

1 **City of Washington Terrace**

2  
3 **Minutes of a Regular City Council meeting**  
4 **Held on March 17, 2026**

5 **City Hall, 5249 South 400 East, Washington Terrace City, Utah**

6  
7 **MAYOR, COUNCIL, AND STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT**

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

19  
20 **OTHERS PRESENT:**

21  
22  
23  
24  
25 **1. WORK SESSION : 5:00 P.M.**

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

- 27 - **Follow up on Weber County Sheriff discussion on services, costs and future plans**
- 28 - **Discussion on Building Permit Inspection Fee Analysis**

29  
30 **Building Inspection Fees**

31  
32 Garrett stated that the reorganization of the Building Department brought to attention how much building  
33 inspections cost the city. She stated that it was determined that we are not receiving full cost recovery on  
34 this service.

35  
36 Garrett stated that they performed a full cost recovery analysis, taking into consideration all aspects of this  
37 service. She stated that the proposed fee schedule is a full cost analysis and direct cost of the services. She  
38 stated that indirect costs were not included in the proposed fee changes. She stated that she included the  
39 summary of the results in the staff report. She stated that those that use the service need to pay for the cost  
40 of the service. She stated that this qualifies as highest level of recovery so that those who use the service are  
41 paying for the service. She stated that we are not covering the cost of permits at this time, noting that the fee  
42 has not changed from \$47.00 in over 24 years.

43 Seaman stated that the "over the counter" inspections are for water heaters, new electrical service, re-roof,  
44 and things that are more of a maintenance inspection. He stated that the inspections are simple, however,

45 they are being performed by the same inspectors who inspect new constructions. Seaman stated that these  
46 permits are required by Building Code. Seaman explained the reasoning for code requirements for doors and  
47 windows as well. He stated that many residents do not know that inspections are required. Council Member  
48 Parkinson confirmed that professionals that are hired to complete a job are aware of the requirements and  
49 often get the permit from the city and add the cost to their price. She stated that a concern would be that  
50 someone who does the work themselves may not be aware of the inspection requirement.  
51 Garrett explained that a reinspection no-show fee is being proposed. She stated that \$55.00 is the hourly rate.  
52 Seaman stated that the city must review the permit application per state law. He broke down the process for  
53 the permit applications.

54  
55 Council Member Zishan stated that property taxes cover employee wages and asked if Garrett looked into  
56 neighboring city's fees. Seaman stated that about 80 percent of the cities that he works for have higher fees  
57 and a different type of evaluation process. He stated that many base the fee off the valuation of the project.  
58 He advised not to use that process, as the cost of valuation is subjective.

59 Garrett stated that we were going off our city policy- which is full cost recovery. She stated that there is a  
60 direct link between the service and what is paid. She stated that taxes do not have that correlation or direct  
61 link. She stated that the person who is receiving the inspection should be the one who pays for the service.  
62

63 Seaman stated that he appreciates the insight Garrett brought to the evaluation process. Council Member  
64 Zishan asked why we are focused on cost recovery. Garrett stated that the cost of this service has become  
65 apparent. She stated that staff follow the Financial Policies and Legislative Policies which direct staff on  
66 how they want staff to recover costs. She stated that the Council Policy to "Maintain stewardship for fiscal  
67 responsibilities by analyzing data driven initial and long-term impacts of policies, programs and projects.  
68 She stated that is what staff have done and this is a great example of sustainability. She stated that the  
69 sustainable fees are a recommendation. She stated that Building Inspections are a fee-based service, not a  
70 tax-based service. She stated that we would be subsidizing this service through taxes if we do not push the  
71 cost through the fee. Council Member Zishan stated that we are already paying employees to answer the  
72 phone and help a resident through a process. Mayor Allen stated that the front office staff is paid for Utility  
73 Billing. He stated that if they are pulled away from the Utility Billing job to help Buildings or Recreation,  
74 there is a cost to that. Garrett stated that their wages are paid through fees, registrations, utility services as  
75 well as some taxes.

76  
77 Seaman stated that he spends more time on inspections when homeowners do it themselves, as they may not  
78 know the code. Council Member West stated that if there are improvements to the home, financing  
79 companies want to know who performed the improvements. He stated that they want to see the record of  
80 who completed the improvements. Seaman stated that he receives many record requests on building permits  
81 on homes to see if inspections were completed.

