

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

May 18, 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. Dom Burchett - UFA
Mr. Jake Petersen – 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. John Evans – West Valley City
Mr. Derek Maxfield – West Jordan
Mr. Brady Cottam – Taylorsville
Mr. Terry Addison – South Salt Lake
Mr. Robbie Russo – Cottonwood Heights
Ms. Colleen Jacobs – West Valley City
Mr. Clint Smith – Draper
Ms. Andrea Partridge – VECC
Mr. Craig Burnett – Murray
Ms. Lisa Dudley – UPD
Mr. Todd Gray – Taylorsville
Ms. Nicole Lopez – VECC
Mr. Ryan Carter – Riverton
Mr. Jonathan Bridges – VECC
Mr. Bruce Kartchner – Bluffdale
Ms. Kari Bueno – VECC
Mr. Tony Bueno - VECC

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.

Korban Lee: Welcome, everyone. Welcome, thanks for joining us via Zoom today. Just a reminder, we will be on Zoom for the trustees meeting in June, and our trustees meeting in July will be in-person. From there going forward, we will have an in-person trustees meeting, still with Zoom capabilities, but an in-person trustees meeting the first meeting of each quarter, starting in July. So, July, October, January, and April.

Korban Lee: With that, Scott, thank you for sending out the minutes from the April meeting. Does anyone have any comments, any corrections, anything they want to mention about the minutes? Yes, David, go ahead.

David Brickey: I know it's a small matter, but in it, there's a reference to a different 'Korban' spelling sometimes. For example, I can find one. I found on page five where Wayne Pyle asks, "I did want to add to what you're saying there, Corban..." and I just think we should probably try to be consistent. The 'K-O-R-B-A-N', versus this other 'Corban'.

Scott Ruf: Yep, thanks Mr. Brickey. On page two, page four, and page five, there's a couple of typos, one of which was 'Korban' with a C instead of a K. It just got missed. On page four, there was a 'Mark' which should be 'March', and page two it should be 'vote' and I think it's a 'C-O-T-E'. Those are the three that I've been made aware of for the record.

David Brickey: Okay.

Mark Reid: There's also a misspelling of my name a few times, 'R-E-E-D'. It should be R-E-I-D.

Scott Ruf: Okay.

Mark Reid: I wasn't going to bring it up.

Korban Lee: There's occasionally these scrivener errors that we'll catch. I guess I'm comfortable with a motion that approves the minutes, then authorizes Scott to correct scrivener errors that are brought to his attention by trustees.

Korban Lee: Undersheriff Petersen, sorry. Go ahead.

Undersheriff Petersen: On page one, it lists me as present for that meeting and I was not, I believe Chief Mazaran was present for that meeting.

Scott Ruf: Yeah, he was.

Undersheriff Petersen: He was listed in the voting, but...

Korban Lee: That's an important one, thank you.

Korban Lee: Anyone else have any comments on the minutes?

Wayne Pyle: I'll make the motion, as you stated it, Korban. Approve minutes with approval for the executive director to make scrivener-type corrections as needed.

Korban Lee: Question on the motion before it gets a second. Will you add to that motion, a correction of Undersheriff Petersen's attendance?

Wayne Pyle: Yes.

David Brickey: I'll second that.

Korban Lee: Okay. We've got a motion by Mr. Pyle, a second by Mr. Brickey. All in favor say aye.

Speakers together: Aye.

Korban Lee: Any opposed?

APPROVAL OF APRIL 28, 2022 BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEETING MINUTES

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Wayne Pyle, to approve the amended minutes of the April 28, 2022 Trustees meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. David Brickey; the motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Korban Lee: Okay, great. Let's keep going. Agenda item number three, public comments. Is there anyone attending this meeting with us virtually today that would like to make public comment in the meeting?

Scott Ruf: We haven't received any electronically, either.

Korban Lee: Okay. With no one speaking up and no prior electronic requests for public comment, we will close the public comment portion of the meeting.

OPERATIONS BOARD

Korban Lee: Let's move on to agenda item number four, which is the reports from the Ops boards. Let's start with Chief Burnett and the police department. Chief, we'll turn it over to you.

Craig Burnett: Hi, we'll make this really quick. We had some scheduling conflicts and had very light turnout at our last meeting, so anything we talked about will be covered by the director's report. We have nothing to report today.

Korban Lee: Does anyone have any questions for Chief Burnett, or for the police Ops Board more generally?

