

**SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER**

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING**

*April 27, 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. Brady Cottam – Taylorsville  
Mr. Dom Burchett - UFA  
Chief Jason Mazuran – UPD  
Mr. Wayne Pyle - 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. Terry Addison – South Salt Lake  
Mr. Robbie Russo – Cottonwood Heights  
Mr. Ryan Shosted – Riverton  
Mr. Clint Smith – Draper  
Ms. Andrea Partridge – VECC  
Mr. Craig Burnett - Murray

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 2:04 p.m.

Mr Lee: Okay. Sorry. I apologize for the slowness in getting connected to Zoom. Scott, looks like we've got quite a few attendees here. Do we have a full quorum that we can get started?

Scott Ruf: Yep. The only... Mr. Harrington from Taylorsville, but I believe he's down in for the CFO conference and the Undersheriff and I don't know if Chief Mazuran is going to try to cover for him.

Brady Cottam: Scott, this is Brady Cottam. I'll cover Taylorsville for Scott Harrington.

Scott Ruf: Thank you Chief. Okay. We're good, Mr. Lee.

Korban Lee: All right. Thank you, Chief. Thank you, everyone. Welcome. Glad you're here. Let's go ahead and get started. The first agenda items is the approval of the minutes for March 16<sup>th</sup>. Does anyone want to make a motion to approve those minutes?

Scott Ruf: So, I do have an email from Mr. Collins with a couple of corrections. I don't know if you want me to read them into the record or just email them out.

Korban Lee: Yeah. Why don't you go ahead and read them into the record here real quick?

Scott Ruf: Do we need a motion and a second the end of discussion? Is that how this works?

Josh Collins: I make a motion to approve them and it says amended in the email. I'll make that motion.

Wayne Pyle: So I'll second it, but didn't I hear we were going to hear what the amendments were and do that in discussion?

Korban Lee: Yeah. Let's do that discussion.

Scott Ruf: I was trying to follow the rules, so okay. So, Mr. Collins had submitted a couple of things in... There's one spelling correction for Chief Cottam. It's Chief Brady Cottam, not Chief Brandy Cottam. So, we'll get that corrected. On page three at about the 21 minute 31 second mark, there's a comment attributed to the Undersheriff and we believe that comment was actually made by Chief Dan Petersen, not the Undersheriff. That same confusion occurs again on page five at the 26 minute 15 second mark. Again, Chief Petersen, not Undersheriff Petersen. And I'll ask Mr. Collins to elaborate. So, on page nine, there was a mention where Mr. Whatcott begins to speak and Mr. Lee tells him to go ahead. And then the next statement is attributed to Chief Petersen. So, I'll have to go back and look at that to fix that. And then finally, on page 11, another spelling issue for Mr. Lee. It's Korban with a C and an I instead of a K and A. So those were the things brought forward by Mr. Collins with regards to the minutes.

Korban Lee: With that clarification on the who was speaking, it was the conversation implied it would go to Gary Whatcott, but then it was attributed to Chief Petersen. Do you want to go back and re-listen, double-check those minutes before they're approved?

Josh Collins: I personally don't think it's substantive. Maybe I'm wrong. And I apologize for the email. I just saw the issues and I don't think most of these are substantive. I just thought if we're going to have this detailed of a record, we should try and get it correct. But I think it's fine. I trust Mr. Ruf to go back and listen to that if everybody else is okay with that because I don't think it's substantive to the discussion itself.

Korban Lee: Okay. So, with that, we have any further discussion before we take a vote on the motion to approve? Okay, let's go ahead and do a roll call vote then on the motion to approve the March 16<sup>th</sup> minutes as amended as proposed by Mr. Collins.

Scott Ruf: Help if I undo the mic. Mr. Lee, West Jordan.

Korban Lee: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Brickey, Riverton.

David Brickey: Yes

Scott Ruf: Mr. Dobbins, Draper.

David Dobbins: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Hill, Murray.

Korban Lee: Sorry, do it again.

Doug Hill: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Hill, Murray. Mr. Whatcott, South Jordan.

Gary Whatcott: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Collins, South Salt Lake.

Josh Collins: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Cherpeski, Herriman. Mr. Reid, Bluffdale.

Mark Reid: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Deputy Mary Hartman.

Lisa Hartman: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Tingey, Cottonwood Heights.

Tim Tingey: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Chief Cottam for Taylorsville.

Brady Cottam: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Chief Burchett, UFA.

Dom Burchett: Yes.

Scott Ruf: And Mr. Pyle for West Valley.

Wayne Pyle: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Okay. It's unanimous, Chief, I mean, Mr. Lee.

### **APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 16, 2022 BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEETING MINUTES**

#### **Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. Josh Collins, to approve the amended minutes of the March 16, 2022 Trustees meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Pyle; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Korban Lee: Okay. Thank you. Let's go ahead and go on to public comments. Is there anyone here on our Zoom call today that would like to speak up and make public comment?

Scott Ruf: And we did not receive any electronically either, sir, Mr. Chairman.

Korban Lee: Okay. No electronic communications for public comment. Again, last call for anyone wishing to speak in the Zoom meeting. Okay. Seeing none, we'll close public comment, and we'll move on to agenda item number four, the VECC performance and progress report from Director Ruf.

