

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
January 20, 2021 Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Dan Petersen – UFA, Chairman
Mr. Korban Lee – West Jordan, Vice-Chairman
Mr. John Eining – Draper
Mr. Blair Camp - Murray
Mr. Gary Whatcott – South Jordan
Ms. Goma Chamness – Holladay
Mr. Kane Loader - Midvale
Mr. Kyle Kershaw – South Salt Lake
Mr. David Brickey - Riverton
Ms. Wendy Thomas - Herriman
Mr. Mark Reid – Bluffdale
Mr. Mike Morey - Alta
Ms. Lisa Hartman - SLCo
Mr. Tim Tingey – Cottonwood Heights
Mr. Scott Harrington - Taylorsville
Mr. Jake Petersen – UPD
Mr. Wayne Pyle – West Valley City

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Scott Ruf – Director, VECC
Mr. John Evans – West Valley
Ms. Andrea Partridge - VECC
Mr. Clint Jensen – VECC
Mr. Clint Smith – Draper
Mr. Scott Young – VECC Counsel
Mr. Terry Addison – South Salt Lake
Mr. Troy Carr – Herriman
Mr. Robbie Russo – Cottonwood Heights
Ms. Beth Todd – VECC
Mr. Don Hutson – Riverton
Ms. Colleen Jacobs – West Valley City
Mr. Ryan Shosted – Riverton
Mr. Steve VanMaren - Public

In view of the COVID-19 Pandemic, this meeting will be held at virtually via ZOOM, as authorized by the Governor's Executive Order dated March 18, 2020 and affirmed November 8, 2020.

Mr. Dan Petersen called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments received for this meeting.

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 17, 2020 MEETING MINUTES

Motion –

. . . by Mr. David Brickey, to approve the minutes of the December 2020 Trustees meeting; the motion was seconded by Mr. Gary Whatcott; the motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF 2021 VECC BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEETING SCHEDULE

Scott Ruf displayed the 2021 meeting schedule and Chief Petersen requested a motion to approve it.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Tim Tingey, to approve the 2021 VECC Board of Trustee Meeting Schedule as presented; the motion was seconded by Mr. Kane Loader; the motion carried unanimously.

FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Korban Lee reported that the Finance Committee has met three times now to finalize a recommendation to the Trustees today for a new formula to divide up the VECC assessments. Everyone received a memo from Scott Ruf earlier today spelling out the process of this formula. VECC's total costs far exceed the assessments charged to the member agencies. The first thing we do is apply the revenue from the 911 fees to the VECC total costs. The remaining costs not covered by these fees is the portion of VECC's budget that needs to be assessed to all the member agencies. This assessment formula only applies to the remaining budget. Also, after a lot of debate as to what input factors ought to be considered and what are the most important criteria to weigh these factors against, it was determined that the primary factor for dividing up the costs should be per console. The first denominator for the division of costs between the law enforcement and fire department side of the house would be the cost of consoles. Right now, VECC runs 18 consoles and only 4 of those are used for Fire. 4 of the 18, or 22% of the total costs would be assessed to the fire side of the house. The remaining 14 of the 18, or 88% would be assessed to the law enforcement side. Regarding fire, once we divide out how much of VECC's total costs should be assessed to the fire agencies, we use the calls for service as the denominator to divide up the costs for the 4 fire consoles. For fire, a call is a call; the agencies generally treat calls the same and protocols among fire departments don't vary much from agency to agency and all the agencies within VECC share the 4 consoles. For law enforcement, it was recommended that consoles be the second denominator. This is the toughest point that the Finance Committee had to work through; how should the costs be divided amongst the different law enforcement agencies. They batted around input factors such as calls for service, population, and number of sworn officers. In the end, it was suggested that the primary way the law enforcement costs be divided be based upon consoles. They felt that the costs for VECC ought to be divided up primarily based upon the consumption of services from VECC. It was then narrowed down to either calls for service or cost per console as those were the two input factors directly related to consumption of VECC services. The other input factor such as number of sworn personnel or population were more indirectly related. They lean towards recommending consoles be the method by which costs are divided because different agencies treat calls for service differently. Also, calls for service are measured differently between Versaterm and Spillman, which makes comparison more difficult. Because different agencies could change their protocols to manipulate how much they are doing calls for service, potentially in an unsafe manner, the Committee was worried about this. They didn't want the assessment model to incentivize any kind of unsafe protocols. Primarily, for those reasons, it's recommended that consoles be the denominator for dividing up the costs for law enforcement agencies. Not each agency will need an entire console; some agencies use more than one, some use one, and some agencies can combine and share. They also liked consoles because agencies can control their own destiny to a certain degree by determining how many consoles they want to purchase from VECC. It does incentivize agencies to figure out ways to cooperate to keep the overall dispatch costs for the Center down by sharing consoles if possible. One of the issues was what do they do with agencies that propose to share a channel. For example, Riverton, Herriman, Cottonwood Heights, South Jordan, and others may want to share consoles. That decision will be left up to the Operations Board, who met yesterday and recommended that when multiple agencies are sharing a channel, those costs for a shared console will be divided by the number of sworn officers budgeted for in each agency. They also recommended that the 4 service channels are assignable depending on an incident or what is happening in a particular part of the valley. These are used by all the agencies that use VECC for law enforcement. The Operations Board recommended that these channels be divided up based on the number of sworn officers as well. Korbin asked if there were any thoughts or questions on the proposed methodology. Chief Petersen felt that with this recommendation, they could move this into agenda item 6 and then allow for further dialog and consideration since neither the Ops Board nor Finance Committee has the authority to decide.

