

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
February 16, 2022 Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Korban Lee – West Jordan, Chairman
Mr. David Brickey – Riverton, Vice-Chairman
Mr. David Dobbins – Draper
Mr. Doug Hill - Murray
Mr. Gary Whatcott – South Jordan
Mr. Josh Collins – South Salt Lake
Mr. Nathan Cherpeski - Herriman
Mr. Mark Reid – Bluffdale
Ms. Lisa Hartman - SLCo
Mr. Tim Tingey – Cottonwood Heights
Mr. Scott Harrington – Taylorsville
Mr. Dan Petersen - UFA
Mr. Jake Petersen – UPD
Mr. John Evans West Valley City

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ms. Gina Chamness - Holladay
Mr. Mike Morey – Alta
Open – Midvale

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Scott Ruf – Director, VECC
Mr. Clint Jensen – VECC Deputy Director
Mr. Scott Young, VECC Legal Counsel
Mr. Troy Carr – Herriman
Mr. Derek Maxfield – West Jordan
Mr. Chris Dawson – South Jordan
Mr. Terry Addison – South Salt Lake
Mr. Don Hutson – Riverton
Mr. Riley Pilgrim – UFA
Ms. Beth Todd – VECC
Ms. Andrea Partridge – VECC
Mr. Jonathan Bridges – VECC
Mr. Chief Craig Burnett – Murray
Ms. Colleen Jacobs – West Valley City
Mr. Clint Smith – Draper
Mr. Andrew Smiley – VECC
Ms. Nicole Lopez – VECC
Mr. Ryan Shosted – Riverton
Mr. Nick Brown – Public
Mr. Robbie Russo – Cottonwood Heights
Ms. Lisa Dudley - UPD

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. Korban Lee called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

Korban Lee (00:01:39): Scott, thanks for putting together the agenda. Let's start with agenda item 2.0, the approval of the minutes from January 19th. Anyone want to make a motion to approve those minutes?

Gary Whatcott (00:01:53): Sure, I'll make a motion we approve the minutes.

Korban Lee (00:01:58): Okay. Is there a second?

Tim Tingey (00:02:03): I'll second it. Tim from Cottonwood Heights.

Korban Lee (00:02:06): Okay. Motion from Gary and the second from Tim. Sorry, motion from Mr. Whatcott at South Jordan, second from Mr. Tingey at Cottonwood Heights. All in favor, say aye.

All (00:02:21): Aye.

Korban Lee (00:02:23): Okay. Any opposed? Okay.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 19, 2022 BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEETING MINUTES

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Gary Whatcott, to approve the minutes of the January 19, 2022 Trustees meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. Tim Tingey; the motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Korban Lee (00:02:29):_Let's move on to agenda item number three, opening up for public comments.

Scott Ruf (00:02:35): We did not receive any requests electronically.

Korban Lee (00:02:39): Okay. Is there anyone on the call today, anyone joining us by Zoom, that would like to make the public comment at this time?

Nick Brown (00:02:53): Sorry, I was trying to go off mute. I'm Nick Brown from Carbyne 9-1-1, and I just want to thank you for allowing me to sit in.

Korban Lee (00:03:00): You're welcome. Nick, do you have any additional comments you want to share?

Nick Brown (00:03:05): No sir, just trying to get my bearings with everything 9-1-1 in Utah. I'm a Regional Sales Manager for Carbyne 9-1-1 next gen cloud solution, and just trying to understand the states I'm responsible for, so thank you for the opportunity.

Korban Lee (00:03:19): Okay. All right. Welcome.

CONSIDERATION OF NEW VICE CHAIRPERSON

Korban Lee (00:03:21): Okay, any other public comments? Okay, we'll close the public comment portion of the meeting. We'll move on to agenda item number four. Consideration of a new Vice Chair for VECC. I would like to have a Vice Chair. I'm hanging at the moment, and we're not letting Chief Petersen off the hook quite yet, but we don't have his support and help for much longer. We'd need a Vice Chair.

Korban Lee (00:04:01): At our previous Trustees' meeting, we had a nomination of David Brickey. We did not receive any other nominations in the intervening time. Are there any Trustees who would like to make a nomination for Vice Chair at this time? David, are you still willing to be nominated?

David Brickey (00:04:24): Only as long as you do it for the next two years and I can learn from you, because I've been watching the Chief, and I got the experience of seeing Gary Whatcott do it, so I'm getting there. I'm beginning to appreciate it. It's not an easy task.

Korban Lee (00:04:41): All right. Last call for any other additional nominations. Okay. Looking for a motion, someone to nominate, or make a motion to accept, David Brickey as the Vice Chair for the Board of Trustees.

Mark Reid (00:05:00): Mr. Chairman. I move that we nominate David Brickey as our Vice Chair.

Korban Lee (00:05:09): Is there a second?

Tim Tingey (00:05:12): I'll second that. Tim at Cottonwood Heights.

Korban Lee (00:05:14): Okay. We have a nomination of David Brickey to be the Vice Chair. That motion was made by Mark Reid of Bluffdale, seconded by Tim Tingey of Cottonwood Heights. I think we probably better do a roll call vote on this one. Scott, will you walk us through the roll call?

Scott Ruf (00:05:34): Mr. Lee, West Jordan?

Korban Lee (00:05:36): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:05:37): Mr. Brickey, Riverton?

David Brickey (00:05:40): Yes?

Scott Ruf (00:05:42): Mr. Dobbins, Draper?

David Dobbins (00:05:44): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:05:45): Mr. Hill, Murray?

Doug Hill (00:05:46): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:05:47): Mr. Whatcott, South Jordan?

Gary Whatcott (00:05:49): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:05:49): Mr. Collins, South Salt Lake?

Josh Collins (00:05:52): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:05:52): Mr. Cherpeski, Herriman? He's not here.

Scott Ruf (00:05:58): Mr. Reid, Bluffdale?

Mark Reid (00:05:59): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:06:01): Deputy Mayor Hartman?

Lisa Hartman (00:06:03): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:06:03): Mr. Tingey, Cottonwood Heights?

Tim Tingey (00:06:05): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:06:10](#)): Chief Petersen, UFA?

Dan Petersen ([00:06:13](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:06:14](#)): Undersheriff Petersen?

Jake Petersen ([00:06:16](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:06:17](#)): Chief Evans for West Valley?

John Evans ([00:06:19](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:06:22](#)): Unanimous by those present, Mr. Chair.

Korban Lee ([00:06:26](#)): All right, great. Thank you.

Korban Lee ([00:06:29](#)): David, thank you. Congratulations, and condolences, and happy to be spending some time with you. Thank you.

MOTION –

By Mr. Mark Reid, to accept Mr. David Brickey as the Vice Chair for the Board of Trustees; the motion was seconded by Mr. Tim Tingey; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

VECC PERFORMANCE & PROGRESS REPORT

Korban Lee ([00:06:38](#)): All right, let's go to agenda item number five, the VECC Performance and Progress Report. Scott, let's just turn the time over to you.

Scott Ruf ([00:06:49](#)): Thank you Mr. Chair.