### **VECC PERFORMANCE & PROGRESS REPORT**

Scott Ruf: Yep. Thank you. As you recall, last month, we're going to transition to a quarterly report and remove some of the standards that are peripheral to what's required by UCA and SB130. So, in this report, it's just a normal update of where things were at for senators and legislator. I did make a note in here that on April 1<sup>st</sup> of this year, we've stopped transferring all 911 calls between Salt Lake City 11 and VECC. So, we

should see our transfer rate start to decrease as a result of the common CAD project and our commitment to eliminate transfers. We are in the process of testing the CAD-to-CAD data exchange hub as well. So that'll eliminate the transfers with DPS, and we should be well below the threshold for 911 transfers pursuant to SB130 and tied to the... is often referred to that carrot money from UCA. Those are funds outside of the state 911 taxes but set aside for the purposes of grants and PSAP expansion and new equipment that you can apply for if you meet the standards and that. So that's a summary here.

Scott Ruf: A little bit about the capital project. You'll see on our answer times, we're going to get rid of the 15 seconds. We're going to focus on the 95 seconds and 20 seconds or less. We made an incremental creep up from February to March of about a half percent. April, I don't want to jinx it, but we're close to maybe hitting the standard, the full month after the implementation of the new phone system we've have a great increase from the low 70s to we've maintained at least a 90 to a 92, 93 percentile. We just got to get over the final hump of that 95% in 20 seconds or less. And we're brutally close to be able to achieve that. But this does illustrate we've seen incremental increases, little dips by half percentages here and there, but at least consistent, which was a huge thing from Speaker Wilson and President Adams with the Senate. And that's reflected here.

Scott Ruf: You'll see our transfer times crept down a little bit in March. That could just be based on activity. But like I said, that number should significantly come down again at least by a percent or two with the elimination of transfer between us and Salt Lake City, and then eventually should drop below 1%, which is well below the 2% threshold set forth in SB130. And then we still track the abandon rate. This number is a wild card, but like I've said previously, Senator Harper brought this issue up. There is no state standard. The definition of an abandoned 911 call is extremely broad, but we've continued to incorporate that in the report. So that's the report, Mr. Lee. If you have anyone who has any comments or questions.

Korban Lee: Let's open it up for any comments or questions. Anyone have any questions for Scott? Scott, I have one question at the start of your report, you... First, congratulations on getting the common CAD done. On April 1<sup>st</sup>, stopping transferring the 911 calls between VECC and Salt Lake 911. That has been in the works for years. Lots and lots of hiccups and potholes along that road. And to see it finally happen, you deserve some great kudos, and everyone at VECC, and everyone involved with that. Thank you. Thank you very, very much. In that same paragraph you say, "We anticipate completing the CAD-to-CAD data exchange hub," but you don't say when. What's the timeframe on the Cad-to-CAD data exchange hub so we can eliminate the DPS transfers?

Scott Ruf: I promise I'll finish it. That wasn't enough? We're actually doing testing. We reengaged with the vendors. We finished 90%. 95% of that hub is completed. They're going through with the data, our data that we provided them. And then we just have to engage with Versaterm. The key for this and probably why it's...

Scott Ruf: And I'm not trying to make a joke about it. I anticipate our side of it being completed, I would hope, in the next 30 to 60 days absence of some problems or issues with moving the data to the hub. The challenge we're going to have is I can't call Colonel Rapich up at DPS and say, "We finished the hub at your request, and you have 30 days to get it finished and connect to your side of it." Right? And that's the issue we're going to have is....And if you recall, we agreed to put this in the CAD project with Salt Lake City. Then Director Burnett and myself, we were like, "You know what? Let's build it. We'll maintain it. We'll get it up and running." And our answer to the legislature or senators or our boards or constituents is, "We've delivered everything we can do. Now it's available for any agency to tap into, including DPS."

Scott Ruf: I know that working on their half of it, I will follow up and get an answer to see where they're at, but that'll be the delay, right? I might have it done in the next month or so, but it's not considered functional. It's live, but it's not functional until the other agencies connect to it, and we start moving data between. But for the board's information, I did get a call two weeks ago that Davis County, Layton, and Bountiful are abandoning their old data exchange hub. And they're going to join this exchange hub as well. So organically, at least on the Wasatch front, it's going to begin to grow. Central Utah 911 in Utah County is going to join as well as Tooele. So how I like to say is we've set the table, and maybe the invitations now, whether or not they show up and how long it takes them to show up and make their side of it functional is the wild card. So-

Scott Ruf: ... Functional is the wild card. So, I can comfortably tell you probably within the next 30 to 45, 60 days probably we'll be finished with it, and then I'll provide updates to where agencies are at and who wants to join. I need to get with Scott Young and just tweak the MOU for people to join it. There is no fees or anything, but we need some controls since we're going to host and manage it. They have to pay for their half of it, so there's no expenses on that side of it to VECC, if that helps fill in any blanks.

Korban Lee: Yes. Thank you. Scott, that transfer rate, which has been so volatile, you mentioned will go down as we quit transferring with Salt Lake. On that graph, you always have a footnote that says, 'Here's what our transfer rate would be without transfers to Salt Lake and DPS.'

Scott Ruf: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Korban Lee: In March, it's 0.53% without transfers to Salt Lake and DPS. When Salt Lake's rolled in, of that 5.5%, a 0.5% is not Salt Lake or DPS. Do you expect, is four of 5%... Is the vast majority Salt Lake transfers, or...?

Scott Ruf: No.

Korban Lee: The majority DPS transfers?

Scott Ruf: It's DPS by a two or 3: 1 margin.

Korban Lee: That's why you think the rate will only dip a little bit with these Salt Lake transfers, getting rid of these Salt Lake transfers, because the majority of that is DPS

Scott Ruf: Yeah. So, we average somewhere between 1800 and 2200 911 transfers a month. Somewhere between four, and five, 550 are Salt Lake to Salt Lake City, and anywhere from 1100 to 1500 a month are DPS.

