

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING-WORK SESSION
CITY HALL-10 EAST CENTER STREET, NORTH SALT LAKE
SEPTEMBER 1, 2026

FINAL

Mayor Horrocks welcomed those present at 6:06 p.m.

PRESENT: Mayor Brian Horrocks
Councilmember Tammy Clayton
Councilmember Suzette Jackson
Councilmember Ted Knowlton via Zoom
Councilmember Heidi Smoot
Councilmember Alisa Van Langeveld

STAFF PRESENT: Ken Leetham, City Manager; David Frandsen, Assistant City Manager; Heidi Voordeckers, Finance Director; Jon Rueckert, Public Works Director; Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director; Craig Black, Police Chief; Mitch Gwilliam, Deputy Chief; Karyn Baxter, City Engineer; Tyler Abegglen, Golf Course Director (via Zoom); Todd Godfrey, City Attorney; Wendy Page, City Recorder; Linda Horrocks, Communications Director.

OTHERS PRESENT: Larry Clark, Dee Lalliss, Dennis Allen, Carolyn Jacobson, Zoram Beebe, Audrey Beebe, Enos Beebe, Grace Kirato, Ben Kirato, Lucy Ballard, Wes Ballard, Alina Ballard, Jim Cowley, Alyce Almeida, Ryan Holbrook, Andrew Jackson, Cambria Drescher, Paisley Drescher, Jamie Nopper, Lily Nopper, Caroline Golden, Hunter Ensign, residents.

1. PRESENTATION AND OVERVIEW OF LICENSE PLATE READING
TECHNOLOGY IN THE CITY BY CHIEF BLACK

Chief Black reported on how and where the Police Department utilized License Plate Reading (LPR) technology. He stated LPR technology has been used in the public and private sector for decades. He clarified that use of LPR technology in the private sector operated under different platforms and rules than the public sector and did not intersect even for insurance or data sharing. He reviewed the history of LPR, explained the City's retention schedule, and how the City was in compliance with applicable state and federal laws.

Chief Black commented that the City began to utilize LPRs in 2012 for crime solving and public safety in a way that did not violate privacy laws and constitutional guidelines. He clarified that

the City's LPR was not a live video feed surveillance camera, was not facial recognition, and did not store data beyond 30 days.

Councilmember Van Langeveld joined the meeting at 6:08 p.m.

Councilmember Jackson asked about a situation in Weber County where the data was accessed 5 million times outside of the city/state's jurisdiction. Chief Black replied that when it said the system was accessed 10 million times that there were 10 million searches but clarified that did not mean the data was moved to outside databases. He continued that the only way data would have been flagged is if another agency (such as a police department) would have recorded a plate in an investigation that was seen in Ogden. He said this meant that other agencies had the chance to search Weber's database and 10 million individual reads were accessed but it did not mean 10 million pieces of data were shipped out.

Chief Black explained that other agencies could not take the data and store it. He said when they ran a report or search that if no data matched the search no return would come back. He clarified that a report was not generated showing every vehicle that went by the camera.

Councilmember Jackson spoke on her concerns related to data storage. She asked about data sharing between Axon and Flock. Chief Black replied that these companies were very protective of their data and said it was doubtful that there had been data sharing. He said Salt Lake County and Davis County used separated platforms and did not interact. He noted that there were reputable companies that were in compliance with State and Federal statutes and laws and companies that may not be.

Councilmember Jackson asked if Flock had the AI ability to match vehicle registration to a license plate. Chief Black replied that it did not and could only provide information matching the license plate number that had been searched for. He gave the example of an individual standing on Center Street and informing him when a Blue Chevy with the license plate 12756 drove by. He clarified that this was basically the same way the LPR system worked as it just had the ability to recognize letters and numbers on a license plate. He added that the license plate information was only stored for 30 days in the license plate reader system.

Councilmember Jackson asked how the LPR cameras helped the Police Department. Chief Black replied that the LPR cameras were like stationary witnesses that could be used to show a vehicle or license plate that went by and create a path for police to follow.

Councilmember Jackson spoke on State Law related to parking violations and parking. Chief Black said Salt Lake City had received permission for active parking enforcement teams to

utilize internal LPR data for chronic parking violators. He explained this data was not shared between law enforcement agencies and said the City did not use LPR for parking.

Councilmember Van Langeveld asked about the use of LPR cameras to track the route of a vehicle when the occupants had perpetuated a crime such as theft or an abduction. Chief Black said the LPR could be used to confirm the car was at the location of the crime or could be used to search for a hit on the license plate if it passed an LPR camera location. He shared some examples of cases where crimes were prevented or solved using ALPR in the City.

Chief Black commented that a hot list could be created to help notify the department about specific license plates such as those on stolen vehicles.