Scott Ruf ([00:06:49](#)): As you can see in the report, from January to December, we made an improvement back above the NENA standards for 15 seconds. We had about a half percent drop-off in the 20 second standard for January, but we've been consistent since the new phone system back in August. We're still working towards that 95%, but we're averaging 20 plus percent call-out on every shift over the last month and a half or so due to Covid, and we're in the middle of a baby boom here at VECC, so we're at a good staffing level. It's a matter of covering shifts and getting people in, but we're staying consistent, and I'm happy that we're at least maintaining the 90% or higher on the answer times, even though the 20 second, we're still not at the 95% yet.

Scott Ruf ([00:07:46](#)): I did serve a letter to Salt Lake City 9-1-1 this morning, and I haven't heard back from their new director yet, about now that all the agencies are on the Versaterm CAD, we need to eliminate or stop the 9-1-1 transfers between the centers, and answer and triage and enter the calls for dispatch directly into the CAD system to be dispatched by the proper jurisdiction. I have not heard back from him yet, but that letter has been served. I requested a March 1st go live, with the elimination of all transfers between Salt Lake City 9-1-1, excuse me, and VECC. Any questions on any of the progress report?

Dan Petersen ([00:08:36](#)): Scott, what does that do for numbers? How much is Salt Lake City count in your transfers?

Scott Ruf ([00:08:43](#)): They're about 25%. We do about anywhere from fifteen to eighteen hundred a month. About 500, give or take, are Salt Lake City, and the big one is still DPS, which averages a thousand to 1200 a month.

Scott Ruf (00:09:06): When you pull those numbers out for DPS in Salt Lake City, we're really only transferring... not even 200 calls, and most of those are around the state. We are, just as a side note, with the new phone system... VECC receives what they call halo calls. There's this unique situation on state borders, so Utah, Idaho, Nevada, Arizona, Wyoming, that when the system doesn't know what to do with a call, it kind of gets lost. So everything comes to VECC as the largest PSAP in the state, and then we have to move it out to appropriate PSAP.

Scott Ruf (00:09:49): The nice thing about that is the numbers are minimal. Not even a dozen a month, if that, it depends. But those are the transfers we should start seeing once we get DPS out of that queue as well. So that was a long answer to the Chief's question, of about 30% to the city.

Korban Lee (00:10:11): Scott, did you ever get any feedback other than the time you met with the legislators? I know you been sending the reports on to them about these performance measures and the improvements that have been made to the performance measures since the new phone system. Do you ever get any feedback on that, further?

Scott Ruf (00:10:31): Nope. Other than the most recent time at the legislature, where the Speaker and the Senate President were pleased with the improvement, I've never received feedback to the progress report. I do get information occasionally from Dave Spatafore with Capstone Strategies, but I've never heard directly from any of the elected officials. Which, I'm assuming if I don't hear from them, we're doing okay.

Korban Lee (00:10:56): Yeah. Yeah, probably is the safe assumption, I would guess. Okay.

Korban Lee (00:11:05): All right. Any other questions for Scott?

OPERATIONS BOARD

Korban Lee (00:11:12): Let's go on to agenda item six, the reports from the operation boards. Chief Burnett, let's start with you, and a report on the Police Operations Board.

Craig Burnett (00:11:24): Due to some scheduling issues, we did not meet this month, so there's nothing to report from the Police Operations Board this month.

Korban Lee (00:11:36): Okay. Thank you Chief. Chief Addison, let's go to you.

Terry Addison (00:11:41): Thank you Mr. Lee.

Terry Addison (00:11:41): The Fire Operations Board did meet, and Director Ruf will discuss the CAD update concerning Salt Lake RMS, VECC and the cloud and so forth. But in the users, we discussed some policies that the... or excuse me, the Operations Board, that the users were reviewing, and some of the Chiefs didn't have enough time to review those due to the legislative session, so we tabled those three policies to review.

Terry Addison (00:12:14): One policy we did discuss, though, was active shooter response protocol. The users' group is working out a first alarm assignment, and so the Operations Board, we came to a consensus that there is going to be a valley-wide drill in April. We're going to use that drill to evaluate the alarm dispatch that we have set up to see if that's sufficient, or if we have to add to it or take away from it. We did receive a report from the technical users' group, which is some of the information that Scott will also discuss.

Terry Addison (00:12:52): Other than that, that's pretty much the information that we discussed in the operations board, and as a group of Chiefs, we're just working on making sure the CAD and everything that we

want to work the way we need it to to provide the service we need to do, and we're just having those discussions. Any questions? Thank you, gentlemen.

Korban Lee ([00:13:17](#)): Chief, is that valley-wide drill in April, is that just on the fire side, or is that police and fire drill?

Terry Addison ([00:13:25](#)): It's police and fire, it's the complex coordinated terrorist attack, the CCTA, that was suspended pre-Covid, and so that's just being resurrected. I believe it's going to be happening, and Chief Petersen might be able to confirm some of this, at the south end of the valley as one of the main venues, I believe, in either South Jordan or West Jordan, and we're going to work on a reunification piece. Last meeting that I heard, we were still trying to determine where that venue would be.

Korban Lee ([00:14:01](#)): Okay. Thank you Chief.

Terry Addison ([00:14:04](#)): You're welcome.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Korban Lee ([00:14:05](#)): All right. Any other questions for fire? Let's go to the Director's report. Scott, let's turn it over to you for agenda items seven one and seven two.

Scott Ruf ([00:14:19](#)): I'll make this kind of quick. As you noticed, the placeholder for the CAD project has dropped off the agenda as a standing item, but in reference to Chief Addison's point, we are moving forward with the migration to the cloud. In fact, tomorrow afternoon, we have the technical kick-off for that portion of the project that's been pre-approved by this board and Salt Lake City.

Scott Ruf ([00:14:44](#)): We had a meet and greet and semi kick-off meeting with the University of Utah back in January. That went well. We're trying to time their kick-off with their move to their new public safety building, which is slated to be sometime in May, in June, and then that project will kick off later this year. But all the agencies are on board, and we're moving forward on the technology pieces, the redundancy, the management of the network, and the upkeep and all that kind of stuff.

Scott Ruf ([00:15:22](#)): The non-emergency administrative phones, I just wanted to leave on there, didn't want it to drop off. I've been doing a lot of research and putting stuff together. I'm not prepared to present it here because I wanted to review it with the Chiefs first, based on some of the discussions we had at last month's meeting on how to manage the non-emergency calls and customer service levels, of quality-of-service levels, that the agencies and our member agencies are expecting. We did have a meeting with Salt Lake County and Department Mayor Hartman and her staff about her concerns around the non-emergency lines and animal control.

Scott Ruf ([00:16:04](#)): I have a follow up meeting with, I believe, their director on this Friday morning to go meet her out at their facility. I've never been out there, so we're still in discussions with them and understanding each other's needs and impacts on each other's operations. But I should have something for the Chiefs and some options, at least for review, moving forward.

Scott Ruf ([00:16:30](#)): Any questions on any of that, or I'll just keep going to 7.2 if you want?

Korban Lee ([00:16:35](#)): Let's pause for a second. Any questions about CAD, the U of U's CAD or the cloud or the non-emergency administrative phones issue? Or the meeting with Salt Lake County Animal Services?

Lisa Hartman ([00:16:50](#)): I would just add, I thought it was a great meeting, and the next step in just talking through how to address our animal control calls, along with everyone else's, and how we create an equitable

system. I thought we had a great conversation, and I really appreciated your time, the Chief's time, Scott, your time as well. I know you've put a lot of thought into it, and I thought it was a great conversation from our perspective as well.