Korban Lee: Okay

Scott Ruf: So, that's why I think you'll see... And the reason I call it out the way I call it out is I really want to make sure we paint a picture and tell a story for the legislature and Senators that we're delivering on everything we said we were going to do, you can't hold us hostage if other agencies don't want to do it. We've stopped the transfers in Salt Lake County, we've built the data exchange hub, we've finished the common CAD project. We've done all these things; I can't be held liable or responsible for others.

Korban Lee: Scott, one last question from me. You mentioned that these reports will go quarterly. Was that referencing the report to the trustees; this report, or sending this report to the legislature?

Scott Ruf: I think that the one I sent out to the senators and the President and senate, and the house speaker and stuff moved to quarterly. I still want to do a monthly drive by for the board to make sure we're remaining consistent, we're hitting our numbers, that we've got close, or we made it and we just going to forget about it. I want to keep it front and center that we're still working to not only achieve but maintain the standards. I don't want to fall us into complacency and just assume everything's going well, and then someone asks for a report and I find out we took a 10% decrease or something.

Korban Lee: Thank you, Scott. Sorry, I've been dominating the questions. Anyone else have questions for Scott?

Wayne Pyle: I did want to almost add to what you're saying there, Korban. Thanks for the improvement and the data driven and objective way that's been show across the months. And I completely concur, if it's even necessary, with Scott's idea that yes, even though our reporting requirement may not be as high at the state level, I'd love to continue to see this stuff at the monthly Level.

Korban Lee: Thank you, Wayne. Any other comments or questions? Scott, thank you for giving us these performance measure reports. I do think by looking at it every single month, it has helped us focus on some of

the things that are very most important about answering those 911 calls, and it has shown that we've kept our commitments to the legislature to get these performance measures improved. You, Clint, the whole team at VECC have done a very good job with this. Thank you.

Scott Ruf: Thank you.

**CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION T22-02 911 CALL ANSWER TIMES AND 911 TRANSFERS**

Korban Lee: Okay, I'm going to move on to agenda item number five, consideration of Resolution T22-02. This is a resolution to propose tweaking our goals for the 911 call answer times. As you recall, as Trustees, we set a goal initially to work toward call answer times that wasn't quite up to the NENA standards. We collectively... I'm paraphrasing and collectively felt like we've got a long way to go, let's set our goal shy of the NENA standards. As we start getting close to that, then we can reconsider adopting the NENA standards. For the past three months since January now, we have been discussing whether we should adopt the new NENA standards as our stated goal for these 911 answer times. So, this resolution is the resolution to adopt those NENA standards of 95% of calls answered in 20 seconds or less.

Korban Lee: We did have a little bit of discussion about this earlier. My personal worry was that if we adopt a standard, are we creating rope that will just hang ourselves if we ever fail to have 95% of the calls answered in time? You'll notice in the language down at the very bottom where it says now therefore be it resolved. It says, "The VECC hereby affirms their commitment to strive to achieve and maintain the NENA and the NFPA standards." It's stating our intent of striving to achieve these standards. I don't believe it's committing or locking us in or creating liability if we adopt this resolution, but this has been kind of our goal to get to these NENA standards and now based on the new phone system in the work Scott and everyone has done, it's time to consider this. Does anyone else want to make comments about this resolution or ask questions about it?

Wayne Pyle: Yeah, Korban. I have one quick question. Your thought process seems logical to me. I agree with your thinking. As far as your logical conclusion that we're not held to that standard, does the attorney agree with that, is Scott on the line?

Korban Lee: Is Scott Young on? Are you on the line?

Scott Ruf: I believe so.

Scott Young: I'm on the line and yeah, I do agree with that, Wayne.

Wayne Pyle: Okay, then I'm good, thanks.

Doug Hill: So, with that in mind, then I'll go ahead and make a motion to approve Resolution T22-02, 911 call answering times and 911 transfers.

Tim Tingey: I'll second it, Tim Tingey.

Korban Lee: Okay. We have a motion by Doug Hill, second by Tim Tingey, to approve Resolution T22-02. Scott, can we do a roll call vote please?

Scott Ruf: Sure. Mr. Lee, West Jordan?

Korban Lee: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Brickey, Riverton.

David Brickey: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Dobbins, Draper.

David Dobbins: Yes

Scott Ruf: Mr. Hill, Murray.

Doug Hill: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Collins, South Salt Lake.

Josh Collins: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Cherpeski, Herriman.

Nathan Cherpeski: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Reid, Bluffdale.

Mark Reid: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Deputy Mayor Hartman.

Lisa Hartman: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Tingey, Cottonwood Heights.

Tim Tingey: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Chief Cottam, for Taylorsville.

Brady Cottam: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Chief Burchett, UFA.

Dom Burchett: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Chief Mazuran, for UPD.

Jason Mazuran: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Pyle, West Valley City.

Wayne Pyle: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Okay. That's unanimous, Mr. Chair.

**Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. Doug Hill, to approve Resolution T22-02 911 call answering times and 911 transfers; the motion was seconded by Mr. Tim Tingey; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

Korban Lee: Great. Thank you. Let's go onto agenda items number six, the reports from the Operations Boards. Let's start with the Police Operations Board, Chief Burnett. I can't see on the back, let's turn the time over to you. There you are.

**OPERATIONS BOARD**

Craig Burnett: Here I am.

Korban Lee: All right, let's turn it over to you.

