



## Regular City Council Meeting

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

5249 South 400 East

Washington Terrace, UT 84405

801.393.8681

[www.washingtonterrace.gov](http://www.washingtonterrace.gov)

As a public service, Council Meetings are streamed on the City of Washington Terrace YouTube channel at:  
[www.youtube.com/@WashingtonTerraceCity](http://www.youtube.com/@WashingtonTerraceCity)

### INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PERMISSION NOTICE

By attending this meeting/event, you consent to the use of your photograph, voice, likeness, and image in broadcasts of this meeting/event, and in subsequent productions drawn from video or audio recordings of this meeting/event, in the sole and absolute discretion of the City of Washington Terrace. The city retains copyright for all video and audio recordings. Video and audio recordings may not be modified, manipulated, or distributed in any way without the express written consent of the City Manager.

1. **WORK SESSION :** **5:00 P.M.**  
**Topics to include; but are not limited to:**
  - Follow up on Weber County Sheriff discussion on services, costs and future plans
  - Discussion on Building Permit Inspection Fee Analysis
  
2. **ROLL CALL** **6:00 P.M.**
  
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
  
4. **WELCOME**
  
5. **CONSENT ITEMS**  
**5.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MARCH 3, 2026, COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**  
Any point of order or issue regarding items on the agenda or the order of the agenda needs to be addressed here prior to the approval of the agenda. Minutes approved in open meeting become the official record
  
6. **CITIZEN COMMENTS**  
This is an opportunity to address the Council regarding your concerns or ideas that are not on the agenda as part of a public hearing. Please limit your comments to no more than 3 minutes. "Washington Terrace City is committed to civility. We strive to act and speak with dignity, courtesy, and respect at all times. All are asked to join us, and act and speak accordingly."

---

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons who have need of special accommodation should contact the City Recorder at 801-395-8283.

#### CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

The undersigned, duly appointed City Recorder, does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda was posted in three public places within the City of Washington Terrace City limits and sent to the *Standard Examiner* at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Amy Rodriguez, City Recorder.

7. **RECURRING BUSINESS**

Recurring Business are agenda items that have previously been brought to Council for discussion

7.1 **DISCUSSIONMOTION: APPROVAL OF TRIAL PERIOD FOR FLOCK CAMERAS TO BE INSTALLED WITHIN WASHINGTON TERRACE CITY**

Flock cameras are surveillance tools used for recognizing and recording vehicle movements throughout cities. The city discussed entering into a non-binding trial period for three flock cameras to be installed within the city at a prior meeting. Motion to approve or disapprove the trial period/budget for future use.

8. **COUNCIL COMMUNICATION WITH STAFF**

This is a discussion item only. No final action will be taken.

9. **ADMINISTRATION REPORTS**

This is an opportunity for staff to address the Council pertaining to administrative items.

10. **UPCOMING EVENTS**

March 26<sup>th</sup>: Planning Commission meeting 6:00 p.m.

April 4<sup>th</sup>: Easter Egg Hunt 10:00 a.m.

April 7<sup>th</sup>: Work Session (5:00 p.m.) and Council Meeting (6:00 p.m.)

April 11<sup>th</sup>: Golden West 5K Run-for-Schools event 8:30 a.m.

April 20-24<sup>th</sup>: Spring Green Waste Curbside Pick-up

April 1-30<sup>th</sup> : Spring Green Waste Drop-off (7:00 a.m.- 3:30 p.m. Sundays excluded)

April 21<sup>st</sup>: Work Session (5:00 p.m.) and Council Meeting (6:00 p.m.) – tentative

April 22-24<sup>th</sup>: Utah League of Cities and Towns Conference- St. George

April 25<sup>th</sup>: Rohmer Spring Clean Up 8-11 a.m.

April 30<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission Meeting 6:00 p.m. (tentative)

11. **ADJOURN THE MEETING**

---

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons who have need of special accommodation should contact the City Recorder at 801-395-8283.

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

The undersigned, duly appointed City Recorder, does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda was posted in three public places within the City of Washington Terrace City limits and sent to the *Standard Examiner* at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Amy Rodriguez, City Recorder.

## City Council Staff Report

Finance Department

**Author:** Shari' Garrett  
**Subject:** BUILDING PERMIT INSPECTION FEES  
**Date:** March 17, 2026

**Type of Item:** DISCUSSION: AMEND THE FISCAL YEAR 2026 FEE SCHEDULE FOR BUILDING PERMIT INSPECTIONS

### **Summary Recommendations:**

The City Council discuss amending the fee schedule for building permit inspections as attached hereto.

### **Council Priority: FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY**

Maintain stewardship for responsibility by analyzing data driven initial and long-term impacts of policies, programs and projects.