Scott Ruf ([00:17:22](#)): Thank you, we very much appreciated it.

Korban Lee ([00:17:29](#)): Okay Scott, why don't you go ahead and go to the next item?

Scott Ruf ([00:17:34](#)): I'll add this as a standing item, at least for the rest of this year, the capital project.

Scott Ruf ([00:17:40](#)): At the beginning of the month, we met, we closed on the funding, everything went really well, closed out the original debt, refunded that debt, moved all the bond proceeds to the appropriate accounts. Last week, myself, a representative from the architectural firm, and a couple of my employees here did a visit out to California to the factory and the facility that builds the console furniture to review the design and functionality and make any tweaks and changes to the overall design. That was a really good trip for them, and for the vendor. We had a meeting this morning with Scott Young and the architects, which is JCRA, they're the ones that actually designed and built this facility back in the late nineties, so they have a first-hand knowledge of the systems and how the building was built and designed.

Scott Ruf ([00:18:35](#)): Just to cover some issues about moving the project forward, utilizing state contracts, procurement processes are followed where needed and things like that, we issued purchase orders for the technology side of it due to the lead times. But we've pretty much kicked the project off. We've already started some in-house demo, if you will, to prepare for that, and we're beginning to build the temporary call center and fire rescue dispatch area, so we can move on to the renovation of the bigger dispatch center.

Scott Ruf ([00:19:08](#)): This'll be a standing item, at least for the rest of the year, at each meeting. If you have any comments or questions during the process, or an update between meetings, let me know, but we'll be prepared to provide those updates monthly for you. But we're excited about dispatch, we're excited about it. I think this has been a long time coming, it's been talked about for years, and we're finally going to get it done.

Korban Lee ([00:19:42](#)): Any questions for Scott about the capital project?

Scott Ruf ([00:19:49](#)): Oh, I do, Mr. Lee. Just for clarification, based on what the board approved with the options and the funding, that anything that falls outside of that scope or is as discovery will be brought back at minimum to the Chair and Vice Chair, or to the full Board, for discussion and review before any decision is made if there's any impact to this, change in scope or cost of the project. We don't anticipate issues as far as budget issues, but if anything that creeps due to the age of the building, where we have to shift in the original scope and move things around, we will make sure to bring that back for, at minimal, discussion, if not approval to go ahead and make that adjustment within the scope of the project.

Korban Lee ([00:20:37](#)): Scott, I have one request. Since the start of the pandemic, we've generally been meeting as Trustees over Zoom. For some of us, it's been a year or two since actually coming out to the facility. If it's possible, I'd like you to invite the Trustees out to the facility a couple of times during the capital project process, so that we can walk around and see the construction, see the progress you're making, or see how you have things operating temporarily during the remodel of the dispatch floor.

Scott Ruf ([00:21:18](#)): Yeah of course. And of course, you're welcome, anyone's welcome any time. But we can make it a point as we start to do phases and stand pieces of it up so you can... It's going to be a good test for us, even though we'll be in the same facility if we ever had to evacuate, because our call takers will be separated from the dispatchers and things like that, so it really ends up being a nice little drill in a controlled

environment, if you will. What it would be like if we have to send call takers to another center or Salt Lake City but have the dispatchers here, or things like that. Just as a result of the project, it kind of forces us to do some systems and logistics testing, without losing too much control over the situation.

Scott Ruf ([00:22:04](#)): But we'll sure to do that, and keep everyone posted on the different phases when things are up and being accomplished. But like I said, anyone's welcome any time to do a sit-along, stop by and visit, 24/7. Just shoot an email, let the commander know, and...

Korban Lee ([00:22:22](#)): Thank you Scott. Any questions about the capital project?

Korban Lee ([00:22:33](#)): Okay. All right. It's going pretty quick. Thank you, Scott. You're done for now.

Scott Ruf ([00:22:39](#)): You just jinxed it.

FINANCE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Korban Lee ([00:22:41](#)): Let's go to Clint, with the Finance Director's Report.

Clint Jensen ([00:22:45](#)): Okay, thank you. The finance report really, we can do this quickly. There's not a lot of discussion. The report's moving along as we might expect it for this time of year. We're 58% of the year in, we've spent 58% of the budget, so riding along just as we would expect this time of year. Scott, if you go to the next page, which is the cashflow report.

Clint Jensen ([00:23:13](#)): This shows the balances. Starting next report, you'll see the proceeds from the bond. Just to maybe give you a little more detail on that, just to report back, was a five-million-dollar bond, which was the total proceeds that we received. Out of that proceed, just a little over a million paid off the 2018 bond. And then there was \$55,000 worth of closing costs for Stiefel and the attorney. After that, the rest of it is available, so about 3.88 million is available to be used for the project. Like Scott said, we'll be reporting each month on that, and you'll see the fund balance show up on this in our next report.

Clint Jensen ([00:24:02](#)): The last two pages of that report's the check register. Nothing out of the ordinary on those, and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Korban Lee ([00:24:20](#)): Any questions for Clint? All right, let's go to the next agenda item, Clint, and walk us through your budget memo. This isn't the proposed budget itself, but this is the framework for building the actual budget, which will be given to the Trustees, likely at the next meeting. Walk us through where you're at.

Clint Jensen ([00:24:43](#)): Very good.

Clint Jensen ([00:24:45](#)): At our last Board meeting, we agreed to meet as the Finance Committee. We reviewed a document that was similar to this at our Finance Committee meeting and walked through some of the assumptions and the details of the proposed increases to certain line items. As Korban had mentioned, in the March board meeting, we will bring back the complete budget, so it'll be the whole detailed budget. But we just wanted to get before the board, have a high-level discussion of some of these things, and then we can kind of go from there, see if there's any discussion early on that we might need to adjust.

Clint Jensen ([00:25:26](#)): This first chart just gives us a little walk down memory lane over the last couple of years. What's interesting to me on this chart is, if you look at fiscal '21, the overall increase to the budget revenues was only 3%, even though the Board had approved a 12% increase to the assessments. Now there was an offset, I think, for UPD, but you can see how that 12% translates into three percent increase to the

overall budget. In our current fiscal year, '22, kind of that same thing happened. We had 15% and an 11 and a half percent increase for law and for fire respectively. And yet, total revenues only increased two and a half.

Clint Jensen (00:26:15): What we're proposing in the 2023 budget, I think demonstrates some stability in the budget overall. Member assessments at the moment are budgeted to increase about 8.8, with a 5.8% increase to overall revenues. I think that's certainly a good thing, to see that stability starting to kick in with this fiscal '23 budget. Scott, if you roll down maybe just a little bit to the next page, there's some bullet points there.

Clint Jensen (00:26:46): As we talk about revenues, the two major sources of revenue come from tax collections. We're budgeting a small increase to those collections of a hundred and fifty thousand dollars. This is consistent with what we're seeing year to date coming in on those taxes, so we included a little bit there. And then the member assessments. We talked about that a little bit, but 8.8% on average. As we apply that to the revenue model, you'll see that on the last page when we get to that. You can see the big swings in those assessments, depending on call volume, and uniformed officers for the police.

