vision zero action plan as proven tools to reduce serious crashes and fatalities on the transportation system. Especially at some high crash locations.

Since the plan was adopted, state legislation has expanded local authority to use automated speed enforcement technologies in addition to red light safety cameras. Staff are evaluating operational staffing and funding considerations associated with the potential future program. Any future deployment would require additional policy discussions and Council direction. So earlier this year, the Oregon legislature adopted Senate bill 516 which establishes a comprehensive framework governing law enforcement use of automated license plate recognition technology. Once again known as ALPR. The legislation includes requirements related to allowable uses, data storage and retention, detailed logging of queries, data sharing, pushily accessible monthly audits, requires a host of related policies to be put in place. Restrictions on use of the data by vendors, ability of the public to seek civil penalties against vendors who misuse information, and conditional exemption of ALPR data from public records requests. While the city's current ALPR system are used for parking management only rather than law enforcement, the legislation provides an exam of how policy makers address policy, accountability and public transparency concerns associated with technologies.

We have reviewed how other jurisdictions have approached surveillance technology governance. Surveillance technology policies are uncommon across the United States. Most of the existing policies stem from the American civil liberty union community control over police surveillance or COPS framework that began in 2016. According to the ACLA, over 2 dozen cities have adopted policies based on the principles and span a wide range from Seattle, San Francisco, Berkeley to grand rapids, Madison, Nashville, Detroit, and New York. Higher in Oregon Portland is the only city that appears to have implemented surveillance technology policy. After a significance community engagement process, Portland adopted policy in February of 2023 as the Council resolution. Establishing a citywide surveillance technology inventory, and setting procedures for privacy use and acquisition.

Next I'm going to talk about some policy design considerations and we'll look at how three cities approach their policy design. To inform a surveillance technology policy, several foundational decisions would need to be made. First what technologies would fall into the policy scope should the policy apply to all city departments, what documentation, reporting and technology specific reviews are required, who would review and approve new technologies, noting that any policy

review process that Council may choose to establish is different than contract approval with specifically falling under the authority of the city manager. Lastly, whether existing technologies should be reviewed under a new policy and whether limited exemptions should be permitted. To understand some of the differences in how cities have implemented surveillance policies let's take a closer look at Berkeley, California, Portland, Oregon, and San Jose, California. City of Berkeley surveillance technology policy represents one that is closely aligned with the ACLU CCOPS model. Berkeley's policy incorporates a broad definition including electronic devices used to collect audio, electronic, visual, location, thermal, olfactory, and biometric data. When a department wants to acquire or use a covered technology staff prepares a surveillance impact report describing the purpose of the technology, expected benefits, potential risks and proposed safeguards. Technology specific use policy is also developed that addresses topics such as authorized uses, data retention, access controls, and reporting requirements.

Proposals then are reviewed through a public process, review of police technologies by the police commission before being considered by the City Council. Council approval is generally required before new surveillance units can be acquired or deployed. Berkeley places strong direct official oversight and public input but requires significant staff time and extensive review process. Portland Oregon spent several years engaging community organizations, privacy advocates, city bureaus and other stakeholders to develop a surveillance tech nothing governance framework focused on transparency, privacy and accountability. The approach is phased beginning with the creation of a citywide inventory already in use, rather than immediately creating approval requirements. Portland's first focused on understanding what technologies existed, and establishing a governance structure around them. Portland defines surveillance technology as any electronic or analog device, equipment, software, information and/or metadata, automated decision systems, data processing or software solution that is designed or primarily intended to be used for the purpose of surveillance. It goes on to further define surveillance. The policy applies citywide and Portland is now implementing privacy impact assessments to evaluate technology and identify potential privacy concerns. Also creating public reporting and transparency requirements.

The process is managed by smart city PDX in the office of equity and human rights. With oversight transitioning to a new city data and privacy office once it is established. Council's role is primarily establishing the overall framework through resolution and receiving information. While much of the implementation work and technology approvals are carried out through administrative and privacy governance processes. Like Berkeley, Portland's process is resource insensitive and differs on administrative process with public hair sharing of analysis decisions and reporting. We wanted to conclude with San Jose, California, because it takes a somewhat different approach than Berkeley or Portland. Rather than focusing primarily on whether technology meets the definition of surveillance technology, San Jose focuses on the privacy and civil liberties risks associated with the technology and its intended use. Departments proposing a new technology submit for review through

the city's privacy program. The level of review depends on the level of risk. Lower risk technologies can generally move through an administrative process while technology with greater privacy implications receive additional review, documentation and public engagement. The city also publishes privacy decisions and supporting information to improve transparency. The general approach is that oversight is proportional to risk rather than applying the same review process to every technology. This approach allows routine technology to be managed administratively while reserving intense review and Council engagement for risk of greater privacy impacts. That concludes the presentation.