Korban Lee: Okay, you're off the hook, Chief. Thank you.

Korban Lee: Let's go to Chief Addison for the Fire Operations Board update.

Terry Addison: Right. Thank you.

Terry Addison: During the fire operations board, we had a report from the fire user's group where they discussed verbalizing status along with using the MDT, versus just going silent still. They're still working on that to make sure we have some solid feedback from the units in the field, so we're expecting to run that through January of 2023.

Korban Lee: Chief?

Terry Addison: Yes sir?

Korban Lee: Before you go off, can you elaborate a little bit about what that is? I don't know if everyone knows. What do you mean on verbalizing status versus MDT or going silent?

Terry Addison: Sure. Silent dispatching, using the MDT and pushing like an F1 key, F2 key, F3 key, to go en-route, arrive, or going out to the hospital, so we're not taking up airtime. We're still having some connectivity issues in some places in the valley where the MDTs are down in the fire apparatus and they're not connecting. So, the users in the field are still going by voice over the radio and pushing the buttons on the key at the same

time, so we can ensure that we have the appropriate dispatch, arrival, and route times and so forth from the units in the field. Did that answer it, Mr. Lee?

Korban Lee: Yes, thank you.

Terry Addison: Okay, thank you. The users' groups also looking at the target hazard policy, which we'll have coming up to us in a little while. Then, they had some round table discussion on animal rescues, mainly duck rescues - it's that time of the year. VECC is going to type those similar to hydrant checks. So, we won't dispatch on calls, it'll just be like a service-type call. The units are still on service and able to handle any other call that might come in, in their area.

Terry Addison: We had our report from the tech users' group. A lot of that was the same information. We're still waiting on some hardware to move to the Versaterm cloud. And then, we were told that the last outage that we had was due to some BCI and police requirements with the RMS System and some other requirements. So, they had an outage until that was repaired.

Terry Addison: Mr. Ruf will cover the directors report. We had an EMD report, as well, where we meet with the VECC Medical Control. They're working on tracking the Apple Watch activation, and that's still ongoing and working good. They did some QA reviews on full arrest calls, with the way the call takers and senders were handling the calls.

Terry Addison: And then, there is a request to add some fall guides to the blood disorder patients, which is in the process of being approved by the doctor, along with a pathway to irreversible death, which is in the protocol now and approved by the doctor.

Terry Addison: The largest one, which will probably lead to some discussion with the trustees, are time penalties. Everyone here knows that we have our medical dispatches separated into two different criteria: a priority one call and a priority two call. Historically, since we've moved to Versaterm and we switched it out to priority one and priority two, the priority two call is similar to what we were used to with Spillman. So, that is going to... for instance, your lower acuity calls, a sick person, nothing that requires a quick ALS response. On our priority two calls, those will exhaust your agency first before it reaches out and captures any mutual aid companies.

Terry Addison: Priority one call is where we're using the AVL, we're using that GPS dispatching. Some jurisdictions, I've ran into some anomalies with the right-hand turns, left hand turns, and we're bringing mutual aid into our jurisdictions, when the time difference is anywhere from eight seconds to 30 seconds, for instance. There wasn't a fire chief in the meeting that was comfortable with adding a penalty, which we're going to discuss, in excess of 20 seconds. So, that penalty that we want to entertain, that we want to actually try as a pilot program, because we're not able to put it in the development side and get actual data, we have to use it in the production side where units are out responding on the calls. So, we wanted to add a 20 second penalty to the incoming mutual aid time.

Terry Addison: For example, I'll use Engine 43 in South Salt Lake as an example. They're located on West Temple, roughly 3400 south. Station 101 from the UFA is on 3900 south and roughly 800 east. Now, if I go to an area on 3300 south and 500 east, which is a block away, by GPS coordinates UFA 101 will beat me by 10 to 15 seconds. So, if we add a 20 second penalty on it for example, Engine 43 for instance, would be able to travel one block further in their jurisdiction, for example, from 300 east to 500 east on 3300 south. Another example would be in South Jordan, there is a care center which has an 8 second difference by GPS drive time, by using a local jurisdiction ALS unit, or an outside jurisdiction ALS unit.