### **Description:**

#### **A. Topic: AMENDMENT TO BUILDING INSPECTION FEES**

#### **B. Background:**

- Over the past several years, the Building & Inspection Department has undergone organizational restructuring, including the outsourcing of building inspection services. These changes have highlighted the need to reassess the City's building permit fee structure for inspection services to ensure full cost recovery.
- Municipalities may set a reasonable fee to cover the cost of providing voluntary services for which the fee is imposed and for services that benefit the payer directly.
- The fee has been \$47.00 for all over the counter permits since at least 2005 or at least 21 years.
- The proposed amendment addresses "over-the-counter" permits that include: HVAC, Plumbing (inside & outside), Electrical, Gas Line, Roofing, Siding, Window & Door.

#### **C. Analysis:**

The Finance Director and Building Official conducted a service cost analysis to evaluate the administrative costs and staff time associated with over-the-counter permits. The analysis reviewed the processes required to apply for, oversee, maintain records, and inspect permits within the City, including both electronic and paper-based systems for permitting, payment processing, scheduling, record keeping, and reporting.

A summary of the time cost analysis is attached hereto.

Only direct costs were analyzed. For calculation ease and minimal perceived impact, no indirect costs (shared costs such as office space, utilities, administration, etc.) were considered.

The proposed fee schedule DOES NOT include the additional 1% mandated building permit fee state surcharge that is remitted to the state (Utah Code 15A-1-209(5)). Said surcharge would be in addition to the proposed fee.

**D. Department Review: Finance, Building & Inspections, City Manager**

- E. Recommendation:** That the City Council discuss amending the fee schedule for building permit inspections. If in favor of, staff will draft resolution for consideration for the April 7, 2026, council meeting.

Washington Terrace City, UT  
**Building Inspection | Time Cost Analysis**

HVAC (90 MIN)

Plumbing (INSIDE)

Plumbing (OUTSIDE)

Electrical

Gas line

Roofing

Siding

Window & Door

<b>SETUP</b> (electronic processing systems)									
Total Cost	\$ 8.27	\$ 8.27	\$ 8.27	\$ 8.27	\$ 8.27	\$ 8.27	\$ 8.27	\$ 8.27	\$ 8.27

<b>PRE-INSPECTION INQUIRIES</b>									
Total Cost	\$ 9.17	\$ 9.17	\$ 9.17	\$ 9.17	\$ 9.17	\$ 9.17	\$ 9.17	\$ 9.17	\$ 9.17

<b>PERMITTING</b> (processing & review)									
Total Cost	\$ 43.08	\$ 33.92	\$ 75.17	\$ 43.08	\$ 56.83	\$ 38.50	\$ 33.92	\$ 38.50	

<b>INITIAL INSPECTION</b>									
Total Cost	\$ 73.33	\$ 73.33	\$ 64.17	\$ 82.50	\$ 82.50	\$ 64.17	\$ 64.17	\$ 64.17	

<b>RE-INSPECTION</b>									
Total Cost	\$ 55.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 55.00	\$ 45.83	\$ 45.83	\$ 45.83	\$ 45.83	\$ 45.83	

<b>SPECIALIZED INSPECTION X2</b>									
Total Cost	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 64.17	\$ 64.17	\$ -	\$ 64.17	\$ 64.17	\$ -	

<b>POST INSPECTION</b>									
Total Cost	\$ 4.86	\$ 4.86	\$ 4.86	\$ 4.86	\$ 4.86	\$ 4.86	\$ 4.86	\$ 4.86	

<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$ 194</b>	<b>\$ 185</b>	<b>\$ 281</b>	<b>\$ 258</b>	<b>\$ 207</b>	<b>\$ 235</b>	<b>\$ 230</b>	<b>\$ 171</b>	
-------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	--

<b>Current Fee</b>	<b>\$ 47</b>	<b>\$ 47</b>	<b>\$ 47</b>	<b>\$ 47</b>	<b>\$ 47</b>	<b>\$ 47</b>	<b>\$ 47</b>	<b>\$ 47</b>	<b>\$ 47</b>
<i>Delta (analysis to current fee)</i>	<i>\$ 147</i>	<i>\$ 138</i>	<i>\$ 234</i>	<i>\$ 211</i>	<i>\$ 160</i>	<i>\$ 188</i>	<i>\$ 183</i>	<i>\$ 124</i>	

**OTHER FEES**

<b>NEW - RE-INSPECTION - NO SHOW</b>									
Total Cost	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55	\$ 55

**WORK WITHOUT A PERMIT - STOP WORK ORDER - WTC15.02.050**

WTC15.02.050 Construction without a permit. When a person engages in any building activity that requires a building permit and fails to obtain such permit, in addition to the fee provided in this chapter, the building official may assess a penalty equal to fifty percent (50%) of the building permit fee.