CONSIDERATION OF FINANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON MEMBER FEE

Chief Petersen wanted to walk through the different items discussed in the Finance report and give members a chance to share their thoughts with each phase. Korban asked and there were no concerns with applying all the VECC 911 charges to the Centers' budget, which has been traditionally done. He then asked if there were

concerns or questions with taking the total number of consoles and dividing the total remaining budget at VECC by that number of consoles to get a per console fully loaded cost. This cost per console would then be applied to the proportionate share of the Fire and Law Enforcement consoles. Wayne Pyle asked what flexibility it gives for scaling either up or down and whether the Finance and Ops Boards have looked at this and if they see it happening, or if they are happy with where we are at in terms of the number of consoles. Korban mentioned that the formula makes it easy to add consoles; the total number of consoles would go up; the budget would then be divided by that number and everyone comes out ahead. When an agency wants to add a channel, the administrative overhead would be divided by a larger number, dividing them out even further. Likewise, if a new agency were to be added to VECC, it would work the same way and the cost per console would go down. The budget is fixed, and we would be dividing by a larger number. The model is flexible and can go up or down. If agencies want to combine to get console costs to go down, the per console cost would go up, dividing by a smaller number, but overall, VECC's total costs over time would stay relatively flatter. Scott Ruf commented that these projections are based in meetings and conversations with both Police and Fire and considering a proposal by himself for shared service channels county-wide and regionalizing those channels. It is also based on operational decisions of the Police and Fire Chiefs. They are projecting this to remain static for FY2022, absence of a Chief changing their mind. These numbers aren't a guess, they are based on a communication plan moving forward. Tim Tingey asked a question regarding capacity and if there is an issue having 4 cities maybe using 1 console and shifting to a service line if it impacts capacity in a negative way on those service lines. Scott said he takes into consideration a few things such as call volume and activity of the patrol divisions and based on these, it's within the safe span of control within emergency communications just based on calls for service and typical activity and a transition of more to leveraging the technology versus using the radio in the dispatch center. Then we would weigh that call activity and volume, with other factors, to decide when it becomes unsafe not only for public safety but us being able to manage that resource for the agencies. One concern Scott has is when you add more jurisdictions on a channel, because of the activity in SL County as a whole, and the way the County is growing, it's not uncommon for us here at VECC to manage multiple high-priority incidents whether it be Police or Fire. The concern becomes when something happens in one of those jurisdictions that is combined, we must move or break that channel and pull a dispatch from somewhere. This becomes the bigger concern and would drive Scott as the Director to go to these agencies and discuss the concerns and determine if they have reached the threshold and must reconfigure the shared channels. He wants to look at public safety first and then money, which keeps us out of that pitfall. Scott mentioned that with Fire and Police, we have a primary dispatch channel, the channel that day to day operations is run on. On Fire, of their 4 channels, we have a VECC county-wide primary dispatch channel. Then, based geographically within the county, those fire incidents are moved to a fire operations channel and then are managed by dispatchers. On the Police side, depending on the size and configuration of the agency, there is a shared primary dispatch channel, or you have your own dedicated primary dispatch channel. Then there are 4 shared or regionalized service request channels. Those channels are the channels used to check license plates, run warrants, and other duties, which is a bit harder to quantify as it varies depending on activity as well as the policies within the law enforcement agencies. So, in the instance where we have a primary dispatch channel with 4 jurisdictions, Scott would look at the number of officers on the street as well as other data and that would be the justification to discuss it further with the agencies. Then we could argue what is far and what's needed. Chief Petersen said that Scott's responsibility is making sure that his dispatchers have the capacity to manage the ask of a police department on sharing channels