Clint Jensen (00:27:29): The other revenue line items, interests and miscellaneous revenue, some smaller impacts there. This pass-through revenue is truly just pass-through, right? So it's for RMS, it's for the University of Utah CAD project, it's for Salt Lake's share of the CAD upgrade to the cloud, and those type of things. Even though that's increasing significantly, that's offset by an expense in our software maintenance budget. Scott, maybe scroll down into the expense line items.

Scott Ruf (00:28:04): Just make out that last point, too, for the police agencies, we have not included the RMS support and maintenance in the assessment. That's a separate line item. Just so they realize that.

Clint Jensen (00:28:18): Yeah, that is a separate line item that is part of this pass-through revenue, but it is not going to be included in your assessment number. That'll be an additional number.

Clint Jensen (00:28:29): On the expenses, probably the two big ticket items here are personnel costs. Overall expenses are going up about 6%. If we take out all of those pass-through costs, personnel costs, that's 80% of our budget. Salaries and wages are budgeted to increase 5.1%, that's about \$485,000, and that's made up of two or three things. First of all, step increases for our operations staff. As those staff continue to have experience and they receive the training, they can advance through the step system. Each step is about a three percent increase in pay, so those that qualify would move forward in their step. The second part of that is a COLA for all staff. That is budgeted to be about \$420,000. Now that's assuming a five percent COLA.

Clint Jensen (00:29:33): Some of the offsets to this budget include reducing the number of part time positions. I think it wasn't too long ago we had 40- or 50-part timers. We really don't utilize them as much anymore, so we're reducing that down to 16. Then with the additional savings from the restructuring as a result of some of our retirees taking the incentive that was offered, we see that we'll be reducing the staff count by four FTEs, which results in some salary savings of nearly \$300,000 for that.

Clint Jensen (00:30:15): In payroll benefits, you're seeing an increase there. A lot of the benefits are tied to compensation, so as compensation increases, so do contributions to URS and ICMA, Medicare, those type of things. That's about a hundred- and forty-thousand-dollar increase. We saw for calendar year '22 a nine percent increase in our health insurance, four percent in dental. We're anticipating that we're going to see additional increases in that, so that's a hundred and fifty thousand dollars of additional premium. And then some smaller adjustments for other things that total about \$10,000.

Clint Jensen (00:30:55): Under the admin and operations, probably the big ticket item here is going to be the Versaterm cloud implementation. That's going to represent the bulk of that number. There are two other

software items that we're looking to include, and that's the Motorola Vesta analytics for about 36,000, and some Hiplink software for 67,500.

Clint Jensen (00:31:25): Facilities maintenance. As we've talked a lot about this building, we see if the wind blows, it blows over wrought iron fence, which is kind of odd to me, but come over here on a window day and you'll see panels that fall down. We've had some issues with the roof. The HVAC continues to give us problems. And none of that was considered as part of this refinancing and new money that we got. We bumped that line item up a little bit to help offset some of these expenses. Also, our janitorial expenses are increasing by about \$10,000.

Clint Jensen (00:32:02): The last piece of that increase is, we do not have a very efficient landscape. We know there's grant money out there, and the legislature's certainly making this a priority. We might be able to leverage our own money to turn that \$15,000 maybe into \$30,000 and do this multi-year project to re-landscape the center property. The training budget is going up nearly \$20,000. Most of that increase is reflected in the ongoing on-site training that's being provided to management staff, and now we're moving that to our supervisory staff. See anything else on there Scott? Maybe just scroll down to the bottom.

Clint Jensen (00:32:51): There's a kind of summary on the debt. As we had talked about, as we were going into this debt, we saw that the increase in debt service would be about \$40,000, and that's right where we landed. After all is said and done, after revenue, expense, and debt service, we budgeted a \$50,000 net revenue, which is hopefully something we can add to fund balance. You can see what it was for fiscal '22 at 75,000. Part of this is to make sure we have adequate net revenue to meet our bond obligations. That was something that the bonding people, meeting with capital One, they really focused in on that number.

Clint Jensen (00:33:37): With that, the last two or three pages. Little more detail on revenues, expenses, and then that final page, Scott, is the model based on calls for service, uniformed officers. The yellow highlights are those numbers that we use for this year, this fiscal '23 budget. You can see what the numbers were for fiscal '22, and so you can see some of those big swings in call volume, or maybe a couple more uniformed officers added and so on.

Clint Jensen (00:34:13): With that, Korban, maybe back to you, or if there's questions, I'd certainly be willing to address them at this time.

Korban Lee (00:34:21): Yeah, I think let's open it up for questions of Clint. I've got a couple, but Clint, let's take questions from Trustees first. Anyone want to ask Clint anything about that budget memo?

Doug Hill (00:34:35): Yeah, Clint, this is Doug. I've got a couple of questions. You had indicated that the RMS costs are not in the assessments. Where can we see what that cost is to us?

Scott Ruf (00:34:52): We have the estimates based on the contract language [inaudible 00:34:58]. We've prepared those for the police agencies, and we wanted to do this presentation first, but we can share those as soon as the meeting is over, [inaudible 00:35:11] you and/or the Chiefs. But that's prepared to be disseminated. Do you want to see them now? Is that what you're asking?

Doug Hill (00:35:19): Well, is it shown in the budget anywhere, or is it just shown us a lump item of revenue?

Clint Jensen (00:35:27): It's just a lump item, it's not in detailed form on this document.

Doug Hill (00:35:32): But we can make an assumption that besides the assessment, we need to budget on our end for the RMS as well?

Clint Jensen ([00:35:43](#)): That is correct.

Doug Hill ([00:35:44](#)): Yeah. So at some point, we are going to need to see that. I don't need to see it right now, but I'll need to know that the sooner the better, so I can put it in our budget.

Doug Hill ([00:35:57](#)): Second question is, when will you know what the health care increases are going to be?

Clint Jensen ([00:36:04](#)): Yes, so we'll be well into the new budget. We're on a calendar year with that, so it's probably going to be October-ish before we know what those numbers will be.

Doug Hill ([00:36:14](#)): Okay. And then on the assessments, I'm just curious, I don't know if you could bring that back up, that shows the assessments and the percentage increases?

Doug Hill ([00:36:29](#)): I understand the formula and everything else, but the part that I'm having a hard time understanding is, why are there some have such big increases and some have much smaller increases? It would surprise me that the call volume increases would have those big swings like that between agencies, but maybe they do, I don't know.

Scott Ruf ([00:37:00](#)): Especially on the south end of the county, and even South Salt Lake fire because of the MRC, but Herriman, I talked to Chief Carr when we first did this, I mentioned that he had almost, it was about a 36% increase in calls for service. Riverton, again, was probably 20, 25 percent. I talked to Chief Addison at South Salt Lake fire, he was aware of that, and for the MRC and the stuff over by the jail there that the state and the county do. But that calls for service number really creates a fairly significant swing when you adjust the call for service call volume by that.

Doug Hill ([00:37:53](#)): So would it be fair to say that those that are experiencing larger call volume increases are taking on a higher portion of the assessment, thus reducing the assessment percentage for some agencies like UPD and West Valley, which are down around that four percent? Or have their call volumes decreased that much?