Craig Burnett: All right. Thank you. Just a quick overview of some of the topics that we talked about that won't be covered by the Director. There was some discussion about coding of channels, where channels are restricted during certain events that are going on, and how that should happen, how we move day to day operations and radio traffic. I think the final was that there will be a policy, that we will be reviewing the policy to see, make sure that the Chiefs are all in agreeance as to how we want that to happen during those stressful type of situations. That's going to be looked at. We talked about terminology to be used in traffic stops, particularly the high risk stops and making sure that we were all as well as that all the officers, as well as the dispatchers were using the same type of terminology. I believe that was a resolution was reached there.

Craig Burnett: There's also some concern about the flagging of addresses and names. And that tends to get a little cumbersome with the records. Some addresses having a flag for something that may not exist anymore. So, they're looking at ways to clean that up, and set it out to the agencies so maybe there's some kind of an end date, at least a review date for something when an address is flagged and who in the department level has the authority, and the ability to flag those addresses so that we can maybe keep that not quite as cumbersome as it's become. I believe the only other thing we kind of talked about was the holding of calls was determined. And I think we all agreed that we like the idea of dispatch notifying the supervisor, that there are calls holding, and then it becoming an issue with an individual department as to how those calls are taken care of, or how they're held at any particular time. But making sure that everybody knows that they're there while they're in the holding queue. So, I think that's really all we had to share. If there's any questions?

Korban Lee: Thank you, Chief. Any questions for Chief Burnett? Okay. All right. You got some challenging issues to work through there, Chief. Thank you for spearheading that with the other Chiefs. Thank you. All right, Chief Addison, let's turn the time over to you for the Fire Operations Board.

Terry Addison: Thank you Mr. Lee. The Fire Operations Board also had updates from the Users group, both the Fire Users group and the Technical Users group. We had a discussion on rapid intervention team and operational retreat policies, procedures, and training that are currently going through the Fire Valley Training Alliance right now. We also had some discussion on target hazards and identifying the certain targe hazards for possibly active shooter events, other targe hazards in our community and concerns addressing the flags on those areas and other flags on other addresses that we need to address, just as the Chief previously mentioned.

Terry Addison: We had a brief discussion on silent dispatching, on how that's working out and from the Technical Users group, the IT personnel wanted to ensure that as the fire users are using their MDTs out in the field, make sure that we have updated to the most current version of the MDT, which is 7.7.3., I believe with Versaterm. Director Ruf gave us his report, which he will give you gentlemen and ladies as well. One discussion that we did have, or an update was that the station alerting system, which is US Digital, which alerts the fire stations, the hardware within has been sold to Honeywell, but that should not affect any operational procedures that we're going through right now. And that's our report for this month.

Korban Lee: Any questions for Chief Addison?

Terry Addison: Thank you.

Korban Lee: Thank you, Chief. Okay. Let's move onto agenda item number seven, the Directors report, Scott. Let's turn it over to you.

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Scott Ruf: Yep. Thank you. I'll be brief because both Chiefs Burnett and Chief Addison really covered a good part of the things with regard to their respective disciplines. We'll just be modifying some policies and procedures or updating them and getting back to that group for implementation. They were also briefed on the Fiscal 23 budget. The process had an opportunity to ask any questions they may have had. Then we rolled into the capital project that's started, we're completing our initial work to set up the temporary locations for the call center and fire rescue dispatching here out in VECC. The call center was completed, being wired, and set up today. We just need to move the phones and computers. We anticipate in the next 30 days or so to move those operations and then begin the demo for the renovation on half of the current dispatch floor. That's working on schedule. We still anticipate being done with that project before the holidays. We've lucked out a



little bit in the sense that all the stuff we were worried about with technology has miraculously been delivered. Everything we were told six or eight months related to the dispatch center itself is now sitting here in storage. So it's on site ready to go. That's a positive.

Scott Ruf: Where we are having a concern with equipment is our migration to move Versaterm for CAD or RMS to the cloud. That equipment has been approved and ordered just over a month ago, but Cisco was holding, at the time of the order, was about 180 day turn time. We're only about 35 days into that, but we anticipate that equipment being here sometime late summer, early fall. We will get at least part of the cloud migration completed, hopefully in the fall. It'll be RMS for law enforcement first, followed by CAD MDT and that's for logistical reasons and the different lifts for those applications. So everything's really coming together for us personnel wise. If I didn't say it, we've been hiring small classes every few weeks, we're actually in a really good place right now.

Scott Ruf: We're only about four or five people under our authorized staffing. So we're hoping to do another group of four or five people here in the next couple of weeks. And of course, we always have life events. We've had a couple of younger people leave to go to the police academy and stuff like that, but we've anticipated some of that. So our attrition rate has really dropped to negligible numbers and our recruitment is getting a little more steady and better, and it has allowed us to do a lot of cross training. So we have significantly more police dispatchers now that are phone and police, and cross training on fire prior to fire season. So we're starting to implement some of the staffing models that as it relates to fire and police, as we go into the busy time of the year here in the Valley. I'll stop there for a second in case there's any comments, questions I'm going kind of fast. And then-

Korban Lee: Any questions? Yeah. Stop there for a sec. Let's pick up any questions for Scott thus far.

Doug Hill: Hey Scott, this is Doug.

Scott Ruf: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Doug Hill: You mentioned the CAD, I think you said NVP or maybe it was MVP. I'm not sure what you said, but is that the same as what we're currently using or at a different version for cloud-based software?

Scott Ruf: No, it's the same. We're just moving everything off of Prem servers to the cloud. So we'll virtualize all our systems. Now included in the cloud project, we've included in the quoting, an upgrade of the RMS and MRE for Law Enforcement. And then they just did an MDT upgrade this month. I think, but yeah, there's no change. There's no new software. There's no same product, just different environment. It could be hosted in a different environment, provide more stability, failover redundancy, which we're lacking right now.