At this point we'd like to shift from providing information to hearing from Council. As you consider the information presented tonight we're interested in what questions you have and your thoughts on what values principles, and/or policy considerations should guide the future evaluation and use of surveillance related technologies. Finally, while this afternoon's discussion is focused on surveillance technology the feedback we receive will help inform ongoing work related to the city's Artificial Intelligence policy, implementation of a data governance framework and consideration of emerging technologies more broadly. Many of these same questions about transparency, accountability, appropriate use and public trust apply across these areas and Council's feedback will be helpful in shaping the work moving forward. With that, we welcome your questions, comments, and feedback.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, assistant city manager Rodrigues for that presentation. A lot of useful information. I think a lot of questions answered just from what you have shared. I'll open the floor for Council discussion. Councilor Zelenka then Councilor Clark in the queue.

>> Zelenka: Thank you. The main question for me in all of this is what's the role of the City Council in the mass surveillance policy. Is that policy a -- is that a policy question, the use have mass surveillance technology, or a management issue. I harken back to what I consider the Oracle on it, Ken TOLINAR, wrote the model code for Eugene. I once asked him what's the difference between, there's a gray line between policy and management. And policy is the purview of the City Council and management or reports are the purview of the city manager. He said it's pretty simple F it's controversial it becomes policy. I thought oh, that's kind of a little too simple. But then as I use that over the years that's become kind of the way that I look at this. If something becomes controversial, becomes in the put realm, it then becomes a policy issue. And is the threshold -- goes beyond the threshold and becomes a policy issue that is the pursue of the City Council. When that issue reaches the threshold of significant public concern and input, it then becomes a policy, then it comes under the City Council purview. For me, the answer to the question whether the City Council should establish a mass surveillance technology policy, the answer is clearly yes.

It ceased being a management or contractual issue under the purview of the city manager when the flock issue blew up into the public sphere and continues.

When the perceived threat of the likely misuse of data and images by the Trump administration became very real it shifted into the policy realm. So should the Council approve the use of all mass surveillance technology, I think yes. Should the Council establish rules on how, whether, and under what rules the city uses mass surveillance technology, I think the answer is yes. But we can -- can we grandfather in some existing mass surveillance technologies that we already use, I think the answer to that is yes. We can by that approve them. Should we have policies for both new and existing or grandfathered-in ones, yes. Should there be a public input process as we develop this process, I think this policy, the answer is yes. So we have some really good examples of the type of policies from Berkeley and Portland used, that we can use to help craft the policy. I like San Jose's risk level. I'm eager to get working on this and have this set up, and have this put in place by the end of the year.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: Thank you, Mayor, thank you for the presentation, Matt. I don't get an opportunity to say this off, but I agree entirely with Councilor Zelenka's comments. If we are going to establish a policy I tend, based on the limited presentation scene, to favor the San Jose model myself. I did have a couple of specific questions. One that Matt during the presentation you mentioned with rode light cameras and speeding cameras that that technology is currently being reviewed. My question, by whom?

>> Matt: Councilor Clark thanks for the question. It is not being reviewed it is being explored. In other words the a number of cities around Oregon implemented the technology. It is part of the two different actions and the vision zero action plan. And the team is trying to understand logistically how we would implement it if we chose to. How much it would cost, how that would work through municipal court and work through EPD. Before that moved forward we would be coming back to Council to talk about that as a proposal.

>> Clark: That will be reviewed by Council before implementation no matter what, correct?

>> Matt: Yes. Yes, the simple answer is yes, both for the implementation and also likely budget needs for a program like that.