and if it is safe for his dispatchers to manage it. If he feels that he can do that, great, but if a police department is asking him to do more than he feels he can do, he needs an avenue to share that he can't meet that request. If a department decides that they want their own channel, no matter the volume, that option is there for that agency. They can also say they aren't busy enough to share a frequency and believe they can manage it with 3 or 4 agencies. Gary Whatcott asked how they keep these decisions from becoming arbitrary and if there are thresholds that can be developed over time. He believes there should be guidelines used so that everyone is aware when certain thresholds are hit. Scott can speak to experience that the Chiefs will present the concern long before he will. He understands the concern with things being arbitrary, but his position is to present the facts and the concerns because the metrics to go by are so inconsistent, whether it be talk time or radio logs. Gary realizes that safety should be our primary mission here and that thresholds are safety-oriented but there is also a fiscal component to it that makes it challenging. If an agency is on a 3-way split on a console, there is a significant amount of money change yearly to go to a full console on its own. If there is some kind of idea or warning to plan for this, it would be very helpful. Scott will reach out to some of his counterparts and see if or how they measure this and see if there is a model we can use as a starting point. Kyle Kershaw asked on the service channels if

they are being treated as if they are fixed costs and everyone will get a portion of those channels allocated to them based on sworn personnel, or are they discretionary, if an agency wants to be part of the service channel costing. Scott responded that because of the 2 CAD systems, Spillman agencies were paying a service request and rover relief channel and UPD was paying a service request and rover relief channel and then the smaller agencies like Cottonwood Heights, when it moved over to Versaterm, there was a perception that they did not pay for a service/request channel and they weren't allowed to use it. So, they were just doing it on their primary channel. In looking at the needs of all the agencies and balancing the load of what the service/request channels are for, Scott's recommendation was to regionalize and county-wide and since they are shared, no matter who you are or where you are, you can go to any one of those channels and get help with what you need. Another thing that plays into this is how do we balance this load and share the channels and provide the service to everyone. Chief Peterson mentioned that it appears there is support for items 1 and 2 of Korban's list. Korban wanted to go back to item 3 on his list and he asked if there were questions or concerns with calls for service as the way to divide up the shared fire costs. Mark Reid asked on the initial split being 22% what that would have been based on total calls for service. Calls for service were more like a 90%/10% split Police and Fire. Korban explained there are different ways to look at that, but Fire and Police calls are not the same thing. On Fire, the agencies do not initiate calls where on Police, they can. It's all based on requests for the service to come through VECC. Mark's question was if the number of police consoles goes down, that drives the fire costs up and he wonders if the split is being presented fairly. Korban said that this proposed model drops the assessment charge to fire versus police ever so slightly from what it's historically been. By using the console charge directly, 22% goes to fire where historically, it's been around 25%. Chief Petersen said the exception to this would be if we broke it up by call volume, if call volume has increased or decreased, the agency might see the increase or decrease. Scott Harrington asked how much of the cost of a console is administration versus the actual cost to work the console. If someone wanted to come in and add a console, we should see a decrease in some of the other costs for the agencies as well, and he asked what that ratio might be. Chief Petersen said it has not been figured yet, but he has asked for this to be deciphered. Scott and Clint have been discussing this and trying to figure it out, but he does not have a number yet. But he agreed that the costs would go down, but he's unsure of the cost at this time. Another challenge we have is that we don't have traditional console costs, meaning, UCA provides the 911 phone and radio system, so we are not spending money on that equipment. It becomes the body and how do we apply the other fixed costs and then depreciation against other equipment. There were no other questions or concerns on the fire side of the formula and there was general support from the Trustees on items 1 – 3.

