

BOARD OF DAVIS COUNTY COMMISSIONERS MINUTES

Board of Davis County Commissioners - Work Session Minutes

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

The Board of Davis County Commissioners met for their regularly scheduled meeting at 8:15 AM on June 17, 2025, in room 306 of the Davis County Administration Building, 61 South Main Street, Farmington, Utah. Required legal notice of this meeting was given.

All documents from this meeting are on file in the Davis County Clerk's Office. The agenda for this meeting is incorporated into the minutes as item headers.

Following the approved Davis County policy, artificial intelligence (AI) was utilized in the preliminary creation of these minutes. The final minutes were edited and completed by Davis County Clerk's Office staff.

ROLL CALL

Chair Lorene Kamalu
Vice Chair John Crofts
Commissioner Bob Stevenson
County Clerk Brian McKenzie
Chief Deputy Clerk Rebecca Abbott
Clerk's Office Aaron Moyes
Clerk's Office Jessica Turner

Chief Deputy Civil Attorney Neal Geddes
Civil Attorney Bret James
Human Resources Director Chris Bone
Information Systems Director Jeff Hassett
Library Director Josh Johnson

AGENDA ITEM

1 8:15 - 9:15 AM

#2025-647. A Work Session to discuss the Davis County Privacy Program - Presented by Brian McKenzie, Clerk, Clerk's Office

[01:28] Clerk McKenzie highlighted Aaron Moyes' recent certification as a Certified Information Privacy Manager (CIPM) through the International Association of Privacy Professionals (IAPP) and emphasized the expertise he brought to the table, which prompted a brief discussion about the qualifications and roles of the new privacy team. Clerk McKenzie went on to outline the core elements of the proposed ordinance which he and Aaron had drafted. He explained its purpose: to designate the Data Privacy Chief Administrative Officer, establish a County-wide privacy policy in line with the Government Data Privacy Act (GDPA), and assign specific responsibilities. Clerk McKenzie elaborated on the formation of a Privacy Advisory Committee, noting its composition of various County offices based on their specific expertise and County-wide influence. He clarified that these individuals had already been involved in reviewing and refining the ordinance, underscoring the collaborative approach to its development.

[04:15] The discussion moved to the practical implementation, revealing a plan to establish "departmental personal data privacy representatives" in each department. Clerk McKenzie explained their role as a crucial point of contact for gathering information and preparing state reports, emphasizing a distributed model for compliance. He shared an update on the annually required training, noting its swift rollout by IS; over 50 employees have already completed the mandatory training. Clerk McKenzie asked for support in helping employees understand this training is vital to maintaining compliance. The importance of accountability was brought into focus with the discussion of an annual audit requirement, which led to a conversation about the built-in checks and balances. The protocol for data breaches was also detailed: initial notifications to both IS and the Clerk's Office, enabling a joint assessment of the severity and necessary response. A crucial point was raised regarding new software purchases containing personal data, with a clear directive that IS and the Clerk's Office must be consulted *before* implementation to ensure privacy by design.

[08:05] A question was asked about the ordinance's adaptability, given the newness of the law and anticipated future legislative tweaks. Clerk McKenzie acknowledged this challenge, explaining that the ordinance was deliberately built with flexibility, referencing the act generally rather than any specific code to allow for adaptation. Chief Deputy Clerk Abbott shared insights from a recent training where state officials indicated a decade-long process of legislative refinement. IS Director Hassett suggested it would be a move towards

"maturity" rather than constant overhauls. Clerk McKenzie affirmed their collaborative stance so far, noting that while the state's initial focus was on state agencies, they actively sought feedback.

[10:12] When compared to other counties, Davis County appears to be "ahead of the curve" with its actions towards data privacy, though the true measure would come with the December reporting deadline. Commissioners expressed gratitude for the thoughtful approach to this unfunded mandate, acknowledging the significant financial commitment by the County. IS Director Hassett explained how his department had reallocated existing resources by shifting positions to security, demonstrating that compliance sometimes involves internal reorganization rather than just new funding. The conversation then transitioned to the practical difficulties departments might face. Clerk McKenzie noted that while Aaron's position was funded, departments would largely be handling privacy duties as "additional duties as assigned," which he acknowledged would be "tough." He emphasized the need for collective support to ensure County-wide success and the development of tools to ease the burden on departmental representatives. The complexities of data ownership were also discussed, with Director Hassett clarifying that data ownership resides with the data itself, not necessarily the system, and that data owners are responsible for identifying, collecting, and retaining data appropriately.