>> Clark: I'm strongly in favor, as I said, of the San Jose model where we have at least the flexibility for routine level things to be discussed. But I also agree with Ken TOLINAR analysis, staff ought to be really careful that something can't blow up into a public issue. Ought to always, you know, lean towards the side of caution when involving the public in the conversation in advance. I wrote a question in response to this work session poll, and can't receive a memo sponsor anything in the AIS. If the chief is there, I'd like to ask a more specific question about a different

kind of technology. My question is whether or not EPD makes use of geo-fencing warrants. If he's available. There he is.

>> Chief Skinner: Councilor Clark I have to get a better sense of what context you are referring to geo-fencing warrants.

>> Clark: Do we ask courts to help us through the means of a private company like Google to say in this area defined at this particular time please give us a list of all devices that were there.

>> Chief Skinner: -- and ask the court to insist Google give it to us.

>> Chief Skinner: There are a variety of technique we use to geo-fence certain information in the hopes of being able to locate somebody or assist us in that investigation. Those are as a result of writing a warrant for that information. So I guess the quick answer would be case by case depending on the investigation we would write a judicial warrant, have that signed by the judge, then the judge would grant our ability to look at that specific information. A good example of that would be, although maybe not geo-fence, is our cell phone pinging. We write warrants for oftentimes unless there's significant exigent circumstances, we write warrants to ping an individual's cell phone to get last known location for a variety of different reasons.

>> Clark: But that's a known individual as opposed to what I'm, my question focuses more towards the gathering of any device in a particular area at a particular time without a known person as part of the warrant. I know that fourth circuit and fifth circuit have divergent opinions and it's before the Supreme Court. I'm wondering the regular use of EPD what is sometimes referred to as a reverse warrant.

>> Chief Skinner: My experience is that we have a very specific investigative need for these warrants, usually anchored to an individual or a group of individuals that we're looking for. It's not just done to cast a wide net and gather whatever data we think we can gather. It is very, very focused.

>> Clark: My second question in regard to those type of warrants is what we do to store the data after the fact and how long we keep it.

>> Chief Skinner: That's case by case basis depending what data we're keeping. Now understand anything we're doing is if it's a warrant has been signed by a judge and it is lawful, lawful police action. We collect that data, likely if it's of evidentiary value it goes into the evidence, digital evidence management system which holds all of our digital evidence.

>> Clark: Okay, thank you sir, very much, greatly appreciate it.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Groves.

>> Groves: I agree with what I heard Councilor Zelenka, saying. I we like this done by the end of the calendar year. I really support the use of technology, we encourage or staffs to explore and find technology that helps them be more efficient in their work, that's going to be even more important as we start wrestling with budget problems, continue wrestling with budget problems I should say. But at the same time with this access I think comes great responsibility. We need to have some level of oversight. I think a lot of it comes down what do we do with the data how do we store it. Any policy we come up with that's going to be something I look at. Just so that we understand the sphere of control, how far and where that can and will go. That's a critical piece. I would like to know more about some of these -- we have nice bullets for the programs that are in place. I would like to find a way to maybe do a little more reading on those. I don't know if that's available online but I'll take a look. I don't want to see us reinvent the wheel. At the same time we have to, whatever we find we have to tailor it to this community. I agree that we need to do more public outreach on this. We heard loud voices during public comment period at our Council meetings. But I would really like to get a feel for how the entire city feels about it. I heard comments that were supportive of surveillance. But those people did not show up at Council meetings to speak. We can have a safe way of polling the community, I think, would be very informative as we proceed with this process. Those are initial comments, I have a lot of things going through my mind but I want to kind of think more about this before I start digging in too deep. I think we need to move forward with this, we need a plan. I like the deadline by the end of the calendar year.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Yeh.

>> Yeh: I agree. I think Councilor Zelenka, had a lot of great points and summed it up, thank you for doing that. I also agree we should use a broad definition for surveillance technology. I also agree that looking citywide rather than just in one or two departments makes a lot of sense. Adding an element of risk assessment, I think also makes sense especially if you consider more emerging technologies often carry more risk because they are less known. If that is a component of it, I think that would make a lot of sense. I would love to have it done by the end of the year. I'm not sure how realistic that is. I would love for a next step to be staff bringing back to us what a realistic timeline would be for doing this work. Especially if our expectation we are going out to the public and we have seen that this is a difficult topic to engage people with. For them to feel comfortable engaging with us with. So how are we going to make those opportunities where people feel comfortable expressing their opinions. So it may take multiple different types of touch points. I assume that will take more time. Having staff get back to us about what a realistic timeline for that would be, I think the next step for us at this point. Just, Matt, real quick do we feel like we have a decent -- sounds like Portland spent a long time figuring out what they had. We're a smaller city, do we have a good grasp of what we're talking about or do you need more work in that area?