1  
2 **City of Washington Terrace**

3  
4 **Minutes of a Regular City Council meeting**  
5 **Held on March 3, 2026**  
6 **City Hall, 5249 South 400 East, Washington Terrace City, Utah**  
7

8 **MAYOR, COUNCIL, AND STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT**

9 Mayor Mark C. Allen  
10 Council Member Anna Davidson  
11 Council Member Zunayid Z. Zishan  
12 Council Member Cheryl Parkinson  
13 Council Member Jeff West  
14 Council Member Michael Thomas  
15 Finance Director Shari' Garrett  
16 City Recorder Amy Rodriguez  
17 City Manager Tom Hanson  
18 Lt. Sean Endsley, Weber County Sheriff

19  
20 **OTHERS PRESENT:**

21 Sheriff Arbon, Julie Stoddard, Chief Josh Gard,

22  
23 **1. WORK SESSION :**

**5:00 P.M.**

24 **Topics to include; but are not limited to:**

- 25 - **Weber County Sheriff discussion on services, costs and future plans**  
26

27 Lt. Endsley presented the current 2026 contract city budget. Stoddard stated that wages were up \$250,000.  
28 She stated that the numbers were very close to last year's numbers. She stated that we are looking at a 4%  
29 percent increase, which includes wage increases. Endsley stated that many of the other expenses are  
30 remaining flat.

31 Lt. Endsley stated that the formula for prices remains the same at 60 percent call for service and 40 percent  
32 population for contract cities. He stated that the population between contract cities has increased around  
33 25,000, while staffing levels have not. He stated that they are looking to increase staffing levels by 10  
34 additional full-time employees. She stated that it would be a 26% increase. She stated that the numbers are  
35 not final, but should be close. Lt. Endsley stated that the extra FTE's will bring their staffing level to .72  
36 deputies per 5,000 residents. Chief Gard stated that they will not be able to maintain the call volume coming  
37 in with the current .57 deputies per 5,000 residents.

38 Lt. Endsley stated that the scale is built on a 3.5 increase in wage each year, determined by deputy evaluations  
39 and other factors.

40  
41 Sheriff Arbon stated that street crimes spend around 80 percent of their time in Washington Terrace and  
42 West Haven. He stated that the division was discontinued a few years ago due to staffing issues regarding  
43 wage wars. He stated that they have worked on the retention plan and competitive wages and feel that once  
44 they have the staff levels needed, street crimes division will start to come back. Sheriff Arbon stated that the

45 support from the contract cities, as well as from the County Commissioner, has been instrumental in helping  
46 with the staffing levels. He noted that compensation is just a component of retention, but that it is a large  
47 component. Gard stated that they used to lose staff to other agencies after training due to pay, but now they  
48 are acquiring lateral moves from other agencies.

49  
50 Hanson stated that he appreciates the smoothing in the calls for service. He asked what has prevented the  
51 Office from moving the staffing level up to help with the smoothing for our budget. Sheriff Arbon stated  
52 that more cities began to come on board. He stated that they used to have 110 deputies for control. He stated  
53 that other cities were saying that the county was subsidizing the department. He stated that through attrition,  
54 the staffing levels started to decrease. It went down to 72 officers. Sheriff Arbon stated that different types  
55 of cases (unfunded mandates) take several officers at several hours at a time and paperwork has become a  
56 burden. He stated that the office is fluid on resources and equipment but pay and workload led to poor  
57 retention. Sheriff Arbon stated that people are now wanting to stay because there is so much opportunity  
58 now. He stated that there is not one ounce of profit in the contract cities numbers. He stated that he feels like  
59 they need to get staffing up so that backup officers can respond timely. Sheriff Arbon stated that the County  
60 Commissioners have not wanted to engage in wage wars, which has led to a slow increase in wages to stay  
61 competitive.

62  
63 Hanson stated that we will be going through Truth in Taxation just to cover the wages for law enforcement.  
64 He stated that there has been a systemic problem within the county for a decade, and the spike is going to be  
65 very painful for our city. He stated that he suggests a smoothing of the ten officers (3,3,4 for example).  
66 Hanson stated that he anticipates having to go through Truth in Taxation every year for cost of living. He  
67 stated that we are not immune to inflation. He stated that we recognize this support for their employees  
68 supports our community. Stoddard stated that the officers are exhausted and if we do not get in the additional  
69 officers, they may lose them to other agencies. Chief Gard stated that exhaustion plays a role in retention.  
70 He stated that they have to be able to keep residents safe. He stated that they cannot have just one officer in  
71 the city at a time. Chief Gard stated that they are at a time when they have to have the spike for the safety of  
72 the citizens and their officers.