Councilmember Jackson asked about the process when a vehicle was on a hot list and then created an alert after driving by an LPR camera. Chief Black replied that it would send a text to on duty officers and notify them that one of the cameras had a violation pass and would send a picture of the car and license plate to the officer. He continued that the officer would then verify the accuracy of the read and enter the information into the verification data base and if it was the stolen car then they would respond.

Councilmember Jackson asked if the vehicles of registered sex offenders were also in the system. Chief Black replied that every registered sex offender had to register their vehicles which was part of the NCIC database. He said the City's Police Department could choose to be notified of this and could then share that database with the LPR hot list. He clarified that at this time the Department shared the database for stolen vehicles, protective orders, etc.

Councilmember Jackson asked how they connected the person to the license plate. Chief Black said the LPR did not connect the person to the plate. He explained that this was done through an entirely different database that was used separately from LPR. He noted that the license plate number was the only thing entered into the hot list.

Councilmember Knowlton join the meeting via Zoom at 6:40 p.m.

Councilmember Jackson said anyone that was on the wrong side of the law was connected to a license plate through registration and might have their plate on a hot list such as for sex offenders. Chief Black replied if the City had enough money to place cameras in front of every school and park, where sex offenders were not allowed, then they could setup a hot list to be notified of sex offenders in those locations.

Councilmember Jackson spoke on understanding the capabilities and how that connection was made. Chief Black replied that if there was a crime committed the Police Department had the capability to have one of the LPR, as a standing witness, notify if a vehicle passed a point.

Councilmember Van Langeveld mentioned the point that this system was only used for legitimate law enforcement business. She said that while there was a list of registered sex offenders with associated license plates that were not allowed near schools that the Department had determined not to put these plates on a hot list for notification. Chief Black responded that initially the Department had a hot list with registered sex offender license plates but found that it was taking too much time to verify plates and whether it was legitimate for the individual to be in that location.

Councilmember Van Langeveld commented that the City's Police Department would share information with federal agencies that showed legitimate law enforcement reason. She asked about sharing information with a parole officer. Chief Black replied that if the agency provided a warrant the information would then be shared. He explained that the State Department of Public Safety and the State Department of Corrections were shared networks. He added that those entities had open access to data that was collected from the Flock cameras in the City.

Councilmember Van Langeveld requested a list of agencies that the City shared with. Chief Black replied he could provide the City Council with that list. He noted that the City's Police Department shared data with almost every law enforcement agency in the State and about 400 agencies across the country but not federal agencies. He said there was a memorandum of understanding between the City and the Davis County Sheriff's Office and how any notifications and violations of the system were flagged.

Councilmember Van Langeveld asked if there was a memorandum of understanding between the 400 agencies that the City's Police Department shared data with. Chief Black said while different States had different memorandums of understanding that the City had individual memorandums of understanding with each of the 400 agencies. He noted that the City and these agencies would share a request, which was then reviewed by an officer, and then agencies had to agree to the terms before data was shared.

Councilmember Van Langeveld asked if the agencies agreed to the terms at the moment of the search or beforehand. She asked if reviewing requests was time consuming. Chief Black replied that an agreement was made and then they would have access to search the systems. He noted that it also involved an officer reviewing the requests by out of state agencies. He clarified that data was automatically shared by Utah agencies as they were all under the same statutes and

rules but said they would revoke access for any systemic abuse. He added that reviewing out of state requests was time consuming.

Councilmember Jackson asked about the memorandum of understanding and if this meant that other states agreed to abide by Utah state laws for information that came from Utah. She gave the example of 30 day retention of data. Chief Black said Utah's statute was 90 days but the City's Police Department policy was 30 days. He explained after 30 days the data and the ability to search the requested information was gone. He continued that the information that is the subject of a search and was located by the City's LPR could be included in another agency's police report, but the ability to search was gone after 30 days.

Chief Black shared that the information was time sensitive and that in more rural areas this could create a problem if a crime was not reported or discovered earlier. He said agencies like the Division of Natural Resources would like to extend the retention of data for a year as some crimes, such as poaching, may not be discovered for months.

Councilmember Jackson asked about what a data request entailed. Chief Black replied that a request would include the last 30 days of where the requested vehicle was seen in a city.

Councilmember Van Langeveld asked about data storage for the City. She clarified that the Flock system collected the pictures which then went to the City's Amazon storage site where they would sit for 30 days. Chief Black confirmed that the data was stored in a dedicated server space in a locked room owned by Amazon. He said the information was then deleted automatically after 30 days. He noted that Flock could not access the City's system and could only analyze the photos to improve their AI capability to recognize letters and numbers.