Terry Addison: So, if we put this 20 second penalty on South Jordan would be able to handle additional calls in their area. Like I said we want to run it as a pilot program, possibly starting June 1st and run this until Versaterm has what they are calling a bubble dispatch option available, which is almost like a stack or a hybrid type system which should be ready for testing some time maybe late summer, or early fall of 2022. That bubble dispatch would be for instance say you have a target hazard like the Men's Resource Center in South Salt Lake, or a high acuity place in Midvale, that you could pick that address, and correct me if I misspeak Scott, and do that area by stacking. So, you might have your first ALS engine and ambulance in your jurisdiction, followed by your second one, even if the third one might be 5 or 10 seconds closer than your second, just because it's a high utilizer and instead of putting that extra burden on your neighbor your own jurisdiction would handle that bit. And that is what we discussed in the operations meeting.

Korban Lee: Thank you Chief. Let's open it up for questions of Chief Addison.

Wayne Pyle: I've got a question Korban, which is... I may have missed this or just forgot it from an earlier meeting but what's the rationale behind even going through this complexity? Seems like a little added weirdness. I sort of understood the homeless shelter and South Salt Lake example, I mean you might want the South Salt Lake guys with more focused or prioritized skills there, but other than that I don't think I really understand why we are looking at this, opposed to just sending the fastest unit?

Terry Addison: Okay. Mr Pyle so each jurisdiction, and Draper has some additional anomalies than some of the other places, and the anomalies with the right hand turns and left hand turns for instance, and so, with that 20 second penalty we've had a lengthy discussion on this for four to five, six months now where units are responding with other units as far as your ALS, say ambulance, 73, might be responding with South Salt Lake, you know that's kind of a bad example because we've worked so well and close together for years...

Wayne Pyle: Right.

Terry Addison: But we don't operate and train with each other that much. So, that extra 20 seconds might keep that continuity of care with a West Valley ambulance and a West Valley engine together. So, you have all that group continuity. The other example would be - I wish I knew the care center - but there's a care center in South Jordan, it's maybe 10 to 12 seconds difference in response time for a South Jordan unit and a UFA unit. A care center generates quite a few calls, and so the other example was if we put that 20 second penalty on the incoming mutual aid, it makes them 20 seconds slower and, in a sense, it makes our people 20 seconds faster in our own jurisdictions. So, those units are able to handle more calls in your area, in your city, in your municipality.

Wayne Pyle: Was this, and you're right Chief and thanks for that answer, and I am sort of remembering some of the background discussion now but another question I had was this desire or this look initiated at the administrative end of any of the cities, or was this something the Chief's themselves wanted to do?

Terry Addison: No, its come up from the users, the firefighters, the boots on the floor, up to the fire Chiefs, we've had the same discussions with some of the areas as...I don't want to talk revenue but some of our ambulances aren't going to our different areas. So, it came up to the Chief with the concerns that we're getting from the field crews, where they know they could be closer, they want to handle more of their calls in their local jurisdiction. The Chiefs in turn had an additional discussion on it, discussing those close times, and basically what it's doing is, it's getting not as close to where we were previously, we're still having those GPS dispatch by AVL. It's just allowing our units to be 20 seconds faster in basically our own areas to handle some of those right-hand turns, left hand turns and so forth.

Terry Addison: Some of the different anomalies, for instance, I'm going to give an example, I'm trying to think if...let's just go 5300 South and Redwood Road or in Draper on 300 east - they call that 'New Jersey J' - where you have to make a right hand turn because you can't do a left hand turn, so that adds an additional time even though you're really not that much further out in your own area. So, trying to cover some of those anomalies until there are other fixes available in Versaterm.

Wayne Pyle: How did you as the Chiefs decide that 20 seconds was the number at which you were at least partly comfortable? As opposed to shorter or longer?

Terry Addison: It was through discussion, we've heard through the firefighters and paramedics on the floor, through dispatch, and some of the different anomalies that we're seeing ranging anywhere from 8 seconds to 10 seconds, up to, in Draper for instance, some instances of a minute, where units from outside agencies are going to be coming into your area just to the geographic areas of the layout in your city.

Terry Addison: So, when we were doing the discussion we threw out 20 seconds, we threw out 30 seconds, we threw out 15 seconds, and through discussion we just all compromised on that 20 seconds actually, and thought we would month by month basis on a pilot program to see if it even makes a change. Some areas it will make a change on probably the closer areas where, for instance, it's the geographic location of engine or station 101 into South Salt Lake, or into West Valley station 76 and the old UFA station 7 for instance there on 5600 West if it was in operation. So, if 76 and 7's were both available, how is it going to overlap right there in one corner of West Valley city, where you might be going into USANA or UFA might be coming into USANA on some type of event more often than your own jurisdiction where the taxpayers are covering more of the cost.