73  
74 Council Member Zishan stated that he understands the situation with the Sheriff's Office but noted that a  
75 tax increase will be hard on the residents. Council Member Parkinson stated that we will be paying more  
76 just to maintain services. Chief Gard stated that it allows them to have street crimes operational, increase in  
77 productivity, and increase in visibility. He stated that their proactive policing is non-existent. He stated that  
78 there will be benefits with proactive policing. Council Member Parkinson stated that the benefits need to be  
79 shared through messaging.

80  
81 Sheriff Arbon stated that they are doing everything that they can to deliver the service that the citizen expects.  
82 He stated that we have to make sure that residents have a safe place to live. He stated that they have to  
83 operate at a level that is also beneficial to their deputy's safety and wellbeing.

84  
85 Garrett asked if the issue could have been addressed earlier to alleviate the spike. She asked what confidence  
86 do we have that the correct choices will be made moving forward. Sheriff Arbon stated that he agrees that it  
87 could have been addressed earlier but he is unable to give himself more officers. Stoddard stated that the  
88 step program is already in policy. She stated that the problem is who is elected as Commissioners. Sheriff

89 Arbon stated that the assurances are on the Sheriff side, however, it is unpredictable on what future  
90 Commissioners will decide.  
91  
92 Mayor Allen stated that he needs to convince people that we don't buy officers, but rather services. He asked  
93 for a list of the services that are provided to the residents as well as the impact that the additional officers  
94 will provide. Council Member Zishan reiterated that this cost is a massive spike for the residents.  
95 Sheriff Arbon suggested that the Mayor host an Open House in which the Sheriff Office can be a part of and  
96 explain their positions.  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136

137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181

**MAYOR, COUNCIL, AND STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT**

Mayor Mark C. Allen  
Council Member Anna Davidson  
Council Member Zunayid Z. Zishan  
Council Member Cheryl Parkinson  
Council Member Jeff West  
Council Member Michael Thomas  
Parks and Recreation Director Carlos Grava  
City Recorder Amy Rodriguez  
City Manager Tom Hanson  
Lt. Sean Endsley, Weber County Sheriff

**Others Present**

Ulis Gardiner, Kathleen Craynor

**2. ROLL CALL**

**6:00 P.M.**

**3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**4. WELCOME**

**5. CONSENT ITEMS**

**5.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND FEBRUARY 17, 2026, COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES**

Item 5.1 was approved by general consent.

**6. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Kathleen Craynor stated that the Council should feel guilty when they drive pass the trees that were caused to be taken down by the Council along the hospital. She stated that she is looking at a warzone. She stated that there never has been a problem with the trees. She stated that if the Council had consulted some of the people living along the trees they would have gotten together to clean up the area. She stated that the Council has caused problems. She stated that the wildlife is now gone. She asked if Council had taken into consideration the lights shining into resident's homes. Ms. Craynor stated that Council has destroyed a beautiful environment for the wildlife and for the residents who live there. She stated that the trees acted as a sound barrier and helped reduce the noise of the planes and helicopters and provided shade. She stated that the city cannot mitigate the damage that has been done.

Mayor Allen stated that he would like to move to Administrative Reports (Item 9) to address the concerns.

182 7. **NEW BUSINESS**

183  
184 **7.1 PRESENTATION/MOTION: APPROVAL OF THE PARKS CAPITAL**  
185 **INVESTMENT PROJECTS LIST FOR PROJECTS WITHIN THE 0-5 YEAR**  
186 **CAPITAL PLAN**

187 Grava asked for formal approval of the priority list for the Park Capital Projects to be started within the  
188 next five years when funding becomes available. He stated that the city works with a five-year plan for  
189 budgeting purposes and noted that prices increase so it is not realistic to work on budgeting past the five  
190 years. Grava stated that some of the projects on the list are already in progress. Grava stated that Council  
191 approval of the priority projects helps him plan a framework within the department, along with the finance  
192 and public works departments, for budgeting, timelines and grant submittals.

193 Grava stated that it is important to have a five-year plan for projects because grant applications give more  
194 points and focus to cities that can show that they have planning components involved. He stated that 0-5  
195 years is a reasonable time frame to work within the five-year budget plan.

196  
197 Mayor Allens stated that the Council has seen the plan and it was reviewed at a recent work session.  
198 Council Member Parkinson wanted to clarify that Council is not approving the expenditures for projects,  
199 but simply the priority projects for when grant funding becomes available projects can begin. Grava stated  
200 that every project will be brought before Council for approval so that they can go through the process for  
201 finance approval and back to Council for funding approval before the project begins.

202  
203 **Motion by Council Member West**  
204 **Seconded by Council Member Thomas**  
205 **To approve the 0-5 year**  
206 **Parks Capital Plan as far as priorities are concerned**  
207 **Approved unanimously (5-0)**  
208

209  
210 **7.2 DISCUSSION: TRIAL PERIOD FOR FLOCK CAMERAS TO BE INSTALLED**  
211 **WITHIN WASHINGTON TERRACE CITY**

212 Hanson stated that there was a request during the Council Retreat for the purchase or lease of additional  
213 Flock cameras to support law enforcement operations within the city. He stated that there are two Flock  
214 cameras within the city which are paid for by the County.