Scott Ruf ([00:38:31](#)): I'll make sure I'm not muted. We pulled all the numbers for '21 the same way for all the agencies, and then removed all the duplicate calls for service. I can't speak to the reductions for West Valley City or Unified or West Jordan. I would have to defer that question to the Chiefs, of what that reason was. Some of it, I'm sure, is staffing, Covid, or just not dealing with calls anymore. But again, I don't want to speak for the Chiefs.

Doug Hill ([00:39:10](#)): Yeah, I don't know, it just surprised me to think that call volumes are going down anywhere, but I'm like you, I don't know the individual circumstances.

Doug Hill ([00:39:24](#)): And then just my last question is, I wondered if at some point in time, we could get an explanation of... If you go back up to the top of the revenue there, where we talk about the 9-1-1 fees, the revenue that comes in. Not the very top, but the top of the budget spreadsheet.

Scott Ruf ([00:39:48](#)): Oh, sorry.

Doug Hill ([00:39:52](#)): Where we talk about the franchise taxes, 9-1-1 revenues, I would just be curious to know what makes up that revenue. We had that discussion a couple of months ago from Dave Spatafore saying that there was, I don't know, an increase in one of the subcategories of that 9-1-1 revenue. I'd just be curious to know what makes up the \$7.65 million of revenue.

Scott Ruf (00:40:28): And I want to apologize, because you did make that request, and I failed to put the memo together for you. But I can tell you, if you look at your phone bill, it's about a dollar forty-nine, and currently the PSAPs on a formula get 71 cents based on a rolling average of the 9-1-1 calls received by the PSAP. In July first of '23, I believe that'll go up to 73 cents. And then the rest of that tax goes to pay for the 9-1-1 phone system and network, the new radio system the state's putting in, and things. So I apologize, that's my fault for not preparing that memo for you, Mr. Hill, and the Board.

Doug Hill (00:41:14): No worries, I'm just ignorant, I just don't know. So if I understand, what you're saying is, about half of the money that a resident pays on their phone bill is coming to VECC. Is that what you're saying?

Scott Ruf (00:41:29): Yes. 71 cents of whatever that 9-1-1 tax is comes to VECC.

Doug Hill (00:41:34): Okay. And then that other amount goes to other agencies, other...

Scott Ruf (00:41:44): It all goes to UCA to pay for the radio networking system, the 9-1-1 phone system they just put in, to support and maintain that system. And I believe, and I would defer to Mr. Whatcott, I don't know if any of that money funds the operation of UCA outside of the technology components.

Scott Ruf (00:42:04): And just so you also know, because I think I'm preempting the question Mr. Lee was about to ask, it's our percentage of the total 9-1-1 calls in the entire state of Utah. It's not based on a tax base of Salt Lake County or the residents. That was changed in, I believe, 2017, under Senate Bill 130, and there's another bill out there, where they moved it from a local tax collection to a percentage of all the 9-1-1 calls in the entire state of Utah. We answer about 30% of that, so we get about 28 to 30 percent of all of that money that gets collected in the state for our 9-1-1 services. Was that your question, Mr. Lee, was going to be?

Korban Lee (00:43:00): Yeah, good anticipation, that was my question. And when they made that change, Scott, did that help VECC or hurt VECC?

Scott Ruf (00:43:11): Oh, it helped VECC. Because I am constantly reminded, and I wasn't even in the state. To the tune of almost \$1.8 million a year.

Korban Lee (00:43:26): Good. Doug, do you have other questions?

Doug Hill (00:43:31): I probably asked more than my fair share, thanks.

Dan Petersen (00:43:35): Korban, I'll take a little bit of Doug's time, if Doug, that's all right. I'll pick up and ask a couple of questions.

Scott Ruf (00:43:44): You need the memo back up Chief?

Dan Petersen (00:43:46): No you're fine.

Dan Petersen (00:43:46): Well, I want to talk a little bit about fund balance. And I neglected to bring this as a big discussion in finance, my apologies to Clint for this. But I want to understand what we think is our fund balance. It looks to me like you're projecting about 248,000 as of the end of January '22, but your budget for next year shows a \$50,000 fund balance. Fundamentally Clint, what is available to us as fund balance, or in reserve, unallocated to anything?

Clint Jensen (00:44:32): Yeah, I'll deal with that.

Clint Jensen ([00:44:36](#)): First of all, the \$50,000 is a contribution to fund balance, so that's what that is in the budget, is demonstrating, "Hey, we want to add \$50,000 to the fund balance." As I've done some projections to the end of the fiscal year, probably looking to be somewhere between two fifty to four hundred thousand dollars' worth of fund balance. That represents, what, three percent of the overall VECC budget?

Clint Jensen ([00:45:13](#)): That's based on those projections, things could change. Hopefully not, hopefully things'll stay stable. But looking right now to have that kind of a fund balance.

Dan Petersen ([00:45:23](#)): Okay. I wouldn't mind seeing maybe an extra line there that says "Fund balance estimate," so that we know kind of a trending on the budget itself, right? So if you're adding 50, then a line below that says... I think that's good to know that we're going to see between 250 and 400.

Dan Petersen ([00:45:43](#)): I think it'd be healthy for us to also look at, maybe as a goal for us, to try and get to five to eight percent fund balance. We have a number of little surprises that happen through the year, and I think we would all like to be in a space where we're not ending up in a mid-year point, having to pull from our own fund balances to feed that to you. And 250 to 400 is a nice start, it's better than we were, for sure, two years ago. Thank you.

Dan Petersen ([00:46:20](#)): But I don't know if we're all comfortable with that number or not. You'll know more within the next month or two, right? I mean, you'll start to get it... We would like you to be closer to 400. Do you think you could do that?

Clint Jensen ([00:46:38](#)): I'll work on that.

Dan Petersen ([00:46:42](#)): I think maybe as a group, we might talk about the fact that if we wanted to speed that up a little and give us some reserves for whatever potential might come, if we added one more percent to the member fee, that'd bring in another hundred to fund balance, right?

Clint Jensen ([00:47:00](#)): That's correct.

Dan Petersen ([00:47:01](#)): Which, at first I was looking at this thinking we only had 50,000 in fund balance, but it's-

Clint Jensen ([00:47:06](#)): No.

Dan Petersen ([00:47:07](#)): It's better to know that we have 250 to 400. But I'd be curious to see what others think. What do we think is a good number to have in cash reserves for VECC?

Korban Lee ([00:47:23](#)): Clint? You said we're hoping to have 250 to 400 by the end of this fiscal year. That's assuming we have some unspent budgeted expenditures dropped to fund balance, right? What's our fund balance at the moment?

Clint Jensen ([00:47:42](#)): So fund balance, that's on that report that I showed you earlier. We're about two points... let me look at that.

Dan Petersen ([00:47:51](#)): Two forty eight?

Clint Jensen ([00:47:56](#)): We have 2.8 million in the PTIF and 260,000 in the Wells Fargo checking, so just short of three million.

Korban Lee (00:48:06): Okay.

Dan Petersen (00:48:07): That's cash flow, right? That's your cash.

Korban Lee (00:48:11): Yeah, that's cashflow. That's going to be-

Clint Jensen (00:48:13): That's cash. Yeah, we've collected everything on assessments. We will have additional tax come in, about 600 to 650 a month, but that gets eaten up with one payroll.