Councilmember Van Langeveld clarified that Flock was not storing any picture captures from the City's cameras. Chief Black responded that they were the intermediary that has purchased the storage space on the City's behalf to store it there. He said once the data was there they did not have access to the data other than to use a misread to improve their AI systems for their algorithms. He noted that Flock could not do searches or take data.

Councilmember Van Langeveld requested the City Attorney review the contract with Flock to ensure that they could not retain picture captures aside from flags for AI improvement. She said this was to ensure there was no risk that Flock was retaining this data.

Councilmember Smoot asked if Flock could ever access the information and if the federal government had a way to access the information without permission from the City. Chief Black

replied that the federal government could not access the information even with permission from Flock.

Councilmember Smoot spoke on the public distrust and the valid concern related to this. She noted that it was fundamentally against resident's rights to collect evidence before a crime was committed. She spoke about the possibility for the data from the LPR cameras to be weaponized against residents. Chief Black responded that two things would have to occur for that to happen including an LPR camera in the right location and then allowing access to the data which was controlled by the City.

Councilmember Smoot asked what would happen if the federal government provided a warrant to access the data. Chief Black clarified that the City would not provide the information if the request was not related to something that was considered a crime in Utah.

Councilmember Smoot said technology in the wrong hands was dangerous. She continued that while she trusted the North Salt Lake Police Department that she did not think all police officers had integrity and not all agencies could be trusted. She reiterated that this could be dependent on who was in the White House or the State senate. Chief Black reiterated that a warrant could not be obtained for something that was not a crime. He noted that it would take legislative or executive action for it to become a crime. He continued that, as an example, the City did not share their network with the State of Idaho as there were crimes in Idaho that were not crimes in Utah.

Councilmember Van Langeveld mentioned a similar concern where what was considered legitimate law enforcement business could change through an executive or legislative order. She gave the example with the shift in immigration with those individuals who were living in the country with DACA status who, under executive order, were no longer allowed to do that and how what was considered legitimate law enforcement business had changed over time based on who was interpreting that law. Chief Black said if the Department was to change how they were sharing data with other agencies such as federal partners, the City Council would know.

Mayor Horrocks said at that point the City could remove the cameras as there was no law that required the cameras. Chief Black replied that the Department could change the retention status to a week or even one day as well.

Councilmember Jackson shared her concerns and noted that in 2020 the governor of Kentucky threatened to record the license plates of anyone who participated in mass gatherings to provide that info to the local health department to require those individuals to quarantine for 14 days in response to COVID. She made the point that governors and presidents could make executive or

emergency orders and how laws could change. Chief Black replied that he understood the concern but noted the LPR was the least efficient way to accomplish enforcement when inexpensive video cameras could be installed.

Councilmember Smoot explained that the concern from the public was that they could get rid of their cell phones or Alexa and internet in their homes to avoid being tracked but as soon as they drove their cars down the street they could be watched by their government. Chief Black replied that they were public streets and residents had no right to privacy on that street. He said if they did not want to be tracked to stay off the street.

Councilmember Smoot said that the way she viewed the constitution was that people had the right to leave their homes and not be surveilled by their government through drones or Flock cameras, etc. She added that the founding fathers set up the fourth amendment intended for a person to leave their home and not be tracked. Chief Black said the constitution was set up so that as things changed the executive branch enforced the laws that the legislative branch set. He continued that the judicial branch would then interpret the constitutionality of those laws and how they were being enforced. He noted that right now the LPR cameras were constitutional.

Councilmember Smoot said as of today the LPR cameras may be utilized correctly but may not be in the future. Chief Black said when laws were drafted as such then the City would not utilize the technology anymore. He spoke on jurisprudence that defined what was a right to privacy and what was not. He said the most important duty as a City Council was the protection of public safety in the City and how LPR was a legal tool.

Chief Black asked that the Council recognize the validity of this tool as a great public safety asset.

Councilmember Smoot clarified that she thought Chief Black was a man of integrity and said the City had an incredible police force that she trusted. She said if the City had a closed circuit system that only Chief Black had access to she would not be having this discussion but her concern was what occurred outside the City's purview and the Chief's jurisdiction. Chief Black replied that while he understood the sentiment that the City's Police Department did not operate in a bubble as there were millions of citizens in the Country and 800,000 police departments which required cooperative law enforcement agreements. He acknowledged there was a misuse of LPR systems both accidental and intentional but said the numbers were miniscule.

Councilmember Jackson noted that this was a two part issue including the legality and the overarching public issue of constitutionality. She said the founding fathers consistently said we will not sacrifice individual liberty for the safety of the mass or the group. She spoke on

sometimes standing up for individual liberty even at the expense of the community good. Chief Black said that case law has been clear and so has legislation that it was the duty of the government to protect its public which may result in the loss of liberty. He said without law it would be a nation of anarchy. He explained the loss of liberty to drive through red lights because of laws and finding the correct balance between personal liberty and public safety for everyone.