215 Hanson stated that he met with Lt. Endsley and discussed locations where additional cameras could be  
216 installed within the city. Hanson stated that there would be a 60-day trial period to see what type of results  
217 could be accomplished with the additional cameras.

218 Council Member West stated that there are budgetary constraints regarding law enforcement and stated  
219 that he feels that the leveraging technology that is available is a good idea to consider as a trial. He stated  
220 that we need to make sure that the data is safe and meets the requirements that we have. He stated that the  
221 trial period provides the opportunity to determine if the technology provides the benefits that we expect.

222  
223 Council Member Zishan stated that everything has value and noted that the Council's job is to see if there  
224 is a net value to citizens. He stated that he researched the product and found that it is not a crime  
225 preventative solution. He stated that it works amazingly well in cities that have a lot of car thefts.  
226 Council Member Zishan stated that the Flock Camera company is a 7.5 billion dollar surveillance

227 company that connects our cameras to 83,000 others nationwide. He stated that when we sign the contract  
228 after the trial period, we will be handing our residents' data to a private corporation with no real control for  
229 who sees it. Council Member Zishan stated that there are recorded abuses using this camera, including  
230 flock data used to track women seeking abortions in Texas, 3,000 immigration searches within one year,  
231 instances of officers using the data to track former partners, and millions of warrantless searches. Council  
232 Member Zishan stated that the company's CEO admitted that they gave federal agents access to  
233 information without telling local governments. He stated that 30 cities have cancelled their contracts with  
234 Flock cameras.

235 Council Member Zishan stated that research conducted by Cornell University of law found no evidence  
236 that it reduces any crime. He stated that he is against the use of Flock cameras.

237  
238 Council Member Parkinson stated that she has received concerns from residents regarding the cameras and  
239 asked Lt. Endsley to address how the Flock cameras are a benefit to the community and how they might be  
240 a problem.

241  
242 Lt. Endsley stated that the cameras that we have are automatic license plate readers that capture vehicle  
243 data and comply with state law regulations as to what data is captured and how long the data can be  
244 accessed. Lt. Endsley stated that the data can only be used and searched to aid in a criminal investigation,  
245 to locate missing or endangered people, located stolen vehicles and to locate wanted people with active  
246 arrest warrants.

247 Lt. Endsley stated that there are audit systems within the flock system that can audit who is accessing the  
248 information and the reason for the search. He stated that a case number has to be used to see information.  
249 He stated that problems would be addressed if it was found during an audit that the case number that was  
250 used had nothing to do with the search, noting that if the results of the search are used in an inappropriate  
251 way, there could be criminal charges.

252 Lt. Endsley stated that the Flock system only holds the data for around 30 days, noting that state law  
253 allows for a nine-month retainage period.

254 Lt. Endsley stated that the system has had successes and highlighted several that he had compiled for a  
255 report for another city. He highlighted an event where the information was used to track a kidnapper,  
256 murder suspects, stolen vehicles, and another event where a resident having a medical emergency was  
257 located.

258  
259 Lt. Endsley stated that there are controls as to who has search rights, noting that only supervisors and  
260 detectives can conduct searches.

261 Lt. Endsley stated that misuse can happen in any profession with any equipment and the Sheriff's Office  
262 tries to prevent that as much as possible and punishes criminal use in serious ways.

263 Lt. Endsley stated that the tool is reactive and not proactive. He stated that it does not reduce crime but is  
264 used after the crime for investigations.

265  
266 Council Member Davidson asked how this reduces officer time. Lt. Endsley stated that it could reduce the  
267 time spent by officers conducting follow-up information. He stated that it reduces time for door to door  
268 canvassing if there is a camera in the area.

269 Lt. Endsley stated that more cameras provide more abilities to help capture the information needed.

270

271  
272 Council Member Zishan stated that his comments were not directed at the Weber County Sheriff's Office.  
273 He stated that his issue is that the data captured is not stored locally and the company has full access to the  
274 data through their cloud server. He noted that the company has already broken trust and given access to the  
275 data to people who they should not have.

276  
277 Lt Endsley stated that the Flock system doesn't have access to who the car and license plate is registered  
278 to. He stated that there are no expectations of privacy on public roads and open views applied to license  
279 plates regarding issues of reasonable searches, privacy, unreasonable search and seizure in places where  
280 there are reasonable expectations of privacy.

281 Hanson asked if Ogden City shares their information. Lt. Endsley stated that Ogden has restricted the  
282 access that they give to other agencies through Memorandum of Understandings.