Korban Lee: In that project, Scott, you mentioned RMS for fire will go first and then others, the subsequent others include the RMS for law enforcement.

Scott Ruf: No, I'm sorry. I thought I said RMS for law enforcement. So RMS, RME, which is their accident reporting, their court documents and then we'll do CAD. The reason for that is the amount of data and modules within the RMS side of it is a much heavier lift than CAD. All the fire agencies for the most part, that doesn't impact other than the CAD MDT part of it, because they all use third party RMS systems for their Fire EMS and that's tied to the state and federal fire reporting guidelines as well as their EPCR, their electronic patient care reporting, which fall under HIPPA and different things. So those are segregated out and interface back to the CAD system. So that was a long-winded answer to say Fire's in good shape, y'all benefit from the CAD MDT and then police from the RMS.

Korban Lee: Okay. Thank you. Scott. Other questions of Scott?

Scott Ruf: I did want to bring up one thing to let you know. I did have a brief conversation the other day with Mr. Tingey. I know this is a concern of other folks as far as the answering and managing of the non-emergency administrative phones here at VECC. From a customer service perspective, and what I explained to him, I'll let you know at a high level was. It wasn't to be honest with you, it wasn't as easy as I thought it was going to be

when we started dealing with the carriers, and then we have to get Motorola to program the phones. So I guess my point is it hasn't dropped off my radar. I understand it's the frustration of some of you, if not all of you, for a number of reasons, whether it be political, customer service, quality of service and things like that.

Scott Ruf: But we are exploring another option, which if it's deliverable, I'm going to fast track. AT&T has FirstNet, T-Mobile has their something hero's, public safety program, which I know UFA and UPD have transitioned to. They also offer a corporate enterprise solution, which would move it into a SAS environment or the cloud, which will remove all the barriers we have today. We could easily add phone numbers, direct lines, because one of the things I explained to Mr. Tingey, and I want to explain here is we do about .3-1.4 million admin non-emergency calls a year. What I can't tell you is, out of that, whether 500,000 are Cottonwood Heights, or 10,000 are Cottonwood Heights. So, our goal is to move to a platform where we know what city, what jurisdiction is calling, who they're calling, we'll be able to provide answer times, statistics back to your agencies.

Scott Ruf: And if we can move it to an enterprise solution in SAS environment. I already told them if they can deliver it, because they're on state contract, then we're going to do that sooner than later. And that'll achieve a lot of what we're trying to get us a better picture into that.

Scott Ruf: I did promise Mr. Tingey that I would update him weekly so he can provide updates to his council and that they know we are working on it. It just wasn't as quick or as easy, or as cheap as I thought it was going to be or could have delivered it and for a number of reasons. But we're looking at other options, which I think would be not only cheaper but more efficient. And if we move to an SAS environment and God forbid we have another pandemic, I can light up a call center anywhere, even not emergency people. We can hire people to work from home if we wanted to. So it'll give us a lot of flexibility, but I'll keep you all posted. I'm hoping if not today, before the end of the week, I have an answer from T-Mobile on their public safety enterprise solution. Anyway, I just wanted to throw that out there. I'll apologize to Mr. Tingey, if that was supposed to be between us, but I wanted to share it with everybody else because I know there's others that are concerned about it.

Korban Lee: Thank you, Scott. Tim, do you want to elaborate or share any further?

Tim Tingey: No, I don't really have a whole lot to say. I appreciate Scott pushing this forward and look forward to the weekly updates. Hopefully we can get it implemented as soon as we can. It's a concern, especially with some of my council members at this point.

Korban Lee: Thank you, Tim. Anyone else? Any questions or comments on this issue? Okay, Scott, I kind of interrupted you a couple times. Anything else on your Director's Report you want to cover?

Scott Ruf: Nope, I appreciate it. I will notify the Board that I was appointed by the UCA Board to the PSAP Advisory Committee. So I'll be representing the city or county of a first class at that UCA PSAP Advisory Committee. And I believe at the same meeting, Mr. Whatcott, correct me if you were there. I think Chief Brown from Salt Lake City was appointed for the Public Safety Advisory Committee for a city or county of a first class.

Korban Lee: What is it, Scott? Will you elaborate a little bit about that PSAP Advisory Committee? That's committee that advises to UCA?

Scott Ruf: Yeah. So it's a committee that's by statute under the UCA umbrella that takes statewide or PSAP concerns, and they vet a lot of policy issues, funding of things like if a center wants new telephone positions or radio positions, because a lot of this stuff is managed at the state level. Anything that's in the PSAP realm with regard to legislation and governance. In Utah it's unique in the sense that you have UCA that oversees. While they're not directly responsible for the 911 systems and networks and radio systems and networks, they provide guidance over the governance of 911, but they don't have a lot of authority outside of anything given to them through the legislature or statutorily with the PSAP. That allows us to vet things. They give the committees projects and provide input for different things.

Scott Ruf: And so it's good networking, a good dialogue. Everybody from first class down to I don't know what you go to in Utah, fifth or six class cities and towns. It's a good collection or cross section of the PSAP. That's what we do. I haven't been on it before, I'm aware of it. I would defer to if anyone knows more about it, but that's pretty much in a nutshell what the role is and they hold it's equivalent to an ex officio. I don't even know if it's that on the board for UCA or they're just a Committee Chair that reports to the UCA. That's not me though. I'm just on the committee.

Gary Whatcott: Basically a mandatory coordination meeting created by the legislature.

Korban Lee: Okay. Thank you, Gary. Well, Scott, we're glad you're there representing our interests. Thank you.