Councilmember Knowlton was in agreement with the notion of whether the American system was whether it was more important to protect the right of an individual to protect innocence or more important to punish guilt. He said if hypothetically the City continued to use these cameras that there must be a clear, defensible, and important answer to the question of if it was worth it. He clarified that if it was worth moving against an established American principle to protect innocence for these reasons with these safeguards. Chief Black said the discussion was not innocence and guilt but the right to privacy. He noted there was a big difference between the right to privacy and the right to be proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Mayor Horrocks commented that this item would be continued during the regular session.

2. ADJOURN

Mayor Horrocks adjourned the meeting at 7:11 p.m. to begin the regular session.

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING-REGULAR SESSION
CITY HALL-10 EAST CENTER STREET, NORTH SALT LAKE
AUGUST 18, 2026

FINAL

Mayor Horrocks welcomed those present at 7:21 p.m. Heidi Smoot provided an invocation and led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Mayor Brian Horrocks
Councilmember Tammy Clayton
Councilmember Suzette Jackson
Councilmember Ted Knowlton via Zoom
Councilmember Heidi Smoot
Councilmember Alisa Van Langeveld

STAFF PRESENT: Ken Leetham, City Manager; David Frandsen, Assistant City Manager; Heidi Voordeckers, Finance Director; Jon Rueckert, Public Works Director; Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director; Craig Black, Police Chief; Mitch Gwilliam, Deputy Chief; Karyn Baxter, City Engineer; Tyler Abegglen, Golf Course Director (via Zoom); Todd Godfrey, City Attorney; Wendy Page, City Recorder; Linda Horrocks, Communications Director.

OTHERS PRESENT: Larry Clark, Dee Lalliss, Dennis Allen, Carolyn Jacobson, Zoram Beebe, Audrey Beebe, Enos Beebe, Grace Kirato, Ben Kirato, Lucy Ballard, Wes Ballard, Alina Ballard, Jim Cowley, Alyce Almeida, Ryan Holbrook, Andrew Jackson, Cambria Drescher, Paisley Drescher, Jamie Nopper, Lily Nopper, Caroline Golden, Hunter Ensign, residents; Catherine Johnson, Brooke Johnson, Steffanie Holdstock, Taressa Earl, Nora Ratto, Oscar Ratto, Why I Love America.

1. PRESENTATION BY WHY I LOVE AMERICA-TARESSA EARL

Councilmember Jackson introduced the Why I Love America association and noted their involvement with the recent City event. She also spoke on the State Why I Love America event and said both events were spectacular.

Taressa Earl, Why I Love America, provided a quick overview of the America 250 City event which included a reenactment of the Declaration of Independence, speakers (including two youth Freedom Festival speech contest winners), and a historical photo with the American flag. She

spoke on the Brent Taylor Foundation which was setup in remembrance of former North Ogden Mayor Brent Taylor who was killed while serving in Afghanistan. She presented the City with a historic photo of residents holding the flag to celebrate America 250.

2. INTRODUCTION AND SWEARING IN OF 2026-27 NSL YOUTH CITY COUNCIL LEADERSHIP

Audrey Beebe reported that the City had no shortage of youth who were high achieving and hardworking. She explained that the Youth City Council was led by an executive committee and introduced those individuals for the 2026-2027 school year:

Caroline Golden as Youth City Council Mayor
Lucy Ballard as Youth City Council City Manager
Wes Ballard as Youth City Council Recorder
Grace Kirato as Activities Committee Chair
Zoram Beebe as Leadership Committee Chair
Lily Nopper as Service Committee Chair

Mayor Horrocks performed the swearing in of the Youth City Council for 2026-2027. He commented that the City had a great Youth City Council and next year would be no exception. He credited the Beebes and said they did a great job.

Councilmember Van Langeveld was in agreement and added that other cities asked the Beebes for advice on how to run their youth city councils.

3. PRESENTATION BY DAVIS COUNTY ANIMAL CARE-DIRECTOR MICHELLE HICKS

Mayor Horrocks noted that this item would be rescheduled to the November 4th City Council meeting.

4. CITIZEN COMMENT

Dennis Allen, resident, spoke on the loss of trees and shade at Hatch Park. He said North Salt Lake was a Tree City USA and per City ordinance when a tree was taken down that it must be replaced at an equivalent value. He noted the removal of many mature trees at Hatch Park and the need for a plan to restore the shade canopy and function of those trees. He requested a real tree plan with species, size at planting, mature trees versus small stock, location, living shade

canopy at opening day through year five, percentage of park square footage with living shade canopy, and how the trees would be cared for including existing mature trees.