Korban Lee (00:48:25): Yeah, sorry, that's not our budgeted fund balance. Yeah.

Korban Lee (00:48:35): I'm glad Chief Petersen brought this up, because it was making me feel uncomfortable that our fund balance was as low as it was at VECC. One of the things I wanted to ask the Trustees is, how would you feel about in addition... We have our ongoing assessment as per the formula. What about an assessment of one-time funds to just provide a little bit of fund balance cushion? For us as agencies and cities, that would be one time money, not ongoing money. Specifically, just to try to get our fund balance up closer to at least five percent. I'd like to see a fund balance at VECC between five and 10 percent.

Korban Lee (00:49:19): I wanted to throw that out there for discussion. We've been making some hard decisions at VECC over the last couple years, and making some really big contributions through our assessments, and the budget right now I think is far, far better than it was a couple years ago, but our fund balance reserves is one area I'm still a little worried about with our VECC budget. I just want to open that up further.

Doug Hill (00:49:46): I'd like to do it. If we're going to do that, I'd rather see us do it this year. At least in Murray's case, sales tax revenues are good, online sales are doing well, we've got the CARE money, the \$10 million exemption that we can allocate in various ways. So if we're going to do it, I'd rather see us do it this year than future years.

Mark Reid (00:50:26): I put your fund balance in this organization a little different than we have it in our city. Cash or fund balance held here is fund balance, we don't get to hold it at the city. So I'd like to keep it low. I think five percent is a pretty good goal. I really wouldn't like to see it go much higher than that though, because we can easily bring the funds in through a new assessment. But I do appreciate Doug's comments that sometimes it's better to build it when times are good than to have to go and get it later. But to hold too much of our city's funds here is a little bit against my philosophy.

Dan Petersen (00:51:18): I want to weigh in. I can appreciate that thought. I guess my preference would be, I don't disagree that probably five to eight is a good number for percent, but I'd like VECC to be able to weather some storms without asking us for additional funds mid-cycle. And if they dip into fund balance then spend the next few years replenishing the fund balance if they have to do that...

Dan Petersen (00:51:52): I like the 250 to 400, but I'd love to see at the bottom of this, just an ending on assigned fund balance that totals up the anticipated, so that we have a number that we keep tracking. I feel good about 250 to 400 this year. I'd be happy to give another percent for the next couple years, and then drop that off once we hit whatever we can agree on, whether it's five, whether it's eight, or whether like Korban... maybe 10. But we pick a policy, and then over the next five or so years, get there.

Nathan Cherpeski (00:52:34): Do we actually know what the fund balance is? This says contribution to fund balance. What is our fund balance right now? And what is the amount that carries forward last year into this year.

Clint Jensen (00:52:54): Yeah, so maybe I'll try to address that.

Clint Jensen (00:52:57): When we ended fiscal '21, we had about \$50,000 worth of fund balance. Now I know the audit will show something different, because we pre-billed a lot of the entities, so we did get some cash in the bank, because we pre-billed... think West Jordan or somebody paid up early, so the cash shows a little bit better, but it's a little bit deceiving, because that cash was really advanced revenue for the next fiscal year.

Clint Jensen (00:53:24): We started the year with about 50,000 in fund balance. I'm projecting that we'll end this year somewhere between 250 to 400, maybe a little bit more. When we get to the end of this budget cycle, we're going to be to about that 250 to 400 number. And the challenge with a small fund balance is, we cannot weather just the ups and downs. We get a big bill for Versaterm, for example in July first, that's a million bucks, and so we have no flexibility. We beg everybody to pay their assessments timely, if not sooner, so that we can weather that cashflow shortage. So we have no working capital whatsoever.

Gary Whatcott (00:54:11): I have a question.

Korban Lee (00:54:19): Go ahead Gary. Clint, there's a question for you in the chat that you can answer after Gary. Gary, go ahead, sorry.

Gary Whatcott (00:54:27): I'm just wondering, I haven't personally seen a really good CIP plan, at least for the three years running out or even longer. I don't know what all the needs are at the center, and that may include, for us, software maintenance or upgrades. And I'm just wondering... It'd be nice to see maybe some discussion about our CIP in the long range.

Gary Whatcott (00:54:56): With the aging building that we have, I'm glad it's paid for but it also now comes with some maintenance obligations, as well as the property that we own. I'd certainly like to see some idea before we set a goal or some kind of a number on our savings, till we understand what our CIP really looks like long term, or at least five years or three years or something.

Scott Ruf (00:55:23): So Mr. Whatcott, to that point, and I can put it together or send it back out, if you recall, we even broached the subject of, UCA's new radio system and the challenges was what precipitated the current capital project. We, along with JRCA Architects, did a building assessment and systems assessments. We go out less than a year, one to three, five to 10, 10 plus, and 15 plus, so we can put that document together as far as... I think that's what you're asking for, right? Like HVAC, roof, [inaudible 00:55:59] capital, building, structural type enhancements.

Scott Ruf (00:56:02): We actually did that as part of my wish list. Like, if everything was perfect and the board gave us \$10 million, we could do it all. And then we had scaled it back. But we have the life expectancy, and when they anticipate we should look at doing some of those capital things, and I think in the next 10 years or so, it amounts to somewhere between three and four million, depending on what you look at. But we wouldn't have to do it all at once.

Gary Whatcott (00:56:35): I guess what I'm saying is, the savings plan should dovetail to some degree with what we think we're going to spend on such items, and balancing those two out seems to be a little better methodology for me to understand how much savings we should have, versus spending on these kinds of items. That's my two cents' worth.

Scott Harrington (00:57:04): This is Scott Harrington. I don't want to go too much above five percent on the fund balance, just because we have the ability to be very nimble, he's going to adjust it for a special assessment if needed, and honestly, I don't think that an entity like VECC should be carrying a huge amount of

fund balance. You can take a lot of the capital projects that you have and put them into the regular budget cycle and do those fluctuations a little bit throughout each year, or you can just dedicate a certain amount to capital each year and knock each one of those projects out. That's my thoughts on it. I wouldn't be a fan of doing higher than five percent.

Korban Lee (00:58:02): Clint, if we come in and end this year at 400,000, you said we'll finish between 250 and 400. 400,000 would be roughly what, two percent?

Clint Jensen (00:58:14): Yep.

Korban Lee (00:58:18): I've heard a number of people say five percent. Few say, "I don't want to go higher than five percent." Five percent would have us with what, about 900,000, or just under a million dollars in a fund balance?

Clint Jensen (00:58:29): Yeah. Just a million would be a nice round number, yeah.

Korban Lee (00:58:32): Okay. Are there any other thoughts on this discussion? Tim? Undersheriff? Who am I missing, who else? Lisa? Others want to chime in?

Scott Ruf (00:58:44): So I don't know who BK is, but there's question in chat about the audit not accruing the pre-payment.

Clint Jensen (00:58:52): Let me address that, because in the audit, it does show that we have fund balance, cash, and cash equivalent, so 2.6. The majority of that was for the CAD project. That was cash we were holding that we had not expended that yet. It was committed, but that shows in the audit. That's why that fund balance looks really good in the audit, but the bulk of that was for that CAD project.

