

From: Elena Lambertson [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2026 4:25 PM
To: City Council <citycouncil@cityofsebastopol.gov>
Subject: General Public Comment: Agenda Item #7

Hello,

As a Sonoma County resident I urge Sebastopol city council not to approve this amendment to the Surveillance Ordinance. The current Surveillance Ordinance already allows for changes to be thoughtfully made with thorough oversight and consideration from the Council and the general public. The PD can already effectively request and attain new, updated surveillance technology even with the ordinance, it does not inherently block them from doing so. Therefore there is no need to reduce this ordinance oversight. We're in a dangerous time dominated by private surveillance companies that have gained centralized, unchecked power and allow illegal warrantless surveillance. This amendment refers to "traditional security cameras" but I urge the council to maintain oversight to "traditional" security cameras (or otherwise) being purchased and installed in Sebastopol.

If the Sebastopol PD believes that evidence for a crime is on a private security camera/doorbell camera, can they not get a warrant to access the footage? Why do they need unrestricted access to private footage without oversight?

Wanting to install new cameras/update cameras is one thing, but wanting less oversight for future changes is an entirely different thing. I believe that Sebastopol's Surveillance Ordinance sets an example that all of Sonoma County should follow. If public safety is truly the priority of the council and the PD, then proper oversight is what really makes the public feel safe and informed. We want to maintain agency to take part in the decisions that directly affect our privacy rights and daily lives.

Thank you,
Elena

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.