Doug Hill: I might add also that, for Wayne and for everybody else, that Murray certainly supports this. We often get calls from residents or even elected officials about "why are people outside of our jurisdiction responding to calls?" And so, I think this helps solve, for all the reasons Terry mentioned, but this also helps all of our political issues of Murray city, people like Murray city to respond within Murray city and in our conversations with our paramedics, our fire Chief, we were comfortable as long as the fire Chiefs were comfortable with that 20 second penalty, that does help us be able to respond to more places in Murray than currently we had to deal with.

Korban Lee: Another question, Chief Burchett and then David Brickley.

Dom Burchett: Thank you Mr Chair, so from my perspective, from Unified fires perspective this penalty was brought up a number of months ago in attempts to keep the integrity of the AVL system together, there were discussions that were happening where it seemed like some anomalies were causing concern to the point where it looked like it might be an issue holding it together, and so this 20 seconds was identified to try to keep the integrity of the AVL model together. In my mind, after we did a little bit of research, and Scott ran a couple of maps, it didn't seem like 20 seconds is where it would end for me, it feels like 20 seconds is a number that is arbitrary, that might solve a couple of issues on the border but I think my biggest concern is that it is going to creep to 25 and then 30 and then 40, and then we will be away from the AVL altogether. In my mind, what I am concerned about is providing the best service to the community and that boundary doesn't matter to me.

Dom Burchett: We have relationships with all the fire departments in the Valley through this AVL and we give in some areas, and we take in some areas, and I am okay with that as a fire Chief to know that my fire engine is crossing a border to be there quicker. Chief Addison you said it is 20 seconds faster, but it's not, it's 20 seconds faster in your computer but to the person that is calling 911, it's slower, right? And that's what is my concern, that we are not providing the best service as the group of fire Chiefs if we implement this penalty. I think it has given us a lot of opportunities to work with other agencies, train with other agencies, so that continuation of

care in my mind isn't such a big deal that can't be handled without a little bit more outreach and a little bit more training. I am really concerned that we put this penalty on, and then we are held liable for not getting there as quick as possible because of the color of our truck.

Dom Burchett: So, Chief Petersen may have been supportive of the 20 second penalty but I am not supportive of it, and I would not recommend that we go that route.

Korban Lee: Thank you Chief.

Korban Lee: David, let's go to you.

David Brickey: Thanks Korban. I probably was just going to simply echo what Chief Burchett said, it seemed arbitrary and capricious to come up with 20 seconds the way it was explained, and I would propose, given the magnitude of how this might impact some of the cities more directly than others, that there should be something of an explanation in a form of a written proposal, whether it's 20 seconds, 25 or 30, that is then shared with the executive board that then could be contemplated and given more thorough consideration. Because at this point if you are asking to implement the 20 second after this meeting, I am going to be really uncomfortable and say "no way," not based on what was just shared today, I'm hearing complete opposite explanations of what the impact might be for one community versus another. And so, without more and more detailed information I think we shouldn't vote on consideration of a 20 second delay, as it would impact all of us today differently. So, I just wanted to share that.

David Brickey: If we are going to do this, I would like a written explanation of how it rolls out, how long does it stay in place if we have a catastrophic loss of life because of it? How does that play out? And I understand Chief Addison's explanation of priority one and priority two, but like Chief Burchett said there is going to be an impact here that I don't want the city of Riverton to hold the bag on.

David Brickey: Thanks.

Korban Lee: Thank you, David. Other questions for Chief Addison, or other comments on this issue?

Gary Whatcott: I guess I'm still not sure, I kind of got the impression that we were actually making better time the way that the CAD was directing it is more the way the crow flies than it is about the real turns, and I thought Chief Addison, you said we were getting there quicker sometimes, in some cases? Rather than the recommended response, is that true? Or am I missing something?

Terry Addison: That is true, you are getting there quicker on some instances and the GPS will always be closer, but the way it was explained to me as well was even with that GPS, it goes into the mapping, they're taking in some of the anomalies for right hand turns and left hand turns which might delay it 5 seconds to 8 seconds and so forth, so we're trying to recover those 5 and 8 seconds to handle a few more calls in your own jurisdiction.

Gary Whatcott: Yeah I think...so I am just going to David's comment "we want the closest unit and the fastest response", we're not always getting that is what I'm hearing and so, maybe what we need to do is look at this thing to make sure we aren't moving as fast, that those are the ones being adjusted, and it's not just across the board, maybe it's specific to these different areas, and where the anomalies are done. Maybe that's just hard to do on the system, I don't know.