Nathan Cherpeski (00:59:22): Just so I'm clear, we're talking about adding to it in the budget that you have in front of this for 2023, or the dark blue, and add 50,000 to the fund balance?

Clint Jensen (00:59:37): That's correct. Based on the current numbers that you have, yes, we would add 50,000 to fund balance.

Nathan Cherpeski (00:59:43): So you're going to be between three and four fifty at the end of that. So if we're really talking about trying to get closer to a million, most of us would have to go up pretty significantly, and I got to get this through a council, it's just not me. We just need to be wise. If we're going to do it, it's got to be over a couple of years. I don't see it happening in one year.

Dan Petersen (01:00:07): And maybe speaking to that, that's 50,000 if you expend every single line item, right? Because I would anticipate that you're going to have some underexpend. If we're budgeting for 50,000, if we have about 400,000 in unassigned fund balance today, and you're budgeting 50,000 to add to that, we start with an estimation of a 450-fund balance at the end of the year, and as long as we don't expend the underexpend, you're going to add on top of that whatever your underexpend is. If you have another hundred thousand, an underexpend will be 550.

Clint Jensen (01:00:54): Correct.

Dan Petersen (01:00:55): So maybe we get there by trying to put this 50,000 budgeted, and then allow for the underexpend to roll into fund balance, and we'll get there without new pain, another one percent or anything. But maybe we target a five percent as a goal and go from there.

Dan Petersen (01:01:17): I'm much happier knowing that we have 400 now than 50. That doesn't require any change to this budget, but I think it still puts a target on there for you, Clint, if we agree to five. It seems like five is a number people are a little more comfortable with, but it'll get there mostly by underexpend.

Clint Jensen (01:01:41): Yes.

Dan Petersen (01:01:42): Okay.

Jake Petersen (01:01:46): Mr. Chair, this is Jake from UPD. With the discussions we've been having over even the last five or six months, there are expenses that we need to plan for, and I'm glad that we're having a discussion about where our fund balance should be, and I think it's healthy for our organization. Five percent seems like a good target for the points that have been made, and it's something that we could support as a goal in getting there.

Korban Lee (01:02:23): Thank you Jake. Anyone else want to chime in on this discussion? Anyone want to make a motion, or give Clint and Scott further direction as they bring back a more formal budget proposal? Well, let me back up. Any other questions about the budget? Other than fund balance, any other aspects of Clint's budget memo we want to talk through or discuss?

Korban Lee (01:03:00): Clint, I've got one. Let me go back on my notes here. In your memo, you talk about a couple of softwares, Motorola Vesta analytics software and Hiplink software. What are those two softwares? What do they do?

Clint Jensen (01:03:16): Scott, you're probably better at that than I am.

Scott Ruf (01:03:22): Okay, so with this spotlight being on us, the Motorola Vesta is an analytics tool that allows us to take a deeper dive into our call volumes and the activity through the phone systems. The administrative lines, and non-emergency call performance answer times and things like that.

Scott Ruf (01:03:49): We're hoping that once the entire phone system is done and we move to, without getting in too techy, the NENA i3 standards, that UCA will move away from what they call ECATS which is where we all have to get our stats today, and move to the Motorola Vesta analytics, so we wouldn't have to pay for it in the future. But one of the things that I know those of you and the Chiefs that are very into the analytics part of it that I struggle with for the ECATS is really taking deep dives into the impacts of various things.

Scott Ruf (01:04:26): So that's what that really is. It's call performance and a snapshot in real time of what's going on with the activity levels in the center related to phone activity. I keep scrolling through this, I'm trying to find the other one was...

Korban Lee (01:04:44): The other one's Hiplink. What is that, Hiplink?

Scott Ruff (01:04:46): So the Hiplink, one of the challenges we've had is moving to Versaterm with paging. A lot of this happens on the Fire/EMS side, but what really drove this, and I would defer to the Undersheriff if I go sideways here, was we were having issues with search and rescue and some of the SWAT teams in the valley, and UPD. And the ability to page directly from Versaterm and do things like that was causing, one, inconsistencies in page notifications, or people not getting them, or the system failing, and it also relied heavily on VECC to manage all those pages and notifications.

Scott Ruf ([01:05:43](#)): So what Hiplink is, it's a bidirectional paging system, which can be used by all of the agencies, and we can set it up however we want for agencies and various teams, search and rescue, SWAT, HAZMAT, CART, homicide, whatever, that can be done either from VECC or from a commander in the field. It's integrated and it allows us to track people responding, so they can push a button and we can know what people are responding, where they're responding from.

Scott Ruf ([01:06:20](#)): It's just an enhancement to paging, because right now, and I'm going to pick on fire, when there's a working fire in the valley, we have to individually page, by policy, any agency that sends any piece of equipment to that call. So if UFA has a working fire and we send Murray and Draper and West Jordan and Bluffdale, we have to remember to send all these working pages to each agency, and we're trying to consolidate that into more of command pages and things like that.

Scott Ruf ([01:06:59](#)): We've talked to the Chiefs of... Does the South Salt Lake City Fire Chief really need to know that there's a working house fire in Murray? Because we do that every day, right? But they might want to know if it's a third or four alarm, or a major incident or bigger in the Valley. That's what we're trying to balance but make the technology useful and efficient for not only us here at VECC but can also be managed by the agencies. Because we have to manage the data too.

Scott Ruf ([01:07:30](#)): So whenever they make changes... a few months ago, I think UPD moved from AT&T to T-Mobile or did some sort of change. We had to make all the updates and upgrades in the system and all the data entry, and that kind of lets the agency manage their teams, their members, set their permissions. Then we just have access. That's pretty much what it is, but I'm trying to paint a picture for everybody of the value in it for everybody, not just VECC.

Korban Lee ([01:08:05](#)): Thank you Scott. Any other questions about the direction the proposed budget is headed before Clint and Scott do further work on it and bring it back to our next meeting? I don't want to try to work a motion, but we did seem to have some broad majority support for aiming toward a goal of a five percent fund balance, perhaps over a number of years. Do we want to turn that into something more formal in our next Trustees' meeting?

Dan Petersen ([01:09:01](#)): Well, I obviously like the idea and I think we can talk about it at the next Board meeting. And even a comment, if you look at the budget trend is so positive compared to what it was in 2020, and then in 2021. I think we'll get there. Once we hit the target, then I like the idea of potentially returning the underexpend to a credit for us in our fee. Once we hit a target, then the underexpend can be potentially returned back to our member fee.

Korban Lee ([01:09:38](#)): Returned back to us, or addressing some of the capital needs around the facility, or...

Dan Petersen ([01:09:44](#)): Or fundamentally, counting as new revenue for the next year, once our target is met for the member fee.

Korban Lee ([01:09:52](#)): Yeah.

Gary Whatcott ([01:09:53](#)): I'd really like to know what our long term issues are with maintenance on the building. I do not want to defer maintenance any longer than we need to, and it should be done pretty expediently as the situations arise, so they don't get worse. I'd really like to understand what that looks like for at least three years out, for me.

Doug Hill ([01:10:19](#)): I wonder if at the next Board meeting, we could have a resolution drafted that set some policy direction on that percentage, so that we have a paper trail going forward of what percentage the fund balance would be desired.

Mark Reid ([01:10:38](#)): Korban?