Scott Ruf: Thanks. And that was a much cleaner, succinct way to present it. I should have gone to Mr. Whatcott first, saved us all five minutes. Okay. I don't have anything else Mr. Chairman.

Korban Lee: Okay, and you covered everything you wanted to say about the Capital Project?

Scott Ruf: Yep. Oh, it's-

Korban Lee: Anything you wanted to say about the capital project?

Scott Ruf: Yep. It's moving forward. Everyone here's excited. Everyone's watching what we're doing, even around the state, as we add some technology and some changes. It'll be fun and interesting and hopefully done before Christmas.

Korban Lee: All right. Thank you, Scott.

Korban Lee: Let's go to the finance director's report. Clint let's turn the time over to you.

Korban Lee: Thank you for joining us, taking time out of GFOA to join us.

### **FINANCE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Clint Jensen: No problem. Welcome, or hello from St. George.

Clint Jensen: Can you hear me?

Korban Lee: Yes.

Clint Jensen: Everything good? Okay.

Clint Jensen: So just real quick on the financial report, it's where we'd expect it to be. We're 75% of the fiscal year complete and all of those numbers, especially on the expense side, are all within that 75% realm.

Clint Jensen: I do want to just call your attention to one number that's getting up there and it's on the overtime and it's kind of as we expect, as we've been understaffed most of the year. We see that overtime is being paid to make up for those staff shortages. So you see that number approaching 100%, but what you also see is a full-time wages number and part-time wages number, both being less than the 75%. So, in total we're okay. I just want to draw your attention to that number as it starts to inch to and will probably exceed that budget as we move forward these next three months.

Clint Jensen: Next page is the cash summary report, and it gives you an indication where we are cash wise. And again, this is a better picture that we have had a year ago, as we start to see maybe a little bit of accumulation of cash. We'll know better as we get towards the end of the year what that will look like, but this

is looking way better than it did a year ago. Then the last couple of pages are the checkbook, so be happy to answer any questions on those.

Korban Lee: Does anyone have any questions for Clint?

Dominic Burchett: Yeah. Mr. chair, this is Dominic.

Clint Jensen: Hi, Chief.

Dominic Burchett: I'm new and I was looking through the budget and the resolution for the fund balance that's coming up later in the agenda, but I was curious if you know, off the top of your head, the historical fund balance percentages on the unrestricted account?

Clint Jensen: Yeah. That's been hard to tie down. If you go back several years, there was a little more fund balance, I think in the \$1 to \$2 million range, but in the last couple of fiscal years, as we get towards the end of the fiscal year into late June, we're getting down into less than a \$100,000 range. So, it's a really small percentage and that's why this fund balance policy that's coming up on the agenda was created to help us have some guidelines that we can stick to, as we try to build a little more cushion, a little bit of financial flexibility in our fund balances.

Clint Jensen: And they're really volatile because we only bill twice a year, so those fund balances get really good a couple times a year and then they drift off almost down to zero and then we bill again, and so we go through this rollercoaster ride throughout the year.

Dominic Burchett: Okay. Thank you for that.

Korban Lee: Thank you Chief. Any other questions of Clint?

Clint Jensen: If there's no other questions on that, just as a note of point, we included the budget as part of the board packet. That is just, keep it in front of you, there's no action to be taken at this board meeting, but next board meeting will be our public hearing and an opportunity for you to take action on that.

Clint Jensen: Scott and I are willing to meet with you, answer questions if you have any on those line items in the budget, but we just want to keep that in front of you, so you see it a couple of times before we have a discussion next month.

Korban Lee: Thank you, Clint.

Korban Lee: Any questions for Clint while we've got him here and while we're here as trustees? Any questions for Clint about the proposed budget? In the packet this time will have been the second. This hasn't changed, Clint, from what we saw last month...

Clint Jensen: Exactly the same.

Korban Lee: ... in the draft budget, right?

Clint Jensen: That is correct.

Korban Lee: Okay. Anyone have questions for Clint about budget items? Okay. Thank you, Clint. Well done. Thank you. We are in a better position this year than this time last year, so thank you for the work you've been doing on that.

Clint Jensen: You bet.

Korban Lee: Let's go to agenda items number nine, consideration of resolution T22-03. This resolution proposed in a resolution to adopt a fund balance policy.

**CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION T22-03 VECC FUND BALANCE POLICY**

Korban Lee: As we discussed as Trustees earlier this calendar year, coming into our next budget, we all noticed that the center's fund balance was very low.

Korban Lee: It was low as a percent of the overall budget. It was low as a percent of just having cash on hand to be able to make payroll at the end of the fiscal year. And, felt like we probably ought to give the center, give ourselves, and give future trustees future guidance as to a desire of what is an appropriate fund balance to carry for the center. And set our goals, set a policy for how much fund balance should we be carrying over at the end of each fiscal year?

Korban Lee: The fund balance policy before you is the finance committee's attempt at that policy. The policy does list different types of fund balances. For example, whether it's a restricted or an unrestricted fund, if the funds are committed.

Korban Lee: For example, we may have a fund balance that's really big at the end of this fiscal year. However, the vast majority of it is committed or restricted funds because they're bond proceeds that we got for the remodel. Well, our true fund balance is very, very small. Our fund balance, I shouldn't say our true fund balance. Our unrestricted fund balance is very, very small.

Korban Lee: This policy, Clint, and I'm asking you to jump in here if I start wandering off track. This policy primarily identifies these different types of fund balance and sets a goal for the unrestricted, unassigned fund balance, and it sets that goal as, our fund balance should be between 6%, at the low end and 10% at the high end of the center's annual budgeted personnel expenses. You'll see that in the paragraph there, that starts by saying operating reserves.