5. PRESENTATION AND OVERVIEW OF LICENSE PLATE READING
TECHNOLOGY IN THE CITY BY CHIEF BLACK CONTINUED FROM THE WORK
SESSION

Chief Black reported that there had been very few tools that were as effective as LPR cameras in the ability to protect public safety. He addressed Councilmember Knowlton's request to address the balance between liberty and innocence. He said it was really a matter of finding the balance between liberty and safety instead of innocence as this was a completely different topic. He spoke on the quote which said to the effect that those who would sacrifice a bit of liberty for safety deserve neither safety nor liberty and how the purpose of government was to setup laws while finding an appropriate balance with liberty/freedom.

Chief Black continued that after the initial trial with two cameras the Department found it was a great force multiplier and tool. He said an agreement was then entered into with Flock to cover the west side of the City, where there were high value targets for thieves, including the manufacturing and industrial areas, a significant portion of residents in the Foxboro area, and new commercial development. He added that over the next five years cameras were added to Highway 89 and other major collectors and not in neighborhoods. He reviewed the locations of the cameras and noted that residents could avoid these cameras if they desired.

Chief Black then presented several examples in the City where the LPR cameras helped to prevent or stop crimes. He spoke on what was unique about LPR which was the ability to have a stationary witness that could provide information on whether a car had passed a designated point at a certain place and time. He continued that the system could tell if it observed certain crimes or unsafe situations including a stolen car, vehicle associated with a wanted person, or a missing endangered person. He reviewed several frequently asked questions and assertions against LPR use including trust for police or future leadership, future use, data being shared with entities like ICE, not knowing where the data was being stored, stories of misidentification, using this unregulated tech for surveillance of citizens, and that data storage is subject to being hacked or misused.

Chief Black clarified that he reviewed every Flock data request from other agencies and Deputy Chief Gwilliam reviewed every Motorola data request. He continued that if misuse occurred from other agencies that their access could be revoked.

Councilmember Jackson spoke on the data that 75% of Americans trust their police. She said if a similar poll was taken for how many Americans trusted their local politicians the number would

be very low and noted that this was the disconnect in that they trusted police to uphold the law but not the politicians creating the laws. She commented that the laws were the actual guard rails for the system and could swing with an administration. Chief Black said that residents should be able to trust their City Council to make decisions. He also spoke on the need to have trust between the City's Police Department and the community.

Chief Black shared information rebutting each of the assertions made against LPRs and noted that the equipment was not capable of becoming a video camera and did not have facial recognition. He reiterated that if the use of LPRs became unconstitutional the Police Department would cease using it.

Mayor Horrocks mentioned UDOT cameras. He asked if the City had a right to control who installed cameras in the City. Chief Black replied that UDOT had live feed video cameras on every intersection of a state highway including 2600 South, Highway 89, and Redwood Road as well as along the freeways/expressways. He replied that UDOT had the right of way in those areas and noted that the City had to request a UDOT permit to place a LPR on Highway 89.

Councilmember Jackson asked about the differences between UDOT, Ring, and video cameras including the ability for identification. She said Flock provided the identifying piece to identify license plates. Chief Black replied that you could view license plates on UDOT cameras but that they did not have a hot list notification. He explained that this was not the purpose of the UDOT cameras and noted that they could provide notification of major traffic problems based on cell phone data and traffic camera data.

Councilmember Jackson said the issue was the individualized identification with the LPRs. She said Ring and other security cameras provided visual but not identification. Chief Black explained that they had utilized Ring and UDOT cameras in the past to identify vehicles but it was not as reliable as LPR.

Councilmember Van Langeveld said there was a rotating argument that surveillance was not a big deal based on all the places where individuals were being surveilled or that this was a tool that was needed as it was better than other cameras. Chief Black explained that UDOT had a system of cameras setup to meet their needs which did not work as well for the City and spoke on how LPRs were as critical to the Department as UDOT's cameras were to their mission.

Councilmember Van Langeveld spoke on the argument of not being worried about being captured on LPR as you were already being captured on Ring or UDOT cameras too. She mentioned the consent piece and opting in to using a cell phone and the City Council putting this

infrastructure in place rather than letting residents opt in. She said the second concern was removing human interface and allowing AI detection which was worthy of careful consideration.

Chief Black commented that it was much more difficult to hide from the private sector.

Councilmember Jackson spoke on how a warrant was needed because there was a suspicion of something that was done whereas there was not a warrant needed for the LPR camera pictures.

Councilmember Knowlton said this was not black and white and suggested the Council discuss this now and make a decision at a later date. He asked for the opinions of the Council as they made up their minds individually on how to balance these things.