Korban then discussed law enforcement and that consoles would be the second denominator for costs, the gist of item 4. If multiple agencies can share a channel/console those shared costs would be pro-rated by the portion of sworn/budgeted officers. The service channel cost would also be divided up based on sworn/budgeted officers. Blair Camp asked if those administrative costs refer to all overhead such as building maintenance and other things, and if they are all included in the administrative costs. Korban said that because we are taking the budget, subtracting out the portion paid by 911 fees, it's the entire remaining budget which includes capital, building maintenance and all overhead. Chief Petersen commented that this also includes Scott Ruff's position, HR, and other positions, so there are some flexibilities, but he mentioned that many of them were fixed costs. Tim Tingey has a concern with sharing a console and used his agency as an example with minimal call volume and having it divided by sworn officers could pose big challenges as far as numbers for him. Chief Petersen has talked with various agencies about this and he commented that it only affects those agencies that are sharing a channel, and there needs to be a method that's easily repeatable to factor in and identify as a cost. While the police agencies talked about the number of officers, it would be easy for Scott to identify that number in the budget, but it's also easy to identify call volume for police, especially moving over to Versaterm. Right now, the 4 agencies on the south end are collectively wanting to use sworn officers and they are very comfortable with that. However, if some agencies decide they would rather use calls for service for their shared piece, it does not affect anyone but those agencies. We would prefer only one model, but both are easily recoverable, and both could be replicated easy. If the municipalities sharing the console have an agreement, do we have a problem with allowing them to use either sworn officers or calls for service as their model. Korban asked Chief Jacobs what her assessment was on this coming from the Operations Board, as they are the ones that made the recommendation. Chief Jacobs said there was a great deal of discussion on this and she does not believe that the agencies who share channels came to any kind of overwhelming consensus. Part of the issue what they did not have all the information needed for Cottonwood Heights to have their shared information with Midvale in front of them to see which option would be fair. As far as the console