Korban Lee: That's the crux of the policy there. That the fund balance for the center should be between 6%, no lower than 6%, and no higher than 10% of our annual budgeted personnel expenses.

Korban Lee: This was what was put forward by the finance committee, after a lot of review and debate. Let me pause there and ask David. You're the chair of the finance committee, you want to say anything further, David Brickey? You want to chime in or elaborate at all on that?

David Brickey: Well, I didn't see Mr. Kartchner. He was very helpful in pushing forward some changes and suggestions to what we've now just been shared with, that Korban just shared. And I don't see him, I'm just flipping through to see if he's here.

Jason Mazuran: Bruce Kartchner is on the road back from GFLA.

David Brickey: Okay. He just wanted to point out, and I thought it made a lot of sense, the VECC structure is always at the end of the fiscal year tight currently, and we were trying to make sure we covered payroll for at least the two... Help me out Korban. Was it two months or two paychecks to make sure that was ultimately covered?

Korban Lee: Yeah, I think it was two months, two months-worth of payroll. And one of the things that I thought Bruce provided some value on in the finance committee was tying this fund balance. I had in my mind, a fund balance as a percent of the overall budget, and that the fund balance policy should be a range on the percent of the overall budget. But, as we talked, Bruce advocated for making it a percent of the budgeted personnel expenses.

Korban Lee: The overall center budget may grow and shrink dramatically from one year to the next based on, for example, bond proceeds and a remodel project, or some other large capital project. Our budget may be inflated because of one-time expenses or one-time revenues. And if our fund balance policy is tied to the overall budget, our fund balance may go up or down based on that growing or shrinking of the overall budget.

Korban Lee: But if the fund balance is tied to the senders annual budgeted personnel expenses, one; the personnel expenses are the largest part of the operating budget. Two; the personnel expenses will grow over

time as our personnel costs grow over time. And so, tying the fund balance policy to a percent of the personnel expenses will keep that fund balance kind of tracking the centers base budget, not accounting for one time cost or expenditures, capital projects, et cetera.

Korban Lee: That was a suggestion by Bruce, and I thought that was a very good suggestion, and hence, the finance committee put that in there. Is that fair David, am I paraphrasing that fairly?

Korban Lee: Anyone else on the finance committee want to chime in on this policy before we open it up for further comments? Okay. Let's open it up for comments from everybody.

Korban Lee: What do you think of this, of this fund balance policy? A: Primarily one. Does the percentage seem correct? Does the percent seem right? Two: Are you okay with it being tied to the personnel expenses of the center? Three: any other comments?

Mark Reid: If I may, I think tying it to the personnel costs is a very smart idea. This, unlike city budgets, is more of a cash flow issue than anything else. And we can't afford to run out of resources in order to meet payroll, which I think was always a challenge as Clint said at the end of each year or end of each six months. And so, tying it to that is very smart, especially based on the ideas that Korban just mentioned.

Mark Reid: My question is, and I haven't had a chance to talk to Bruce or others is, adopting a 6% to 10% level. Is that going to require us to have a special assessment from the entities?

Korban Lee: Clint, can you elaborate on that? Because we did talk about that. I'm going to let you answer them.

Clint Jensen: Yeah, and I think if you look at the resolution, what we're proposing is that over the course of three years, till fiscal year 2025, that we would let the underspend of each budget help build that account balance. That account balance we're looking at, on the low end, about \$850,000, and on the high end, about \$1.5 million. So, that's two to three payrolls that would cover. That would give us that nice flexibility at the end of the fiscal year to make sure that we make payroll.

Mark Reid: How close are we now to that level?

Clint Jensen: So, I'm projecting at the end of this fiscal year, 2022, we're going to be between \$300,000 and \$400,000 on fund balance. That compares to a year ago, we were at about \$45,000 in fund balance.

Clint Jensen: If we can continue that same type of underspend, that same time of being prudent in our expenses, we hope that again, by 2025 that we would meet that goal. We'd probably be closer to the upper end of that goal.

Korban Lee: Mark, if I can chime in. I think our intent was to get to this 6% to 10% range without having to do a special assessment. But, in the resolution, giving us some time to get there by just dropping the turnover savings or the budget savings at the end of each fiscal year into fund balance, until we get into that range.

Mark Reid: I like it. Thank you.

Korban Lee: Good questions. Other questions?

Korban Lee: Any other comments? Anyone like it? Hate it? Think the percentages are too high or too low?

Nathan Cherpesk: This is Nathan. I'm glad you guys did it. I support it. And I think let's start with the percentages you have and see how it works.

Wayne Pyle: Korban, I support it as well. We do have a formal fund balance policy at our city; probably most entities do, I would guess. And I did have a couple of questions, but those got answered in the discussion. So, I'm good.

Doug Hill: I'll move things along then by making a motion unless there are other comments to be made.

Tim Tingey: I just have one comment. I just want to reiterate I'm comfortable with it coming from the underspend, but not a special assessment. That was clarified, I just want to make sure this is the case.

Doug Hill: And I will move that we approve Resolution T22-03 regarding the VECC fund balance Policy.

David Brickey: I'll second that.

Korban Lee: Okay, we have a motion by Doug Hill, second by David Brickey. Any further conversation on the motion? Okay. Let's go on a roll call vote. Scott, we'll turn it to you.

Scott Ruf: Mr Lee, West Jordan.

Korban Lee: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr Brickey, Riverton.

David Brickey: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr Dobbins, Draper.

David Dobbins: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr Hill, Murray.

Doug Hill: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Whatcott, South Jordan.

Gary Whatcott: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Collins, South Salt Lake.

