CITY COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT

Meeting Date: September 18, 2025
From: Jeremy Dennis, City Manager
Subject: Discussion – Installation of a Camera at the Community Park

Recommendation

Per the request of Councilmember Kern, Staff recommends discussion on the potential installation of cameras at Community Park.

Background

At the September 4, 2025 City Council meeting, Councilmember Kern requested the City Council agendize a discussion regarding the potential installation of cameras at Community Park. Below is a summary of the potential uses of a camera, how other local communities have utilized cameras in their public spaces. And costs associated with such installations.

Examples of Use
Municipalities install cameras for a variety of reasons:

- Increasing the visibility of a public area (such as a webcam that overlooks a park, building or street
- Enhancing public safety/increasing the number of investigative tools in the event of a crime or incident
  - Providing deterrence from future criminal activity or incidents
- Increasing the visibility of a public infrastructure project's construction progress
- Providing real-time traffic/outdoor facility use updates
- Coordinating emergency response coordination/increasing visibility in high-fire areas

The City of Brisbane has installed cameras at the following locations:

- City Hall and Annex
- Corpyard
- Community Pool
- Marina
- Right of way location at Main Street and Bayshore Blvd to deter/monitor/investigate illegal dumping

Case Uses from Local Municipalities

To learn more about the usage of cameras in public spaces, staff surveyed neighboring cities to learn more about their experiences with cameras in community parks. The following information was received:

- *Burlingame:* Installed four cameras at Washington Park four years ago in response to ongoing concerns regarding graffiti. Staff selected Arlo Pro cameras, as it was a cost effective and simple solution. The camera footage is not accessed publicly, and the Parks Department and Police Department have access to the footage. Burlingame has been able to apprehend individuals who have vandalized the park. The biggest issue was difficulty with Wi-Fi connectivity.
- *Millbrae:* Installed the Verkada camera system both inside and outside of recreation center along with visibility into Central Park. The cameras are smart cameras that track movement. The Parks and Recreation Department have access to the footage and review footage on an as-needed basis. If needed, clips may be sent to the police department.
- *Redwood City:* Installed different types of cameras throughout the city. Some high end Verkada cameras, and a few simple webcams based on the location. The footage is not publicly accessible.
- *South San Francisco:* Installed the Verkada camera system along with an Avigilion system. While the system is not actively monitored, footage is pulled on an as-needed basis. The city does have a Verkada livecam for the aquatic center construction project. You can view it at www.ssf.net/newpool.
- *San Carlos:* Installed cameras at their parks and public facilities. The city upgraded their cameras to 360 cameras in 2017 for select facilities. The Sherriff's office is able to review camera footage as necessary and IT staff have permission to review only to determine if the cameras are functioning property. The footage is not publicly accessible. The total project cost was $450,000.

Costs of Various Camera Systems

The use of a public-facing camera system has a direct relationship to the cost of purchase, installation, and subscriptions. In the case of a system intended to bring visibility to an amenity, construction project, or other similar use, a standard webcam system, Webcams are typically consumer grade and used for personal video communication. Many webcams are plug-and-play by utilizing a USB, they have a fixed lens without the ability to zoom or pan. Webcams also are lower resolution (720p to 1080p) with a limited field of view and no built-in streaming protocols. Common webcams include Arlo Pro, Logitech C920, Razer Kiyo, and Microsoft LifeCam. Data may be stored in the cloud and remote access is available. The cost of webcams may range from $50 to over $250 per camera. The City's webcam purchased to curb illegal

dumping cost $250 per camera plus a $25 per month subscription fee.

As noted above, some cities utilizing camera systems which have the capability to provide real-time camera feeds. Designated staff may monitor the camera with remote access and view from their smartphones, tablets, or desktops. These systems also allow for centralized control of multiple locations including city halls, police stations, and public parks. The automation feature triggers alerts based on motion, door access, or license plate recognition. While Verkada is widely used, other systems include PTZOptics, Sony SRG series, and Panasonic AW series to name a few.

In gathering cost information, Staff received quotes for two types of cameras provided by Qovo Solutions, Inc. The Artificial Intelligence (AI) Camera has the ability to analyze audio and dispatch law enforcement. Audio triggers may include screaming or a car crash. The camera pans and has the ability to zoom. It is cloud based and costs approximately $9,000 per camera plus $10,000 for installation and an annual licensing fee of $400. The second camera is a traditional dome, fixed camera. While also cloud based, it does not have the ability to zoom or pan and does not have audio. The cost per camera is approximately $16,000 plus $10,000 for installation and a $500 licensing fee.

Best Practice
Best practices when implementing public facing cameras include creation of transparent policies, limiting data retention, restricting access to footage, and complying with any privacy laws.

Should Council wish to proceed, Staff anticipates creating a camera policy based on best practices that also incorporate an auditing component, similar to the audit requirements provided by the Automated License Plate Reader (ALPR) policies. The audit allows the Police Commander or the Chief of Police to conduct an audit of ALPR browsing inquiries at least monthly each calendar year. The audit is documented and reviewed by the Chief of Police and retained in a secure location.

Discussion
Staff recommends the City Council weigh the costs and benefits of the various types of camera systems and provide staff direction on whether to continue to explore installation of a camera at Community Park.

Fiscal Impact
The fiscal impact to the City is dependent on the camera system selected.

Attachments

Jeremy Dennis
Jeremy Dennis, City Manager