method, especially those on their own channel, they were in full agreement for that. Chief Eining said that on the south end and with some of the conversations they had, they all agreed that they like the per-officer model better. They discussed how call volume can be manipulated which caused some grief among agencies. If two agencies are going to agree that that's the way, the only problem we have then is that there's not consistency throughout VECC when you split this up. He also mentioned that with regards to having protocols in place to identify when there are too many people on a channel, it also needs to be address what will happen when there is an agency like Draper who, without an invitation to join a channel, he would be put in a very tough position because he would be alone and would have to figure out what to do in paying for a channel by himself. An agency that gets put in this position, there should be some type of conversation on how we remedy this, as they cannot afford to take on the cost of an individual channel that they didn't choose to have happen to them. Cottonwood Heights also shares this concern. Gary Whatcott said based on previous experience, there was a lot of manipulation by various departments on calls for service and in many cases, it was honestly an officer safety issue, where administrative people made decisions based on costs. Wendy asked if any models have been run showing the difference for cities between call volume and per officer. The formula today is based on call volume and there will be information presented to show options in a bit. There was a lot of discussion with item 5 and 6, and minimal discussion with item 4. Korban asked if there were any other concerns about consoles being the primary denominator for costs. Tim Tingey is supportive if there is flexibility on the sharing component; it will be a very difficult challenge for him to take this back to the city council without flexibility, with a 66% increase. Korban asked Scott who determines who can share or not, and if it's left up to the agencies to partner up themselves. Scott mentioned we've been having these conversations already as it was a concern of his. He believes VECC can make recommendations, but he really believes it's an operational decision for the Chiefs to make. Chief Carr also commented that he believes that with the 4 agencies together, considering what they are doing with silent dispatch, they will be able to manage that effectively and even with the number of cars they have on together, collectively, on any shift, he believes they would probably be about equal with what West Valley has on regularly. Chief Jacobs said the bigger concern is depending upon how many critical incidents occur between the 4 agencies at the same time, that will push all the radio traffic to a service channel, which is paid for by everyone, and if that's happening daily or several times a day, that's where the imbalance will come from. Chief Carr understood but also commented that when they have a critical incident out there, they may all be responding to it in all 4 agencies. Chief Jacobs mentioned that the Operations Chiefs came to a consensus yesterday but there is still plenty of room for discussion. Scott was asked if geographic proximity matter with agencies sharing a channel. He believes it does 100% because it gives us resources or situational awareness to what is going on around you and from an officer safety standpoint, he would argue that if an agency is going to share a channel, it makes public safety sense to be continuous to the people you are sharing a channel with just by the way resources are managed. Gary Whatcott suggested that we allow flexibility in shared channels to keep things moving along and then more data can be shared to see how the shared consoles are working. As technology continues to evolve including silent dispatching and impacting the load at the console level, we will need to revisit these factors over time, but we need to get over the hurdle now. He suggested allowing those agencies sharing to sit down and work out an agreement with each other if it's within the parameters of either call volume or assigned officers. Chief Petersen believes there is high motivation to collaborate, work together, and make sure VECC is successful. Scott has been making a difference for us; we aren't done getting Versaterm on board, and there is more dialogue to be had with combining the different police agencies to meet the continuous dispatch option and balancing this across all the channels as much as possible. Korban added that it has not been the intent of the Finance Committee to implement this change necessarily all at one time unless that's the direction of the Trustees. They are open to discussions about implementing these changes as there are big winners and losers and implementing these changes slowly over the next few years to soften the blow. They aimed for a formula that primarily supported philosophically and methodologically before they look at the impacts on the numbers. With Chief Petersen's suggestion to allow agencies who are sharing a console to determine amongst themselves whether they split costs by sword officers or calls for service, Korban asked how many would be opposed to the formula at that point. Tim Tingey would not be opposed but he would like some time to have the conversations with those he is sharing consoles with and understand where that's at before making a final decision today. Kyle asked about flexibility with those agencies that share a channel and if that same philosophy would be carried over to the 4 service channel that everyone shares, that there will be flexibility, or will they be locked in with the sworn officer allocation. Korban recommended that because the service channels are shared among all law enforcement agencies that that formula apply to all the agencies, whether it be pro-rated based on number of officers or even divided. Korban's suggestion would be that the cost of the service channels is divided needs

to be the same for every agency. Right now, the proposal is to be done by number of officers. Calls for service may be definable in the primary dispatch where the usage of the shared resources directly correlates to call activity and agencies being pro-active. Chief Petersen believes there is no reason to push this immediately to any kind of decision, to Tim's point. Korban asked Clint about delaying this decision until February if it would affect him and to the agencies how it would affect their budget processes. Clint said he is moving forward in preparation of the budget, coming up with expenses and issues. This model will just determine the assessment and what dollars VECC needs from each agency and is part of that, but if a decision were made in February, he could have a draft budget to everyone by March and possibly even sooner.