Terry Addison: Sure, and Director Ruf will be able to explain that a little bit better because whatever change we make it would be global, even with Salt Lake City.

Korban Lee: Scott, let's go to you.

Scott Ruf: Just wanted to let you know that this is a global setting in the Versaterm system. So, it's across the board for all agencies like the Chief said, including Salt Lake City. I just wanted to clarify one thing that Chief Addison brought up, early on we did have a discussion in the Ops board about drive penalties and Chief Evans or Addison, correct me if I am wrong, about left turns and traffic signals, and speed limits and we did a lot of research, or a bunch of research with some agencies and they have abandoned those types of penalties. So, I just wanted to clarify that those penalties don't currently exist on our system today. So, we are not taking into consideration a left turn delay, there might be a delay just because they happen to make a left turn, or different roads. But there are no penalties currently layered into the AVL system today. So, we don't take into consideration any of that other stuff, and I think the Chiefs agreed not to do that because it would create more of a challenge.

Korban Lee: Thank you for that clarification, Scott.

Korban Lee: Other comments or questions?

Josh Collins: If I can, can you explain Chief Addison if this 20 second penalty would cause a problem with a medical response and a medical emergency? With the example of your 101 and 43, will that cause a concern for you as a professional in responding to a medical emergency, meaning the difference between being able to treat someone appropriately, save a life, etc. Is that going to make a difference for you in treating?

Terry Addison: With the 20 second penalty, that's why no fire Chief was comfortable with going past 20 seconds, so the 20 seconds could be eaten up as easy, or as quickly as a firefighter putting their shoes on, to get on the truck, making it out to the engine to respond. So, what it's doing is, like I said, is bringing in your mutual aid companies 20 seconds slower which in sense is just slowing them down a little bit. I am comfortable with 20 seconds, I know some fire Chiefs are comfortable with a little more or a little less, and some fire Chiefs are not comfortable with it at all. And so, with the 20 seconds it will make a difference for some agencies and for other agencies it will not. Like I said it might be four or five house difference, responding into one area or another.

Terry Addison: Scott?

Scott Ruf: The only other thing I want to make, just for clarification... And again, I'll do whatever the board and the Chiefs decide... is that the penalty is making an assumption that everything is perfect, right? Nobody is out and about, everybody is home, in the station, so this gets skewed when you start being mobile right? So, the Valley is, I'd like to say steady, not necessarily busy, although we do get our highs and lows like anywhere else. So, it changes as the units change if that makes sense, so if everybody was home and nothing was going on and there was one call in South Jordan and everybody was in safe, it would work, but once people are out and mobile the system takes different things. So, you theoretically could have an engine driving down a street and pass a block where a cardiac arrest is coming in and it's not going to recognize that unit. Because it's looking for the agency first based on the penalties, cause they are an outside unit, and they might drive down a block and get a 20, 30 second wind outside that window and not be selected.

Scott Ruf: So, I just want to make sure that to Chief Adams point is it would be true if everybody was always home, and we do one call at a time. So that could skew the responses, so I'm just trying to clarify points, so there is no misunderstanding about how it works. And then, I think Chief Addison alluded to this, if an MDT goes to sleep, or if somebody turns it off, or it fails, the system automatically defers to the station XY, so as long as they're in service ... the truck is in service ... even if their MDT fails, they will default to their station for AVL. So even though they might be closer, there's always these... I don't want to 'what if' these, there is always

some anomalies where a Captain of Battalion, or Chief, or somebody may or may not want to step in and fix a dispatch based on people moving around, or equipment working or not working. I don't know if that made it clear or muddier for people but...

Josh Collins: Can I also ask, or just respond a little bit to what Mr. Brickey was talking about as far as making a motion about it today, I don't think procedurally that is where we are at right? This is just an issue that the Chiefs have brought forward. We would have to move this to another meeting, correct?

Korban Lee: That's a good question, this issue is not separately agendized. There is enough discussion here, I feel like this issue is not settled quite enough amongst us that the Ops board, I think Chief, you suggested starting this pilot June 1st. I'm a little uncomfortable with that because we don't feel settled, whether it's Chiefs or trustees. But I don't know if Josh your question about whether we take a motion on something in here, that's a good question.

Josh Collins: I didn't think procedurally we could because it wasn't noticed.