82  
83 Seaman stated that the \$47.00 permit fee for these "over the counter" permits were an industry standard for  
84 a long time. He stated that cities began to move away from this fee over the last several years because it was  
85 noticed that the fee did not even cover an inspector's time. Seaman stated that we keep building permits  
86 forever. Council Member Zishan stated that his concern is the price of the increase, stating that we should  
87 "ease" into the price increase. Council Member West suggested taking out the re-inspect fee of \$55.00. He  
88 stated that the actual cost is not as high if there is no reinspection. Seaman stated that re-inspections occur  
89 maybe 10 percent of the time. He stated that a reinspection fee should be for no-shows or if he must reinspect

90 because something was done incorrectly.

91

92 Council Member Parkinson proposed a basic permit cost and additional fees if they apply. Council Member  
93 Zishan stated that the initial inspection fee should not include the reinspect fee. They can be charged a \$55.00  
94 reinspection fee if it is needed. He stated that this way they know up front what the cost could be.

95 Seaman gave examples of common reinspection circumstances. He stated that some of the reinspection can  
96 be completed by photo if he feels comfortable signing off on the permit.

97

98 Garrett stated that the reinspect fee can be taken off the base and if Seaman needs to come back to the project  
99 a second time, the reinspect fee can be paid at that time. She recommends that specialized permits that have  
100 required second inspections can have the \$55.00 built into the initial fee so that the residents know that the  
101 permit covers two inspections.

102

103 Garrett and Seaman will work on the fee costs based on the conversation tonight and bring the results back  
104 to Council.

105

106 **Sheriff Update**

107

108 Hanson stated that our contract cost is going up to 1.4 million, which is a significant increase to cover (1)  
109 recruitment and retention, (2) additional staff.

110 Hanson stated that the County Commission had to make a change because they did not take care of business  
111 as time went on. He stated that the Sheriff has asked for increases to keep their employees, but the  
112 Commission has not been providing the increases to retain employees.

113

114 Hanson stated that the County is going to offload 9 individuals back to the contract cities to take the burden  
115 off of the county. Hanson stated that the 9 employees become the freight of the contract cities, without the  
116 additional services. Hanson stated that the Sheriff originally wanted to add 10 officers. Hanson stated that  
117 it was suggested that there should be a contract meeting with the contract cities and Commissioners at the  
118 end of the month. Hanson stated that we need the numbers for the contract in March so that we can anticipate  
119 what the budget numbers will be. He stated that it is frustrating to hear about the 9 employees being taken  
120 away from contract cities. Hanson stated that he would like to know what the cost would be for sheriff  
121 operations if there were no contract cities. Hanson stated that the analysis was not complete. He stated that  
122 he has made it clear that the city cannot pay for the additional 9 officers.

123

124 Hanson stated that he and the Mayor can try to set the meeting with the three Commissioners, along with  
125 the Sheriff Office and contract cities. Lt. Endsley stated that the increase would keep staffing levels that  
126 same and service levels the same. Hanson stated that in order to stay equal, the city will need to fund the  
127 nine and no increases in service. Hanson stated that we are not paying the freight for cities that have a high  
128 population growth. He stated that we pay based on our population and calls for service.

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

**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  
City Recorder Amy Rodriguez  
City Manager Tom Hanson  
Lt. Sean Endsley, Weber County Sheriff

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Casey Sanders

**6:00 P.M.**

**2. ROLL CALL**

**3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**4. WELCOME**

**5. CONSENT ITEMS**

**5.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MARCH 3, 2026, COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES**

Item 5.1 was approved by general consent.

**6. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Casey Sanders addressed the flock camera item on the agenda, stating that security researchers found a flock camera pointed at a children’s playground that was publicly accessible online. He stated that this is the exact type of environment the city will be discussing tonight. Sanders stated that he supports public safety, however, he wants Council to consider whether this is the correct type of software to achieve it. He stated that placing surveillance cameras in the parks means monitoring families and children and residents, raising privacy concerns and how the footage could be used over time.

Sanders stated that the research report noted that there were over 60 flock camera feeds that were easily accessed online. Sanders stated that researchers reported that people were able to interact with the online servers by removing and altering data.