Clint displayed the spreadsheet walked the Boards through the different models. He began with the sworn officer model grouping the entities that share a channel together. Those consoles per agency are pro-rata, based upon the number of officers. On the 4 service channels he displayed the impact of those on each of the entities divided up based on sworn officers. Clint also displayed the Fire models and explained that call volume changed agencies rates more than anything. There are 4 fire consoles multiplied by \$475,000 gives an assessment of about \$1.9 million which is divided based on the share of the calls. Korban asked if there were additional comments or questions on the spreadsheet. Tim Tingey mentioned that the Board knew his concerns. Korban mentioned that Draper and South Jordan had reductions because they were partnering and sharing a channel by 4 agencies. He asked Tim if his concern was with the methodology or the impact of that on the community. Tim commented that the 56% increase was very difficult to take back to his city, after an increase last year. If there is flexibility in allowing for calls for service to be negotiated between those that share a console, that might be easier. Scott Ruf said that the way this model is presented on the spreadsheet, from the VECC perspective, could not support another marriage outside of what has been presented. If the Taylorsville change didn't happen July 1, 2021, his recommendation was to break the Taylorsville/Midvale precinct anyway because they were so busy, and it was presenting a safety issue. There is a good balance presented based on workload and activity on the channels and any addition or marriages may cross the threshold of what is safe. Clint also displayed the Midvale/Cottonwood Heights model using call volume numbers which is softer than using the sworn officer model. Kyle Kershaw requested additional time to speak with his City before he could vote on something. Wayne Pyle echoed this request and gave his thanks to Korban and the Operations Board members for their time and effort.

Chief Petersen said that the next charge of the Finance Committee would be to review the initial budget and go over the total need of member fee. Then when we come into February's meeting with that member fee applied to the options we are in today, we will have a proposed number. A positive note, with 3 channels reduced, it should significantly reduce the basic FTE model need; the collaboration alone might be getting everyone where we want to be. Scott also mentioned that he and Clint were reviewing this based on historical data for FTE's between VECC and UPD. This model from an operations perspective has already shaved 6 FTE's from the operations side, but it still allows us flexibility for dispatching, increases our capacity on call taking and further meets the performance expectations that have been laid out and committed to. Scott feels VECC is in a good place as we move into the budget process. Chief Petersen had consensus that the Finance Committee will review the proposed budget before the next meeting, we will come into the next meeting with a proposed total budget, and an option to plug it in to a variety of formulas with the intention to vote on a formula in the February meeting. Korban also wanted the Finance Committee to bring back the options for a 1 year, 2 year and 3-year phase-in.

BOARD OF OPERATIONS BOARD BRIEFING

Chief Carr reported that the Police Operations meeting mostly discussed the member fee formulas as asked by the Finance Committee. They also talked about the mental health state, which Scott will address in his report.

Chief Maxfield reported that the Fire Operations meeting discussed AVRR/AVL issues and most of those are being worked on. The big thing discussed was related to this and to the APCO EMD switch-over. They have discussed AVRR and the fact that some of the calls probably do not necessitate as rapid of a response; they've talked about using a hybrid model where they will use AVRR/AVL for priority 1-type calls and then classifying the other calls as priority 2. It was brought up that SLC911 has already created somewhat of a framework for this; they use 3 priorities. Fire Operations felt that the same model SLC911 is using would work with some variations on the criteria used for classifying them. Scott is working with Lisa on this and Operations is looking to have a way to classify those calls and run more efficiently both with AVL and a stacked agency response.