>> Matt: As was shared we focused on camera based technologies. IF we're expanding that definition similar to other cities we have to do another dive. One thing I want to say, the definition of what we're talking about is the most important part. Just for comparison none of the other cities use the term "mass surveillance," it's surveillance. It might be something that's used, only specifically collecting data about one person. If they consider it a surveillance technology, it is part of that policy. So that foundational piece really helps understand the level of work. As you said, Portland took a number of years before they adopted their resolution doing engagement. These of not been fast processes, for the cities that put them in place.

>> Yeh: I think two years is not what we're looking for. If the feedback to us is if you want us to go super broad it's going to take a long time. Perhaps feedback about where the boundaries are for maybe a first phase to be able to do some work might be helpful for us, if we need to start small and then work our way out to other technologies.

>> Matt: Right, I think most of that time was the public engagement not necessarily the inventory.

>> Yeh: Excellent, thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor leech.

>> Leech: Thank you, Mayor. I agree with my colleagues, we definitely need to implement a surveillance policy. I think citywide. There's got to be that public process and Council process component in my opinion. As we saw last year, the last thing we want is for the public and Council to find out about new technology as it is being installed. We wanted that process to start earlier. I like the risk assessment factor of the San Jose model as well. I have a question around that. Who would be doing that risk assessment, is that something that would be independent or outside, in city staff?

>> Matt: That would depend on how Council defined it. I believe in San Jose they do that risk assessment internally. Also to be clear in Portland, they do all of that internally. The Council direction was high level about establishing a program. Then review and approval happens through that smart city PDX and office of equity and human rights team. Soon to be transitioning to a data privacy office.

>> Leech: Thank you. You mention that heavy staff load for the process and a model like Portland and Berkeley, now I see why. If it is all of that done internally. Again, we're also a small city. The assumption is that we're not going to be doing this every day. We have identified about 6 different types. I support grandfathering our current tech in. But I think the fact that there is this kind of slower process built in makes sure that we are doing the right steps for the publics, for the community, for the Council. So that when we are implementing a tool we know that we can do

that confidently without as much backlash. So I'm really looking forward to continuing to talk about this. I don't know, assistant city manager, can you -- since we have gone around, can you give us some feedback on what else you need from us to move forward, a timeline that feels reasonable. I know by the ends of the year has been brought up a few times. Does that feel feasible?

>> Jenny Haruyama: If I can weigh in I appreciate the comments Council makes. Between now and the ends of the year, we have over 100 items coming to you on your agenda. Given that context, I think that we can put a timeline together. But understand that it is competing with a lot of other just as are equally important things. I think how I want us to take this approach in bite-sized pieces would be flexibility in that way. The phased approach would be helpful. I think we can take a meaningful first step and give you some policy framework. Probably within, maybe, 6 months. But in terms of actually getting a full policy implemented that is going to take us some time. I just wanted to present that context in front of you.

>> Leech: Thank you, city manager. That makes a lot of sense to me as well. The fall goes by very quickly. But if we had the ability to look at something that feels like actionable moving forward by the end of the year, that would be amazing. Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you Council. We'll head into a second round, I have Councilor Zelenka, in the queue before offering the microphone I want to add a couple of observations. One of them is that I do think we have heard clearly interest in a citywide surveillance policy and thinking about the commitment to doing work well. And the points at which this set of policy questions intersects with other current policy that are before the City Council. I think there could be an opportunity for us to think about a phased approach that is very strategic and uses this body's time well and helps us to focus that surveillance conversation on emergent technologies and issues that are already aligned with the work that is in the next six-month work schedule for this body just with the items that already are before Council. I wanted to just offer that I think there is a lot of wisdom in that phased approach and initiating this work. And for looking at the areas where we know we might need early feedback or feedback sooner so that we can progress efficiently with other areas of work and not get caught up in a conversation that is much broader and longer about the entirety of our surveillance work. I think the citywide surveillance policy development is important. And coming forward in components of work is a very solid approach to that. Having a policy framework within six months would be amazing. Thank you for offering a little bit of that sense of timing. Beginning the second round if Councilor Zelenka, in the queue, thank you.