Josh Collins: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr Cherpeski, Herriman.

Nathan Cherpeski: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Reid, Bluffdale.

Mark Reid: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Deputy Mayor Hartman.

Lisa Hartman: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Tingey, Cottonwood Heights.

Tim Tingey: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Chief Cottam for Taylorsville.

Brady Cottam: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Chief Burchett, UFA.

Dom Burchett: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Chief Mazuran, UPD.

Jason Mazuran: Yes.

Scott Ruf: And Mr. Pyle, West Valley City.

Wayne Pyle: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Alright, it's unanimous, Mr. Chair.

**Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. Doug Hill, to approve Resolution T22-03 regarding the VECC fund balance policy; the motion was seconded by Mr. David Brickey; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

Korban Lee: Great. Thank you.

Korban Lee: Those of you on the finance committee, thank you. That was a little bit of a tricky issue to work through in the finance committee. And David, thank you for your leadership in that discussion.

Mark Reid: Can I ask a quick question, somewhat related. As if we add entities to VECC, we should set a policy of what type, what level of fund balance they should bring on with them. I know as we've added in the past, they've come without any fund balance. So, it seems like to be fair to those that are adding to the fund balance that we may want to look at a policy that if other entities are added to VECC that they are added with a need of adding a fund balance too.

Korban Lee: Clint, will you put some thought into that? And Mark, it's a good question. Clint, will you put some thought into that and then perhaps bring it up with the finance committee at a future time?

Clint Jensen: Yes, I think as we talked to the finance committee, there's probably a whole spectrum of financial and fiscal policies we can work on. And I think that point by Mr. Reid will certainly be something we can consider as part of that discussion.

Korban Lee: Thank you, Clint.

Korban Lee: David, are you okay with that.

David Brickey: Yeah, I was just going to say, get an example of what the prior practices have been, Clint, and then discuss it next month in the finance committee group.

Korban Lee: Okay. Let's go on to agenda item number 10, closed session.

**CLOSED SESSION**

Korban Lee: I'm looking for a motion to enter into a closed session according to the Utah Code 52-4-205 to discuss strategy sessions for pending or imminent litigation.

Korban Lee: Anyone want to make that motion?

David Brickey: I'll make that.

Korban Lee: Okay, I have a motion from David Brickey to go into closed session. Is there a second.



Gary Whatcott: I'll second it.

Korban Lee: Okay. A second from Gary Whatcott

**Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. David Brickey, to move into a closed session; the motion was seconded by Mr. Gary Whatcott; the motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting went into a closed session at 3:04 p.m.

**Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. Wayne Pyle, to move back into an open session; the motion was seconded by Mr. Josh Collins; the motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting went back into open session at 3:29 p.m.

Scott Ruf: All right, It's unanimous and there's nobody in the waiting room any longer Mr. Chairman, so-

Korban Lee: Okay. Thank you. We are back in public meeting. Before I go to agenda item number 12, motion to adjourn, I want to ask, are there any additional comments, any statements, any questions from any trustee members before we close the meeting?

Mark Reid: I missed the last meeting. Was it the intent to try and do an in-person meeting, next meeting?

Korban Lee: Yeah. So, let me comment on that because I was going to bring that up. Thank you for asking Mark. At the last meeting, I think we discussed and came to the conclusion we would do once a quarter in-person meetings, and then the other two meetings in each quarter would be over Zoom. And that we would try to do the first meeting of each quarter, that would've been this April meeting. So, it would've been January, April, July, and October. However, there were some conferences, we changed the meeting by a week. And with all of that, we decided let's not try to do the in-person meeting today, but let's start our in-person meeting this next quarter. So, I believe it will be our intent, unless anyone wants to propose something different. We will hold the May and June meetings via Zoom and start with our July meeting in person. And then July, October, January, April, and stay on that schedule once per quarter. Is that okay with everyone. Does anyone want to propose anything different or want to change that up?

Mark Reid: Sounds good.

Josh Collins: Just that's the summer. So, I'm going to be out of town already at that time for the first-time meeting. So-

Korban Lee: I thought about that with July, right? That June, July, August, all of those are going to be a little bit challenging in person, particularly perhaps the July meeting.

Mark Reid: In the past, not the last two years, I think, but we've actually cancelled the July meeting.

Korban Lee: I'm pretty open to this. I don't really have strong feelings. I do like the once per quarter in person schedule. I don't really care which meeting it is. Would you rather do what would that be like May, August, November?

Doug Hill: No, let's just keep it on the natural quarter break and let's make a decision about July when we get closer to that date. That's my take on it.

Mark Reid: I like it.

Korban Lee: I don't want it to be hard to remember whether we're in person or not.

Gary Whatcott: Aren't you going to always have an option, even if when we're in person that you can get on, if you need to?

Korban Lee: Yeah, we will.

Gary Whatcott: Okay.

Korban Lee: I mean, Doug and I are here cozy in the boardroom. We miss you all in the boardroom today because we just both happen to be out here, but let's do April. Let's do first month of each quarter. So, January, April, July, October. And take it from there. Okay.

Gary Whatcott: Okay.

Korban Lee: Any other comments, questions. Look for a motion to adjourn.

Mark Reid: Move we adjourn.

Korban Lee: Is there a second?

Wayne Pyle: Second.

Korban Lee: All right. All in favor.

All: Aye.

Korban Lee: Okay.

Wayne Pyle: Thanks Korban. Everybody, Scott.

Josh Collins: All right. Thanks.

Gary Whatcott: Thanks everyone.

Scott Ruf: Thank you.

The meeting adjourned at 3:34 p.m.