283  
284 Council Member Parkinson stated that the issue of privacy is something that we all want to protect. She  
285 stated that public places have the right to film people in public. She stated that many people are using ring  
286 cameras and home surveillance cameras to protect themselves and have shared their data to assist law  
287 enforcement. She stated that people using public streets should not expect privacy, as they are private  
288 anymore.

289  
290 Mayor Allen stated that he is not sure how he feels about the flock system after seeing news reports and  
291 abuse of the system due to bad actors.

292 Council Member Davidson stated that there are checks and balances within state law and agencies and  
293 that we need to weigh the benefits as to how they are used. She stated that there are guardrails and that the  
294 use of the cameras are very beneficial to law enforcement to do their job. Council Member Davidson  
295 stated that she is a supporter of flock and noted that there are enough checks and balances within the  
296 department.

297 Hanson stated that this item will be on the next agenda for motion as to whether to include Flock cameras  
298 as a budget item.

299 Hanson stated that we would own the lease for the cameras and access is for the Sheriff Office. He stated  
300 that no city staff would have access to the system. Hanson stated that the city would have access as to  
301 whom we share the information with through a MOU.

302

303 **7.3 MOTION/RESOLUTION 26-02: AMENDMENT TO THE POLICY AND**  
304 **PROCEDURES MANUAL REGARDING URS SAVINGS PLAN AUTO-**  
305 **ENROLLMENT**

306 Rodriguez stated that the city needs to submit an updated service agreement to the Utah Retirement  
307 System. As part of this agreement, the staff would like to take advantage of the URS Automatic  
308 Enrollment Plan option for newly hired employees. This will allow the city to automatically withhold 2%  
309 of the employee's paycheck and put it towards a 457 Savings Plan upon their hire date.

310 Rodriguez stated that his type of enrollment has proven effective in helping employees maximize their  
311 retirement savings because they never see the 2% in their paycheck so they don't have to adjust for pay  
312 reductions later if they choose to participate in a savings plan.

313

314 Rodriguez stated that the policy requires that the employee would be notified of this enrollment before

315 they come in to complete their new hire paperwork in order to give them time to review the information  
316 and research the plan and the URS options. She stated that they will be able to opt out of this plan on their  
317 first day or anytime after. Rodriguez noted that all savings plans offered through URS are available to any  
318 employee at any time, stating that auto-enrollment helps simplify the process for them. Rodriguez stated  
319 that there are no fiscal impacts associated with this policy, as the city does not participate in matching  
320 contributions to employee savings plans.

321

322 **Motion by Council Member Thomas**  
323 **Seconded by Council Member Davidson**

324 **To approve Resolution 26-02**

325 **Amending the Policy and Procedures manual**

326 **Relating to URS Savings Plans Auto-Enrollment**

327 **Approved unanimously (5-0)**

328 **Roll Call Vote**

329

330 **8. COUNCIL COMMUNICATION WITH STAFF**

331 Council Member Davidson stated that she is grateful that the Rohmer Park project is underway. She  
332 thanked Jake Meibos for his work coordinating things and trying to save the rocks and organize safety in  
333 the area.

334

335 Council Member Zishan confirmed that the city is providing temporary restrooms in parks that do not have  
336 permanent restrooms this summer. Hanson stated that the temporary restrooms are included in the budget.

337

338 Council Member Parkinson stated that she has had numerous residents contact her about the trees at the  
339 hospital and appreciated the information shared tonight. She stated that she is concerned about the  
340 misinformation that is out there for the citizens, noting that she wants staff to look at ways to clarify the  
341 communication. She stated that she wants to work with the hospital on messaging so that the hospital is not  
342 put in the position of being the bad guy. She stated that she is looking forward to working with the hospital  
343 on upcoming plans. Council Member Parkinson stated that she was contacted by a resident who was  
344 concerned about flooding. She would like staff to follow through on the impact the removed trees are  
345 having on the community.

346

347 Council Member Parkinson stated that she has been contacted by several residents excited about the  
348 construction on the property next to the library. She stated that she loves that people notice that things are  
349 happening within the city. She asked that information be shared in the next newsletter as to what is  
350 happening with the construction of the new building, noting that more information is always helpful.  
351 Council Member West agreed, stating that it would be nice to show what business and development is  
352 coming into the city.

353

354 Council Member Thomas was thankful to have the information on the spring green waste clean up as he  
355 was contacted by residents. He stated that he would like the information on the Rohmer Park spring clean  
356 up on Justserve platform so that people outside of the community can have the information.