Chief Black answered Councilmember Jackson's comment related to needing a warrant and said the Department did not need a warrant to search what was on the street but did need a warrant for a private place, person, or possession per the Fourth Amendment. He said the outside of a vehicle was not private when it was in public.

Chief Black shared that the data was owned and controlled by the NSL PD and was stored on Amazon Web Services in a specialized database that was Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) compliant and secure. He spoke on the potential for misidentification and said that while it did happen that the issue could be resolved in minutes. He noted how the LPR automated the system to determine whether a car was stolen or assisted in Amber Alerts.

Chief Black reviewed the concern that police were using LPR for unregulated tech surveillance. He said LPR use by police officers was heavily regulated and subject to frequent audits. He continued that Utah enacted the Automatic License Plate Reader System Act in 2013 which narrowly defined who, what, where, and how LPR data could be obtained, used, shared, and stored in Utah.

Chief Black shared an example of tracking a vehicle for 30 days and showed the data that was returned from the analyzation software. He noted the data included the route traveled, times, and general description of the vehicle (color and possible make and model).

Councilmember Smoot asked if the cameras ever took photos of the front of the vehicles. Chief Black replied that the cameras were designed to be one directional and only took photos of the front of vehicles incidentally. He added that the Utah State legislature had removed the requirements for a front license plate so the camera was programmed to take a photo of the plate on the back of a vehicle.

Chief Black continued that the license plate recognition data tracked locations, timestamps, and direction. He said it did not contain any personal demographic information such as driver's identity, age, gender, race, or residency details. He summarized that data storage was subject to being hacked and misused. He said in the last 20 years over 24 billion private records had been exposed to data hacks including names, addresses, phone numbers, birth dates, and behavioral profiles, etc. and noted that LPR data was not the way that people were being tracked.

Councilmember Smoot spoke on ways that technology has been misused and misinterpreted in society now. Chief Black replied that this was not occurring with the LPR technology with the current oversight. He said at this time the value of the tool exceeded any type of risk that it was exposing the public to. He shared a video of how an individual could be tracked just by posting a photo on social media and said if someone such as the government was going to track citizens they would use that data versus an LPR camera.

Chief Black concluded his presentation with data that was tracked through air quality monitors, water systems, garbage/refuse, and sound/noises. He noted how COVID was tracked through water systems.

Councilmember Knowlton commented that there was a difference between information that can be gathered versus information that was gathered and compiled in a database that enabled an entity to put together information about a person's path of activity. Chief Black replied that the Department would not be using LPR data unless an individual was the target of a criminal investigation.

Chief Black summarized that the world was data driven and dependent on that data. He reviewed areas that obtained much more sensitive data from individuals including financial institutions, government, health care, retail establishments, scientific and research industries, churches, schools, and employers. He said technology would continue to improve and become more powerful in analyzation particularly in agriculture, manufacturing, banking, and law enforcement.

Councilmember Jackson said this was an example of the angst in society in that technology has developed farther than the guard rails developed to contain it. She spoke on the societal epidemic of youth that were suffering from this and the push for society to install guard rails for AI and other new technology.

Chief Black said that while he could not rebut every what if or inflamed statement but he provided the following assurances that this technology was being used by the Department and shared networks in compliance with Utah State law, that it was constitutionally based, regular

audits and training were conducted, crimes were prevented and solved with the assistance of ALPR, was only used for legal reasons, data was not released to a non-criminal entity until the case was closed, they only partnered with LPR companies that met the highest guidelines, in a data breach the information divulged was already public information, and society was giving nothing up with the use of ALPR cameras as the data gathered was not subject to any constitutional protection of privacy.

Chief Black shared a video in which Flock cameras were utilized to find a vehicle involved in a child abduction. Councilmember Smoot said that this played into the worst case scenario and was unfair as individuals in that situation would give up every freedom to recover their child.

Mayor Horrocks mentioned that the other worst case scenario was one cop may abuse the system.

Councilmember Jackson spoke on the COVID issue and the worst case scenario of a governor threatening individuals from gathering together. Mayor Horrocks said that at that point the City Council would remove the cameras from the City to prevent that scenario from occurring.

Chief Black said if it got to that point he would come to the City Council and request the removal of the cameras. He gave the scenario of a law requiring the removal of firearms from residents and said the Police Department would not enforce that. He noted that if this tool was used properly, it was a very valuable tool for public safety. He pleaded with the Council not to take the use away from the Department that was entrusted with protecting public safety.

Mayor Horrocks commented that everyone shared the same concerns and spoke on the fact that the 20th century was known for murder, particularly by their own government. He said there was a legitimate concern about surveillance. He spoke on an incident related to Hatch Park in which a woman was murdered and the criticism of the City due to fake cameras in the park. He noted how there were two sides to every equation related to surveillance.