REVIEW MONTHLY PERFORMANCE & PROGRESS REPORT

Scott Ruf displayed the monthly progress report, and VECC is continuing to make small but good progress, and in some cases, significant from where we were in July with meeting the standards set forth back in October, but more so the NENA standards of 90% within 15 seconds and 95% within 20 seconds or less. For December, we were just over 80%, almost a 15% improvement from July and just over 14% improvement in the 20 seconds or less column. Progress is being made. We are a little slower in the call processing times, but we are still making improvements. There were a few hiccups in the Versaterm system for reporting which we are ironing out, which deal with the outliers that are skewing the call processing times. Scott believes if January remains on track with the personnel, new hires, and scheduled changes, we will be close to meeting the standards. Then the mission is to sustain and continue to move forward performing at those levels ongoing. The transfer rate remains above the 2% threshold, but this directly relates to the not deployed yet CAD-To-CAD aggregator with DPS or UHP, and there is still a chunk of transfers that go between SLC and VECC. Once the CAD project is done and the CAD-To-CAD aggregator is completed, we will be significantly below, not even 05% on the transfer rate. We are in a good place staffing and scheduling-wise, we just need to maintain it and continue to move it forward. Chief Petersen commented that Sen. Harper came out and met with Scott and himself, and we discussed the times and rates; he was a little upset that we didn't adopt the statute standards of 90% in 15 seconds, but he seemed to understand that this was a progress. We do not expect him to run any bills this year that attacks VECC revenue through the 911 funds. Scott did a really good job speaking with him.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Scott Ruf commented that we have covered everything already; the CAD project is continuing to move forward. South Jordan came on board in December, Murray Police is in progress right now, slated to go live early March, and we are beginning the ongoing conversations with West Jordan and West Valley, who are on board. We are hoping by the end of this calendar year to have a full transition and cut over to the CAD system. Scott covered staffing and performance, and we are still on track with the APCO transition; we are hoping to go live in February with this. Our cross-training and reciprocity training is going on now. SLC is on board, and we have worked well together to develop standards in protocol that will be uniform across the county to include SLC and Sandy. Dr. Youngquist is now the Medical Director for both VECC and SLC911 so that we have some consistency in standards there moving forward. On the police side, we are introducing a policy to deal with the mental health crisis calls, and we are looking to leverage the MCOT crisis line through the Department of Health Services and doing hand-off's so that non-violent, non-emergent type calls can be taken care of by crisis workers who can put them in touch with resources. Anything involving weapons or violence will still be dispatched to the scene. This policy has been presented to the Police Chiefs and to Scott Young for a quick review, but it is a pretty standard operating procedure around the country as mental health becomes a larger focus. It also goes in line with the 9-8-8 nationwide number and there is legislation in Utah of creating this number. There are still a lot of questions on it to include who will staff it and where the financing will come from as well as what the possible impacts could be to 911 moving forward. The go-live date federally and nationally is July of 2022, so we are following these bills closely.

There has been ongoing discussion with the Chiefs about the new radio system and impacts and changes as that project gets rolled out. We have made a log of changes in our legacy phone equipment which Scott believes they are now configured properly after months of arguing with the vendor. He also couched his commitment to the Board with the new NG911 phone system, which we were supposed to have last summer, and then the fall, and then we were supposed to go live in early December. Then it was supposed to be April/May and we had a call last Thursday that it has now been pushed to possibly July. The agencies along the Wasatch Front pushed back on July of their fear of doing a major lift in the middle of July with the holidays and the height of fire season. If this is the case, we are talking Fall of 2021 which is a year after the proposed go-live and commitment on that.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR ADMIN/FINANCE REPORT

Clint Jensen displayed the budget report. On the franchise taxing 911 numbers, Kyle asked last month where we were as compared to last year as far as collections on these fees. For the same time period a year ago, we are running ahead about \$127k more than we were in 2020's budget. On personnel expenses, it is running slightly ahead of where we are at, 52%, however, we've had 14 of our 26 pay periods that fell in the first half of the year; we had 2 months where we had 3 payrolls. That is distorting this number a little bit, and overtime is running

a little bit ahead, but we expect this with this part of the year having more of the holidays in it. This is not an alarm to him; he is just pointing these things out. Overall, the budget is feeling like it is in pretty good shape. Clint has done some projections to get us to the end of the year and he believes we will sit right where we budgeted. Korban asked about software maintenance being high and asked if it was because of bills paid at the first half of the year that will cover the entire year. Clint explained that we see a lot of these come in the first two or three months of our fiscal year which cover us for the rest of the year. On the cash report bottom line cash available as of December 21st, unrestricted, we have about \$1.7 million, and we have also sent out the assessments for the second half of our fiscal year. Some of these have come in and the remaining will come in soon. We also continue to see the 911 funds come in every month. The check registers were included as well, and Clint is happy to answer any questions on these.

Chief Petersen wanted to thank Korban Lee for his leadership on the Finance Committee in moving through and for all the work done today.

There was nothing more to discuss at this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:51 p.m.