>> Zelenka: Fortunately we can learn from other cities that have gone before us and that can speed up the process since we have models to work off of. We wouldn't necessarily have to start from scratch, that helps us quite a bit. So cribbing off of the other policies that had thoughtful discussions in some cases two years, will be very, very -- this is a very important policy issue. It is of one of the highest in front

of the Council. Councilor groves being mindful of budget and efficient is really good. This isn't uncomplicated stuff. A lot of moving parts. People say ban all of it, it's not that simple. Public works uses drones to do rooftop inspections rather than risking someone going up and down the roof. Police use drones to track suspects at night when they can't find them. Legitimate uses that make work efficient, lower costs and more effective. I think at the least a policy framework start by the end of the year starting with grandfathering in the stuff we have. Having that be incorporated is fairly straightforward process. Go on to new rules for new tech. In particular we want something in place before we do anything with ALPR. That way we can do it in a systematic fashion and fairly quickly. The big bulk part of it.

>> Mayor Knudson: Other questions from Council? Assistant city manager, I have a question, I am in touch with all three of the mayors in these cities. Can you imagine in the last year that we have had a couple of conversations about surveillance work. And public safety. And community engagement. It is a very different picture in each city. They're structured in different ways, different resources, different relationships to technology. The Mayor of San Jose among the colleagues that I have met in the last year and a half is the most forward thinking Mayor of technology, A.I., engagement, he comes out of the world of tech. Certainly that is of influence in the work that that community. We have some great examples to build off of from Berkeley, and the lessons from Portland as well. I'm curious if you can share a little bit about what we learned in our past year, year and a half of work and our community conversations. And compare that to what you saw come through the legislature with the new legislative engagement and Senate bill 15-16. By the time that that -- could you speak a little bit to any utility that we as a city have experienced related to the passage of that bill, how having that new floor for engagement with one area of technology could influence other conversations. I'm curious. That was all happening at the same times. Even last year, we were having a very intense community conversation about technology, there was also internal work happening to learn from and improve upon what we were doing. Though not all of that was implemented. We ended our FLOCK contract early in the fall. I don't want us to lose the lessons learned along that way. I'm curious if we can contextualize how we think about this work and how the state seems to be thinking about it.

>> Matt: Thank you, Mayor. I can try to add some to the conversation. The Oregon legislative session work I think actually was a great example of a number of different parties with different perspectives working with legislators to craft something they thought would be functional yet address concerns around use of technology that some folks are worried about being abused. You know, we have our own policy on ALPR for that EPD policy that was created in conjunction with the police commission. I don't believe that's been updated yet to agree with state law. We haven't talked about re-implementing the technology. As folks talk about just having really clear guidelines on data retention, some of these things are exactly what we were doing. Having a state law that makes it consistent was the important goal. 30 day retention, making sure there's detailed logs of queries, posting audits.

All of these things that help folks understand how a technology is being used. One of the things that the legislature also did was made vendors who misuse data subject to potential civil penalties for misuse. I think that is probably in this specific instance of technology something that is reassuring to folks who may not believe that a contract is enough. Though I think there were interesting lessons to learn about bringing groups together to understand how you actually have a functional policy for a technology that can do good and make sure that it feels like it has the right level of oversight.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, thank you for those examples. I realize not everyone is following the axles of the legislature as closely as this body and staff. Especially related to this issue. Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: Particularly on the legislation passed in '26, SB-1516. I thought that that law had the basics right, and got most of the stuff in there that needed to be in there. But it didn't go far enough on security for my perspective. To me it felt like there were too many loopholes. When we look at that policy we want to take good look at how that -- what that law says and how we might beef that up to make it a little bit more transparent and secure than what the legislature was able to go through. I think it sets the floor. It is the floor, it is the state legislature. We certainly go beyond that.

>> Mayor Knudson: Any other questions or comments, discussion that Council would like to have today regarding surveillance policy and what sounds like pretty solid trajectory and thoughts on timelines. Okay, well I'll say thank you to staff for very informative presentation, for all of the work that's one into preparing this overview, it is significant and touches many areas of our work. I'll just say thank you to everyone. That concludes our agenda for today. I now close the June 17, 2026 City Council work session. We are adjourned.