Mayor Horrocks said there may be new laws per the Legislature next year and how the City could always remove the cameras.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT CONTINUED

Hunter Ensign, resident, shared a posting from Flocksafety.com which stated that “all existing Flock LPRs will soon stream live video and capture clips with a free optional software update. No new hardware, no permits, no extra costs, same lens, same angle and field of view as the LPR. See basic video clips for every plate read. Zero lift for your team. Free and optional to opt

in.” He noted that while Flock cameras helped solve crimes and recover stolen vehicles that the problem was that if it was good at tracking down criminals then it was also good at tracking down regular citizens. He continued that these cameras took pictures of your route and your vehicle including distinguishing marks or political stickers which was all searchable. He concluded that the Amazon database included every American’s location history which did not feel American to him but rather ripe for abuse.

Councilmember Knowlton asked about next steps. Mayor Horrocks suggested waiting to see what emerged from the next Legislative session.

Councilmember Smoot commented that it felt disingenuous to wait until February to address this again. She said that the driver for this was law abiding citizens that feared that one day the information could be weaponized against them. She suggested that each Councilmember take a position even if the majority wanted to wait until the legislative session next year to address it.

Councilmember Clayton thanked the Chief for the information presented. She said people shared similar information on social media including their location, children’s school information, etc. and the disconnect between worrying about LPR cameras and not what information they were sharing online.

Councilmember Van Langeveld noted that she had additional questions for the Chief and was in favor of keeping this item open. She suggested a future agenda item to continue the discussion. She noted that the contract with Flock would have to be renewed at some point and then need a vote from the Council to affirmatively approve.

Councilmember Jackson said technology was a cost benefit analysis. She spoke on how the cameras were being used as a positive tool for many things right now but there was an overarching ethical and moral question as well. She noted that the Legislature may have guardrails but noted the bigger question was if regular citizens would be deemed enemy to the state and what direction this could go. She was in favor of revisiting this item and continuing to obtain public feedback.

Ken Leetham commented that the purpose was to shine light on this and said this issue had a high level of public interest. He noted good observations were made by the City Council. He added that he had been in public service for 38 years and how this felt different than any other time in his discussions with the public. He said that the City staff cared deeply about the public’s constitutional rights and rights to privacy and that we are trying to weigh that against our duty to keep the public safe.

7. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

- a. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2026-41R: A RESOLUTION
AMENDING THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE FEE SCHEDULE RELATED
TO EAGLEWOOD GOLF COURSE AND EVENT CENTER FEES
EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2027

A resolution amending the City's comprehensive fee schedule related to Eaglewood Golf Course and event center was approved.

- b. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

The City Council minutes of August 18, 2026 were reviewed and approved as amended.

Councilmember Clayton requested a change to word tense on line 770 from "fell" to "falls."

Councilmember Jackson moved that the City Council approve the consent agenda as presented. Councilmember Smoot seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Clayton, Jackson, Knowlton, Smoot, and Van Langeveld.

8. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2026-40R: A
RESOLUTION ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE 2026-2027 FISCAL YEAR
BUDGETS

Heidi Voordeckers reported that this budget amendment recognized new revenue streams and capital projects that were not considered in the original fiscal year 2027 budget. She continued that the spend down of fund balance proposed was a net of \$768,760. She noted that \$720,000 of that was for road surfacing projects that happened to fall right in the middle of the construction cycle and were not completed by June 30th. She said the projects would be completed in fiscal year 2027.

Ms. Voordeckers reviewed the General Fund and recognized the grant for the school resource officer of \$70,000, contributions of \$25,000 from the Call Foundation for the tree program, and \$2,000 from tuition reimbursement to the police department for a net change of \$95,000 increase to the General Fund. She spoke on the Parks Capital Projects including the City Hall South Park (triangle) project adjustment of \$250,000 per the August 18th City Council approval. She continued with the Road Capital Projects Fund with \$720,000 rolled over from FY 2026 and the additional \$10,000 funding plus \$13,800 in design fees for a total of \$23,800 for the Eagleridge Drive landscaping project.

Ms. Voordeckers reported on the Storm Water Fund and a drainage project from the Capital Facilities plan for fiscal year 2028 to take advantage of cost sharing with Albertsons for a total of \$100,000. She concluded with the Golf Fund including changes related to new golf carts with a net positive of \$230,040.

Heidi Voordeckers clarified that the storm drain project was related to property that the City acquired from the County and drainage needs in the industrial park. The Council asked about the location of Albertsons and Ken Leetham responded that it was a Distribution Center in the industrial park. He said the project included an upgrade to the storm drain pipe.