Sanders stated that the consequences of errors or miscalculations should be considered. He stated that there are real world examples of how this type of technology can go wrong.

Sanders stated that no internet connection is immune to hacks or failure. He stated that there is risk in no knowing what happens to our data if it fails. He stated that people in a free society should not be monitored simply for spending time in a park.

Sanders stated that the city needs to consider these types of risks.

Sanders urged Council to slow down, gather public input and evaluate long term risks before moving

181 forward.

182

183

184 **7. RECURRING BUSINESS**

185

186 **7.1 DISCUSSIONMOTION: APPROVAL OF TRIAL PERIOD FOR FLOCK**  
187 **CAMERAS TO BE INSTALLED WITHIN WASHINGTON TERRACE CITY**

188 Mayor Allen stated that the item has been put back on the agenda after a discussion at the last meeting.  
189 Council Member West stated that he understands that there are real concerns. He stated that the cameras  
190 will not be pointed at parks, but rather at the ingress and egress to the city, with the idea that the Sheriff  
191 would have an image of a suspected vehicle in an open case. He stated that the cameras will be in an area  
192 that only tracks vehicles without knowing to whom that vehicle belongs.

193

194 Council Member Zishan provided recent information as to why cities are getting rid of their Flock Camera  
195 Systems. He stated that recent research has been provided in Business Insiders. He stated that the report  
196 states that misreads of vehicles and license plates can happen 10 percent of the time, causing a real risk of  
197 misidentification.

198 He stated that simple misreads have led to innocent people being pulled over and injured. He stated that in  
199 practice, officer safeguards do not always work. He stated that the lack of independent oversight can cause  
200 risks. Council Member Zishan stated that many times systems are adopted without asking all the questions  
201 first. He stated that his view is not about being anti-technology or anti-police, but rather accountability.

202 Council Member Zishan stated that when the system can trigger high stake police responses the burden  
203 should be on proving the system is safe and reliable before widespread use. He stated that there we should  
204 be cautious in expanding use in our community until it can be proven that there are consistent and reliable  
205 oversight.

206

207 Mayor Allen stated that our Sheriff Department has shown safe handling of the entire system. He noted  
208 that since this was last discussed, there have been two murderers caught using the flock system.

209 Council Member Davidson stated that it is important to note that these cameras have been used to find  
210 vulnerable adults, and people that may have medical issues or emergencies. She stated that it should be  
211 recognized that the cameras are not solely used for criminals. Council Member Davidson stated that  
212 officers confirm the license plate before they pull a vehicle over.

213 Council Member Davidson asked for statistics on how the LPR systems have been utilized within Weber  
214 County.

215

216 Council Member Thomas stated that residents have reached out to him to state that they are grateful for the  
217 flock cameras to recover their stolen vehicles. He also noted that runaways and missing persons have been  
218 found using the system. Council Member Thomas stated that the cameras will not be near parks at all. He  
219 stated that they will be facing the roads. He stated that they are supposed to look out for the safety of the  
220 residents.

221

222 Council Member West stated that this is not a new program. He stated that our community has different  
223 statistics than the communities that are reporting the problems. He stated that there is a 90 percent chance  
224 that the system will help someone. Council Member West stated that it should be considered if the  
225 benefits outweigh the risks. He stated that the system can be vulnerable because whomever owns the