357

358 **9. ADMINISTRATION REPORTS**

359 Hanson stated that our Code Enforcement Officer works throughout the city enforcing laws that help

360 protect residents' safety and property.  
361 Hanson stated that the officer has spent two years working with the hospital to remove tall weeds,  
362 underbrush, branches, vegetation, dead fallen trees, overhanging trees, and debris from the area. The  
363 officer has worked with the administration over the last two years to help mitigate fire hazards. Hanson  
364 stated that the Code Enforcement Officer has detailed records with the hospital directing them to remove  
365 fire hazards. Hanson stated that he has never mandated the removal of trees. Hanson stated that the intent  
366 was always to remove the hazards, and not the trees. Hanson stated that there has been encouragement to  
367 trim trees, but at no time was there a mandate to remove trees. Hanson stated that one of the focuses was  
368 removing the undergrowth and creating a buffer on the west side of the property. He stated that this effort  
369 was to mitigate fire hazards, protecting the neighboring property and bringing the property into nuisance  
370 tree compliance.  
371 Hanson stated that it was described as hazard maintenance and mitigation.  
372 Hanson stated that there has never been a citation given. He stated that the only removal was for dead  
373 trees that were on the ground. Hanson stated that he has considered what had been said to hospital  
374 managers by the fire chief, code enforcement officer and himself and stated that they never told the  
375 hospital administration to remove all the trees. Hanson stated that in July of 2025, there was the most  
376 significant brush fire that the city has ever had and it occurred on the south end of the hospital property. He  
377 stated that it resulted in multiple ladder trucks and agencies responding to the fire to help put it out.  
378 Hanson stated that the fire departments were concerned that another fire would impact residents' homes.  
379 Hanson stated that the city continued to have conversations with the hospital administration on how they  
380 could mitigate and manage the fire risks. He stated that the city never required a clear cut or removal of the  
381 trees that are now gone.  
382 Hanson stated that the city did not require the clear cut of the trees. Hanson stated that there are two years  
383 of records and they do not reflect the mandating of the clearing of the trees.  
384 Council Member Parkinson asked Hanson to clarify that the Council had not been made aware that this  
385 was going on. She stated that the Council was not made aware of what the hospital process was going to  
386 be. Hanson stated that the City was not made aware either. Hanson stated that it is private property and the  
387 hospital can do what they want on their own property. Hanson stated that there were no fines or citations  
388 threatened to the hospital. Hanson stated that there was only encouragement for maintenance of the fire  
389 hazards. Hanson stated that the city followed our process and the hospital choose to remove their trees.  
390 Mayor Allen stated that our Code Enforcement Officer did his job well and kept documentation on the  
391 property. Mayor Allen noted that there have been residents who have complained about the fire hazards  
392 on the property. Hanson stated that his heart goes out to those who this has impacted.  
393 Council Member West stated that it is private property and it was their choice to do what they did. He  
394 asked if staff knows what their plans are for the area. Hanson stated that the city has not received any  
395 building plans for expansion of the property or plans as to what they plan to do with the area.  
396  
397 Hanson reported that the RAMP Grant application prepared and submitted by Recreation Director Carlos  
398 Grava has received a unanimous recommendation from the County RAMP Commission for the Pickleball  
399 Phase 4 Project.

## 400 401 **10. UPCOMING EVENTS**

402 March 17<sup>th</sup>: Work Session (5:00p.m.) and Council Meeting (6:00 p.m.)

403 March 26<sup>th</sup>: Planning Commission meeting 6:00 p.m.(tentative)

404 April 4<sup>th</sup>: Easter Egg Hunt 10:00 a.m.

405 April 7<sup>th</sup>: Work Session (5:00 p.m.) and Council Meeting (6:00 p.m.)  
406 April 11<sup>th</sup>: Golden West 5K Run-for-Schools event 8:30 a.m.  
407 April 20-24<sup>th</sup>: Spring Green Waste Curbside Pick-up  
408 April 1-30<sup>th</sup> : Spring Green Waste Drop-off (7:00 a.m.- 3:30 p.m. Sundays excluded)  
409 April 21<sup>st</sup>: Work Session (5:00 p.m.) and Council Meeting (6:00 p.m.) – tentative  
410 April 22-24<sup>th</sup>: Utah League of Cities and Towns Conference- St. George  
411 April 25<sup>th</sup>: Rohmer Spring Clean Up 8-11 a.m.  
412 April 30<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission Meeting 6:00 p.m. (tentative)  
413

414 **11. ADJOURN THE MEETING**

415 Motion by Council Member Parkinson  
416 Seconded by Council Member Thomas  
417 To adjourn the meeting  
418 Approved unanimously (5-0)  
419 Time: 7:23 p.m.  
420  
421  
422

423 \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date Approved**

\_\_\_\_\_ **City Recorder**

# City Council Staff Report



**Author:** Tom Hanson

**Subject:** Flock Camera System

**Date:** March 17, 2026

**Type of Item:** Discussion / Action

**Summary Recommendation:** Follow up to our last council meeting where we discussed the addition of three Flock cameras to bolster the two Flock cameras that are installed in our city by Weber County. Staff are requesting clear directions by the council to include or not include the \$9,000 annually in the tentative budget and to enter a trial period with Flock.