Sherrie Pace commented that the City needed a storm drain project in this area and that Albertson's had approached the City about redoing the grading on their property and fixing the drainage. She continued that it happened to tie in to where the City wanted to place a storm drain line so the determination was made to partner on the project to increase the storm drainage line along with their storm drainage.

Mayor Horrocks opened the public hearing at 9:20 p.m.

There were no public comments.

Mayor Horrocks closed the public hearing at 9:21 p.m.

Councilmember Clayton moved that the City Council approve Resolution 2026-40R: a resolution approving and adopting amendments to the 2026-2027 General Fund, Parks Capital Projects, Road Capital Projects, Storm Water, and Golf Fund Budgets. Councilmember Van Langeveld seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Clayton, Jackson, Knowlton, Smoot, and Van Langeveld.

9. FINANCIAL REPORT FOR FOURTH QUARTER OF FISCAL YEAR 2026

Mayor Horrocks noted that this item would be rescheduled to the September 15th City Council meeting.

10. REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED TOWN CENTER URBAN DESIGN STANDARDS

Sherrie Pace reported that staff, the Planning Commission, and the consultant had been working on the Town Center Urban Design Guidelines for seven months. She continued that the Planning Commission held a public hearing last week which approximately 50 residents attended and 16 public comments were received. She said the majority were in favor of the adoption of the

guidelines. She provided the final draft for consideration which included five subdistricts each with defined streetscapes, standards for parking, setbacks, building heights, facades, prohibited and permitted uses, landscaping, etc. She proposed that this item would be placed on the City Council agenda in two weeks for consideration.

Councilmember Jackson shared one concern related to the allowance of seven stories in certain subdistricts. She asked for more information and deliberation on that item. Sherrie Pace replied that the consultant would attend the next meeting and explain the site study and reasoning behind the recommended minimum and maximum heights.

Councilmember Van Langeveld acknowledged the level of work that had gone into preparing these standards. She suggested that this item be placed on the next City Council agenda for review followed by approval at a later date.

Councilmember Knowlton said the Council could approve this at the next meeting or make the decision to table it until a later date.

Councilmember Van Langeveld commented that in general for substantive changes like this that collaboration should occur in public meetings and recommended having this item on the agenda for the next meeting and then voting in another meeting following that review. Councilmember Smoot was in agreement and said councilmembers should never feel bad about tabling an item or requesting more time to consider an item that was significant such as a general plan or code.

11. DISCUSSION OF ACTION ITEMS

The action items list was reviewed. Completed items were removed from the list.

12. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Jackson thanked staff for their efforts in completing action items. She also commended Karyn Baxter for resolving an issue with detours and a contractor.

Councilmember Van Langeveld provided an update from the Health and Wellness Committee and noted that there had been nine applicants for the neighborhood block parties. She noted that half had requested a City official attend the party including an officer, staff, and Parks and Trails Committee members.

Councilmember Jackson asked to be kept updated on the neighborhood block parties for future voting purposes. Ken Leetham replied that staff could share the spreadsheet where this information was being tracked with the Council.

Councilmember Van Langeveld asked for an agenda item related to a Planning Commission update or being added to the Commission agenda emails.

13. CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Todd Godfrey had nothing to report.

14. MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Horrocks reported that the regional center in North Salt Lake of the LDS Church would be demolished. He said it was originally zoned as a musical venue and asked about future owners of the property. Sherrie Pace replied that staff met with a representative from the church who informed them that the building would be demolished and that there were no plans to sell the property at this time. She noted that the investment required to bring the building up to current earthquake and fire standards outweighed the value of the property. She requested that the property owner meet with the City before listing the property for sale to review appropriate land uses and review the potential for RDA or other economic development incentives.

15. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Ken Leetham reported on the annual Utah League of Cities and Towns convention in October. He noted it would be held in Salt Lake. He asked the Council to notify staff if they would like to attend. He reminded the Council that the September 15th meeting would be held at the Foxboro North Clubhouse. Mr. Leetham also said staff had a preconstruction meeting on the parcel to the south of City Hall with construction commencing on September 2nd. He mentioned that there were three water leaks tonight which was why several members of staff had been excused. He noted that one employee was injured onsite.

Councilmember Smoot requested an agenda item related to providing a donation to the Bountiful Davis Arts Center. She clarified that the City had not donated to the BDAC in 2026. Ken Leetham replied that this could be placed on the next agenda and said staff could provide a history of the City's donations to the BDAC and ensuring that only one donation was made in the fiscal year.

16. ADJOURN

Mayor Horrocks adjourned the meeting at 9:47 p.m.

The foregoing was approved by the City Council of the City of North Salt Lake on Tuesday September 15, 2026 by unanimous vote of all members present.



Brian J. Horrocks, Mayor



Wendy Page, City Recorder