[20:45] The Commissioners discussed the timeline for formal adoption, aiming for July 1, 2025. All three Commissioners were given the chance to read the draft and provide feedback. No feedback was given, but they did acknowledge that future adjustments were likely as the law changes. Commissioner Kamalu raised a point about tailoring the approach for law enforcement, which Clerk McKenzie explained was already addressed in the act due to the unique nature of their work. The absence of specific guidance for cities in the act was also noted, implying each city would have to navigate the requirements independently. The conversation then turned to the plan for engaging department directors. The consensus seemed to be that while director buy-in was important, relying on subject-matter experts at this stage was crucial to avoid delays, particularly given impending deadlines. It was clarified that the intent was to frame the post-approval discussion with directors as initial training and awareness, emphasizing that this was a starting point subject to future refinement, rather than a final, unchangeable policy. Clerk McKenzie reiterated his commitment to making the process as "bite-size and doable" as possible for departments. The sheer scope of "processing activity" was highlighted by Commissioner Kamalu, who read its comprehensive definition aloud, prompting a shared recognition of the significant work involved in reviewing and potentially reforming every process that touches personal data.

Commissioner Kamalu recessed the meeting at 8:50 AM. It would reconvene at 9:15 AM to discuss the next topic.

ROLL CALL

Chair Lorene Kamalu
Vice Chair John Crofts
Commissioner Bob Stevenson
County Clerk Brian McKenzie
County Treasurer Matt Brady (Arrived at 9:20 AM)
Chief Deputy Civil Attorney Neal Geddes

Civil Attorney Bret James
Chief Deputy Assessor Dale Peterson
Human Resources Director Chris Bone
Information Systems Director Jeff Hassett
Commission Office Shauna Brady
Clerk's Office Jessica Turner

2 9:15 - 9:45 AM

#2025-653. A Work Session to discuss two 1347 Applications and consider Approving or Denying -
Presented by Lorene Kamalu, Davis County Commission Chair, Commissioners' Office

[34:40] The meeting reconvened at 9:19 AM with a second roll call. Dale Peterson, Chief Deputy Assessor, presented the first case involving the Edwards family. He explained that a property had been inaccurately assessed in 2023 because it was deemed buildable when its slope prevented construction, leading to a significantly high tax. While the 2024 tax year was corrected via appeal, the Edwards family is seeking a retroactive adjustment for 2023. Commissioner Stevenson questioned why the issue hadn't been appealed in 2023, and Chief Deputy Assessor Peterson provided historical payment data illustrating the dramatic difference in tax amounts, reinforcing the severity of the overvaluation. A discussion ensued about precedent for multi-year adjustments, with Chief Deputy Assessor Peterson confirming the commission's past actions and the 1347 form's allowance for such discretion.

VOTING:

Motion to Approve the first 1347: Bob Stevenson. **Second:** John Crofts. All present voted aye.

[41:10] The second application, from Thomas Brown, involved a payment that was part of a "batch" that never reached the County's lock box, potentially due to being mailed to the wrong state. Treasurer Brady confirmed the applicant's history of on-time payments, aligning with other cases of lost payments recently approved by the Commission.

VOTING:

Motion to Approve the second 1347: John Crofts. **Second:** Bob Stevenson. All present voted aye.

MEETING ADJOURNED

The meeting adjourned at 09:28 AM.

Minutes Prepared by:

Patrick Black
Deputy Clerk



[Brian McKenzie \(Jul 1, 2025 15:19 MDT\)](#)

Minutes Approved on:

07/01/2025



[Lorene Kamalu \(Jul 1, 2025 11:31 MDT\)](#)

Brian McKenzie
Davis County Clerk

Lorene Miner Kamalu
Commission Chair