226 contract is not being vigilant. Council Member Zishan stated that flock has been caught sharing data with  
227 the federal government without the contracting cities knowledge.  
228 Council Member Zishan stated that images of people have been tracked without the contracting cities  
229 knowledge.  
230  
231 Mayor Allen stated that we have had three flock cameras in our community for many years. He stated that  
232 he has seen the data tracking a vehicle with a kidnapping.  
233 Council Member Parkinson stated that the officer that was over street crimes stated that the flock cameras  
234 impacted drug crimes in a positive way. She stated that it was a benefit for the city.  
235  
236 Council Member Parkinson asked if the city still needs to pay the set up fee for the cameras after the trial  
237 period if it is decided to discontinue the service. Hanson stated that there is no cost during the trial period  
238 and the set-up fees have already been waived. Hanson stated that one of the cameras will be relocated at a  
239 cost of \$150-750 depending on infrastructure.  
240 Hanson stated that all platforms have people doing nefarious things. Hanson stated that we will set  
241 parameters around best protocols to ensure safety for residents as well as people going through city.  
242 Hanson reiterated that the systems is designed to track vehicles, license plates, and the makeup of cars.  
243 They do not have the information as to who owns the equipment. He stated that officers work through the  
244 system to see validity and who owns the vehicle.  
245 Hanson stated that it is governed closely with a clear protocol as to who can access the information.  
246  
247 Council Member Zishan stated that the cameras become part of 83,000 other cameras on the network and  
248 that CEO's have admitted that they have given access to the federal government without telling local  
249 government.  
250  
251 Hanson stated that the Sheriff pays for the established three cameras within the city and we would pay for  
252 the additional three.  
253 Council Member Parkinson stated that the toll booth has quite a bit of surveillance at their location and  
254 asked if those cameras were sufficient for that corridor. Lt. Endsley stated that the toll booth is privately  
255 controlled and owned. Mayor Allen stated that we would need time sensitive data and the other cameras  
256 are private and it would take time to gain access if allowed.  
257  
258

259 **Motion by Council Member Thomas**  
260 **Seconded by Council Member Davidson**  
261 **To approve trial period of the Flock Cameras**  
262 **To be installed within the city.**  
263 **Approved (4-1)**  
264 **Council Member Davidson- aye**  
265 **Council Member Zishan- nay**  
266 **Council Member Parkinson- aye**  
267 **Council Member West- aye**  
268 **Council Member Thomas- aye**  
269

270 **8. COUNCIL COMMUNICATION WITH STAFF**  
271 Council Member West stated that the North End Project at Rohmer Park is looking really good and  
272 sends his compliments to the staff.  
273  
274 Council Member Davidson thanked Meibos on the Rohmer Park North End Project, noting that it is  
275 running smoothly and that it is appreciated.  
276  
277 Council Member Parkinson stated that she has heard from numerous citizens about construction in  
278 the city and suggested using the newsletter to get information out to everyone.  
279  
280 Council Member Thomas stated that he received comments from residents thanking the Public  
281 Works Department for starting work on filling the potholes.  
282  
283 Mayor Allen stated that he participated in the groundbreaking ceremony at the construction site last  
284 week, stating that it was good to welcome them to the city.  
285  
286

287 **9. ADMINISTRATION REPORTS**

288  
289 Hanson stated that our Public Works Foreman, CJ Gerritsen was headed home from weekend duty and  
290 stopped to help clean up the debris from the rollover crash. He stated that he was not asked but knew that  
291 he could help. Hanson stated that that type of mindset is active and alive throughout the city staff.  
292  
293 Hanson noted that there will be a RAMP Ribbon Cutting Ceremony on April 29<sup>th</sup> for the completion of the  
294 Rohmer Park (Phase 3) Project. All are welcome.  
295

296 **10. UPCOMING EVENTS**

297 March 26<sup>th</sup>: Planning Commission meeting 6:00 p.m.  
298 April 4<sup>th</sup>: Easter Egg Hunt 10:00 a.m.  
299 April 7<sup>th</sup>: Work Session (5:00 p.m.) and Council Meeting (6:00 p.m.)  
300 April 11<sup>th</sup>: Golden West 5K Run-for-Schools event 8:30 a.m.  
301 April 20-24<sup>th</sup>: Spring Green Waste Curbside Pick-up  
302 April 1-30<sup>th</sup> : Spring Green Waste Drop-off (7:00 a.m.- 3:30 p.m. Sundays excluded)  
303 April 21<sup>st</sup>: Work Session (5:00 p.m.) and Council Meeting (6:00 p.m.) – tentative  
304 April 22-24<sup>th</sup>: Utah League of Cities and Towns Conference- St. George  
305 April 25<sup>th</sup>: Rohmer Spring Clean Up 8-11 a.m.  
306 April 30<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission Meeting 6:00 p.m. (tentative)  
307

308 **11. ADJOURN THE MEETING**

309 **Motion by Council Member Thomas**  
310 **Seconded by Council Member West**  
311 **To adjourn the meeting**  
312 **Approved unanimously (5-0)**  
313 **Time: 6:46 p.m.**  
314  
315

316 **Date Approved**  
317  
318 .

**City Recorder**