## **Description:**

- A. **Topic:** Direction to participate in a trial period and add three Flock cameras to our system.
- B. **Background:** Following the last council discussion regarding Flock there were concerns of the cost to add the Flock system to the city, privacy concerns, legal authority to access data, unauthorized use by users and historical mishaps regarding the Flock information.
- C. **Analysis:**

From AI search: **Cons of Flock Safety Camera System** (based on privacy groups like ACLU/EFF, lawsuits, news investigations, and recent city actions):

- **Mass surveillance of innocents** — Logs millions of vehicle movements daily (e.g., ~700,000/month in some cities), creating searchable location histories without warrants, potentially tracking daily routines and chilling free movement.
- **Privacy erosion and potential abuse** — Enables overreach (e.g., searches tied to protests, reproductive health, or discriminatory terms); risks of officer misuse (**though rare**); data in private company hands raises security concerns.
- **Federal data access concerns** — Some cities discovered local data accessible to federal agencies (e.g., immigration enforcement), leading to distrust and cancellations amid political debates.
- **Accuracy issues causing harm** — AI misreads (e.g., dirty plates, lighting) trigger wrongful stops, arrests, injuries, and lawsuits; documented cases nationwide despite high claimed accuracy.
- **Ongoing cancellations and backlash** — Since early 2025, at least 30–50 cities (e.g., Flagstaff, Santa Cruz, Eugene, Cambridge, Mountain View, some in Washington) have canceled, paused, or deactivated contracts over privacy, trust, and federal overreach fears; momentum growing in 2026.
- **Cost accumulation and mission creep** — Subscription fees add up with scaling; expansions (e.g., video/live feeds, AI natural-language searches) increase invasiveness beyond original vehicle-focused intent.

**Pros of Flock Safety Camera System** (based on police reports, city usage like Ogden, and company claims):

- **Faster crime-solving and investigations** — Provides real-time alerts for stolen vehicles, wanted suspects, AMBER alerts, and evidence (plates + vehicle details/video) that help close cases quickly, including homicides, kidnappings, and burglaries. Ogden PD calls it a "game-changer" for crimes they otherwise couldn't investigate.

- **Crime deterrence** — Visible cameras discourage repeat offenders; some areas report reduced vehicle thefts, property crimes, and overall neighborhood stabilization.
- **Efficient for understaffed departments** — Acts as a "force multiplier" with solar-powered, easy-install cameras that reduce manual patrols and officer workload; often funded by grants (e.g., most of Ogden's 41 cameras).
- **Locating missing/endangered people** — Helps recover stolen vehicles, find missing persons (e.g., dementia cases), and support urgent alerts.
- **Integration and scalability** — One platform combines ALPR, video, and sharing across agencies (when opted in); no major infrastructure needed.
- **Practical local benefits in places like Ogden** — Utah's largest user reports tangible wins in vehicle recovery, warrants, and high-level cases, with state regulations providing some limits.

### My interview with Flock:

**\*From Flock Directly:** Flock spends considerable effort to audit searches ongoing and send reports to the governing agency for review. The agency processes the information to determine if the query is misused. Misuse is a crime. Yes, bad people may misuse information and those people are prosecuted.

**\*Flock holds no personal information:** It is important to note that Flock does not hold, or search data associated with the plates for fingerprints of vehicles. The contract agencies are responsible for searching for owners and links to particular vehicles.

**Bottom line for Ogden/Utah context:** In places like Ogden (with 41 cameras, grant-funded, and PD emphasizing reactive use for investigations), the pros often outweigh cons for public safety gains under local/state rules. But nationally, the cons drive real pushback—success depends heavily on strong local safeguards (e.g., audits, short retention, strict search policies) to manage risks.

<https://www.ksl.com/article/51460087/not-a-hiding-place-ogden-police-lauded-for-role-in-catching-nevada-wisconsin-murder-suspects>

- D. **Fiscal Impact:** The fiscal impact will be \$9,000 a year or less than \$1.00 per person/annually. If you choose to do so, this cost will be bundled with the TNT necessary for the law enforcement contract.
- E. **Department Review:** After discussing cases with Flock directly, seeing positive outcomes from Flock and the overall security that is used in the system locally, I would be in support of adding additional Flock cameras to the system to aid our law enforcement efforts. However, I will support your decision either way.

### Alternatives:

- A. **Approve the Request:** Add three flock cameras to the tentative budget and proceed with the trial program.
- B. **Deny The Request:** Do not add Flock cameras to the system.
- C. **Continue the Item/Impact:** Invite Flock to meet with us to discuss their protocols for security.