



LAI-ON-THE TABLE
MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE
ASSEMBLY MEMORANDUM

No. AM 554-2026

Meeting Date: August 18, 2026

From: Assembly Members McCormick, Scout, and Vice Chair Volland

Subject: AN ORDINANCE OF THE ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL ASSEMBLY REPEALING AND REPLACING ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTER 3.102 AND AMC SECTION 7.15.040 TO CLARIFY EXISTING RESTRICTIONS ON SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY AND ESTABLISH NEW RESTRICTIONS ON AUTOMATED LICENSE PLATE READER SYSTEMS, REAL-TIME CRIME CENTER OPERATIONS, AND LIVE CAMERA MONITORING, TO LIMIT THE RETENTION OF SURVEILLANCE DATA, TO PROHIBIT PARTICIPATION IN EXTERNAL SURVEILLANCE DATA NETWORKS, TO REQUIRE ASSEMBLY APPROVAL FOR THE ACQUISITION OF SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY, AND TO PROVIDE FOR AUDIT AND ENFORCEMENT.

The proposed ordinance reorganizes Anchorage Municipal Code chapter 3.102 to provide a clear formal structure for the use and approval of all surveillance technologies by the Municipality, and introduces new language governing the use of automated license plate readers (ALPRs), integrated camera networks, Real Time Crime Center operations and the retention and storage of data.

First the ordinance authorizes the limited use of ALPRs for real-time comparison against a narrow hot list involving stolen vehicles, AMBER/Silver Alerts, felony warrants, felony investigations, or missing persons. They may not be used for misdemeanors, and retrospective queries beyond fourteen days require a warrant. Additionally, the section authorizing ALPR use for these purposes includes a sunset provision ending the authorization in 2031 unless affirmatively renewed.

Second, the ordinance sharply limits how long surveillance data may be retained. ALPR data, camera footage, and real-time crime center recordings must be deleted within fourteen days unless individually designated as evidence or preserved under a warrant, litigation hold, or public records request. Bulk or automatic retention is prohibited, and the chief of police must annually certify that automated deletion is functioning.

Third, the ordinance tightly constrains real-time crime center operations. The center may provide situational awareness for specific incidents, but it may not serve as a system of continuous observation or virtual patrol. Live monitoring requires a specific incident, an imminent threat, a missing-person case, a felony investigation with supervisory approval, or a warrant. Sessions must be logged, time-limited, and automatically terminated unless renewed with written justification. Cross-camera tracking is prohibited except in narrow emergency or warrant-based circumstances, and integrated camera feeds cannot be continuously displayed, buffered, or stored.

1 Remote control of private cameras requires explicit written consent, and audio
2 access is disabled by default.

3
4 Fourth, the ordinance takes the established procedure for the Assembly authorizing
5 the use of facial recognition technology currently codified in AMC 3.102.020F. and
6 applies it to the acquisition of any surveillance technology. Under this system, any
7 agency wishing to acquire a new surveillance technology must get approval from
8 the Assembly for a 90 day trial period, and may apply for a permanent authorization
9 to be placed in code thereafter.

10
11 Fifth, the ordinance preserves and relocates the code's existing language governing
12 facial recognition technology, Unmanned aircraft systems, and Body cameras while
13 leaving the substantive language largely untouched. This new organization of the
14 chapter will facilitate the addition of future sections governing new technology yet to
15 be contemplated.

16
17 Finally, the ordinance adds meaningful enforcement mechanisms while preserving
18 those already existing in code. The Office of Ombudsman or Internal Audit must
19 conduct annual audits of compliance, including review of logs, retention settings,
20 access controls, and samples of live monitoring sessions. Additionally, the
21 Assembly will retain the authority to suspend an agency's use of surveillance
22 technology after a public hearing.

23
24 Taken together, the ordinance transforms AMC 3.102 from a disjointed and limited
25 set of rules into a robust privacy framework. It ensures that surveillance technology
26 in Anchorage is used only for legitimate, incident-based public safety purposes; that
27 data from people not suspected of wrongdoing is not retained; that the Assembly—
28 not vendors—controls surveillance capability; and that residents have meaningful
29 remedies when violations occur.

30
31
32 **We request your support for the ordinance.**

33
34 Prepared by: Assembly Legal Services

35
36 Respectfully submitted: Keith McCormick, Assembly Member
37 District 6 – South Anchorage

38
39 Sydney Scout, Assembly Member
40 District 1 – North Anchorage

41
42 Daniel Volland, Assembly Vice Chair
43 District 1 – North Anchorage