Korban Lee ([01:10:39](#)): Thank you. Mark, yeah, go ahead.

Mark Reid ([01:10:42](#)): Because cashflow is always an issue every year, could we put together a policy that 50% of the assessment would be due at the first of the year, with 25% the next quarter, and 25% the next quarter? It just gives you an opportunity to get more of the money up front, so you don't have cashflow issues. We try really hard to segregate it over four quarters, but is there a reason that we couldn't put some of it more up front?

Scott Ruf ([01:11:20](#)): We bill semi-annually. We bill the first two quarters in June and the second two quarters in December. Everybody has been paying. We've had one agency request, because they also have a cashflow problem, that they pay quarterly, but we do that already, Mr. Reid. We don't complain if an agency only pays for the first quarter, but we currently bill twice a year, two quarters at a time, and most all the member agencies pay that bill twice a year. So we're getting two quarters at a time.

Mark Reid ([01:11:55](#)): Very good.

Korban Lee ([01:12:00](#)): Thank you, good question Mark, thank you Scott. I want to circle back to Doug and to Gary. Doug's comments first. Clint, can you work on some kind of putting on paper something that you think might be a good direction regarding giving us guidance as Trustees for a fund balance target?

Clint Jensen ([01:12:24](#)): Yes, I will do that.

Korban Lee ([01:12:26](#)): And Scott, between you and Clint, can you prepare for a future Trustees' meeting some follow-up report about capital project needs at the center over the next, what Gary, five years, 10 years?

Korban Lee ([01:12:44](#)): I know you did have the walkthrough as we were debating and discussing the remodel, the assessment for the whole building. I'll be honest, I'm quite happy to see in the budget some monies going towards the facilities, because we haven't always done that in our budget the last few years. So I'm really glad that that's in our budget this year. But I think Gary's question is a good one. We don't want to have a long-term maintenance liability because we defer capital maintenance too long. Gary, am I getting that you're concerned-

Gary Whatcott ([01:13:21](#)): Yeah. I think you're... I don't know. I really think in that report, we need to understand any software issues, because the maintenance on some of this software is just out of sight, and those are big ticket items for us, as well as the building maintenance and grounds issues. So anything that we think might be coming up that we think would be fairly significant on software, maintenance issues of software, that'd be nice to know as well. But I don't know how far you have to go out. It's kind of hard to predict. At least five years or something would be adequate for my needs.

Korban Lee ([01:14:04](#)): In understanding future liabilities too, I'd like to roll into that any other liabilities you foresee. Deferred capital maintenance, upcoming software risk management issues, what have you. That's for a future Trustees' meeting.

Korban Lee (01:14:24): I think generally, I'm judging by the lack of additional comments and questions, I think generally as Trustees... I'm hoping for some head nods. I think generally as Trustees we're pretty happy with your budget memo, Clint, and pretty happy with the proposals that are coming forward on the budget by Scott and Clint, both of you. Anyone disagree with that, or anyone want to propose amending the proposed budget in any way before it comes back as the budget document?

Clint Jensen (01:15:01): Point of order, next Board meeting will include the tentative budget. We'll maybe spend a little more detail, and you can see more of the line items. I give you an opportunity at that point to approve that tentative budget, and the set that public hearing into a future Board meeting. So that's the idea.

Korban Lee (01:15:22): I think that would put the public hearing for the budget at the April Trustees' meeting, if I'm thinking about this correctly.

Clint Jensen (01:15:29): Yes.

Korban Lee (01:15:29): I do have one more request, however, Scott, Clint. For agencies that... if you're seeing big swings in their calls for service since so much of our assessment formula now is based on calls for service, if you can see mid-year that our calls for service are trending in a way that's going to give us sticker shock come the next budget, will you make sure you're communicating with those Trustees, those agencies that are seeing their calls for service numbers trend up, so that it doesn't hit us with sticker shock in the budget assessment formula when we get to the budget?

Dan Petersen (01:16:13): Maybe something for us to think about too is, one year swings can be pretty bad. You can have a windstorm in your community and it generates long term cost for you. Maybe we should discuss during this process looking at a three-year rolling average for calls to smooth that out, so that we don't end up with a single year spike of events that are a little bit out of... wouldn't surprise the budget quite so much.

Doug Hill (01:17:01): Could I also request that as part of the tentative budget, Clint, that you include somewhere in there those RMS assessments as well?

Clint Jensen (01:17:12): Yes, we can do that.

Korban Lee (01:17:16): Good comments, thank you Chief Petersen. Doug, thank you.

Korban Lee (01:17:25): Okay. It seemed like the issue about rolling averages, three-year, five-year rolling averages versus year to year calls for service numbers was debated among the Finance Committee when we reconsidered the assessment formula. I'm struggling to remember why we did not use the three-year rolling average. I think it was, at the time, a lack of trust in some of the data, I believe, was the reason.

Dan Petersen (01:17:52): And we could even go next year to two-year, and then the next year to three, as we trust our data better. It just would help to prevent this one-year spike.

Scott Ruf (01:18:10): And I think Mr. Lee, I think that conversation, we had people on Spillman and Versaterm, we're now all on the same CAD system as of January 1st of this year, so we're counting and treating all the calls for service equally across the board. I think that was also part of the discussion as well was, who was counting what, or not counting what?

Korban Lee (01:18:30): Yeah, I think that was it. Thank you, good call.

Korban Lee (01:18:33): Clint, will you put that down as something to discuss at a future Finance Committee meeting and bring back to the Trustees in the future?

Clint Jensen (01:18:44): Yes I will.

Korban Lee (01:18:46): Where we're only one year into all being on the same CAD system, it's maybe not this year, this current budget, but I like the idea of considering making out a three year rolling average as we go forward with this CAD. But that's something we ought to debate with the Finance Committee, and then bring back a recommendation.

Scott Ruf (01:19:07): And unless there's objections to Mr. Hill's request, I'm going to include the Police Chiefs on that dissemination of the RMS costs if that's okay. Or...

Korban Lee (01:19:21): I think that's a good idea. Does anyone object? Okay. Yeah, Scott, please share that with the Chiefs.

Scott Ruf (01:19:29): Okay.

Korban Lee (01:19:32): Okay, any other discussions on the budget before we go on?

NO CLOSED SESSION/ MOTION TO ADJOURN

Scott Ruf (01:19:40): Mr. Young advised there is no need for a closed session, Mr. Lee.

Korban Lee (01:19:45): Okay. I'm going to skip agenda items 10 and 11 then, as it says, "Close session if necessary." It's not necessary. Before we adjourn, is there anything else anyone would like to bring up with this body?

Korban Lee (01:20:05): Okay, looking for a motion to adjourn.

Doug Hill (01:20:12): Motion to adjourn.

David Brickey (01:20:12): Motion to adjourn. I'll second Doug's motion.

Korban Lee (01:20:17): All right, motion to adjourn from Doug, and a second from David. Or Mr. Hill and Mr. Brickey, excuse me. All in favor say aye.

All (01:20:28): Aye.

Korban Lee (01:20:28): Any opposed? Hope not. Thank you everyone. Clint, Scott, great work on the budget. Thank you, see you next month.

Scott Ruf (01:20:37): Yep, thank you.

Clint Jensen (01:20:39): Thank you.

The meeting adjourned at 3:22 p.m.