Korban Lee: Yeah, I don't... That's a good question. Scott, are you on with us? Scott Young? You may not be on with us.

Tim Tingey: I am along with what David said, I'd like to have a little bit more information. There is enough concern I think has been expressed, or differing views that I think we need to see something in writing, look at it and then have a more formal conversation after that and a decision.

Scott Young: This is Scott Young. I think Josh is right, I think that the motion should be noticed.

David Brickey: Korban if that's the case then we need to put this on another agenda, does Chief Addison become the representative? I just think it's only fair that we know who is going to be doing that. If Chief Addison wants to do that, that's great, but I appreciate Mr. Collins bringing that, and clarifying that in Mr. Young's answer. So, I am a little more comfortable, I thought if we were going to try and vote today I was going to object, so I appreciate you all looking at perhaps putting this on another agenda and getting some additional information out there, I think that's wise.

Korban Lee: Does anyone have concerns with putting this on a future trustee's agenda item for consideration, and hence I think it follows to say, asking the Ops board not to implement this change yet, until we discuss it further as trustees.

Nathan Cherpeski: Korban, I would like to see something in writing, I think as Tim and some of the others have said, that outlines this. So that we can actually make an informed decision. And I may have missed this, this is the first time I've heard this conversation.

Korban Lee: I would like some counter viewpoints too. I know the Chiefs aren't 100%, I know the 20 seconds was kind of a compromise, right? The Chiefs are 100% on any delay or any penalty across jurisdictional lines, and so what I would like to see is something in writing that lists point by counterpoint. I'll be honest I am not a fan of this issue on the surface, taking priority one calls and intentionally adding a delay to the closest unit responding, because of a jurisdictional line. I am struggling with that, and I'd like to see it articulated well, with the reasoning why, the justification and defensibility of why, and why this improves or enhances public safety, and improves our response, versus the closest unit responding, regardless of jurisdictional boundaries. I am personally not sold on this yet, and so I would like to see something in writing that lists both sides on this issue.

Josh Collins: Can I ask another question real quick? It was mentioned by Chief Addison the 'bubble' or the Versaterm were going to implement something for specific high utilizer areas, when is that going to go into effect? Maybe that's a Chief Addison question or a Scott Ruf question.

Scott Ruf: So, like the Chief said the plan is to have it live sometime this summer. So here is some background on it, right now we build out response plans for the call types, there is a command in there, so right now there is no 'then', everything is an 'or'. So, it doesn't have the flexibility on the AVL side to build it out that way, so that's what that bubble is, they're editing some commands. Right now, it's 'this' or 'this', and we are trying to change it to say 'then' or 'if', so if this happens, then this will happen. So, if South Salt Lake is busy with other calls, they'll say so if South Salt Lake is busy, then get me the closest medic ambulance. Does that make sense? Right now, we don't have that 'then', that modifier that allows the system to work that way, so that's really what the bubble is, it's kind of a primary, secondary, that 'if this happens then do this'. And we can't do that.

Josh Collins: Thank you. I appreciate that explanation. The reason I bring that up is because if we are going through the process that we just described that I think most trustees are comfortable with, of getting the feedback in a written format, not having a discussion, that's going to put us into July probably before anybody is comfortable ever authorizing the Chiefs to implement this. And if we are getting close to having the bubble already implemented in July or August or whenever this is going to be, it might just make that whole conversation moot. So, that's why I ask.

Korban Lee: So, Josh you make a good point, maybe we shouldn't conflate these two issues, right? Is the bubble issue... if the bubble if, then sequencing as a separate issue than the 20 second penalty on jurisdictional lines, are they intertwined issues? Or issues that can proceed separately?

Scott Ruf: They're separate but there is some overlap. So, what they are calling the bubble...and I just text our project manager with Versaterm to see if she can get me a better... ETA. So...

Scott Ruf: The penalty issue is one issue, the bubble we believe will fix the need for the penalty cause what it will say is "I want you to look for all of South Salt Lake first, and if they are not available then give me this." It sounds like I am saying the same thing so...

Chief Addison: That's my understanding on how Chief Maxfield and Lin explained it, for instance that bubble...I'll just use a men's resource center as an example, and please correct me Scott, I would use all South Salt Lake resources to go to the Men's Resource Center which generates quite a few calls for the city of South Salt Lake, calls that don't necessarily meet the criteria for a priority one. However, due to the nature of the phone caller, or the way the call taker took the call, it's going to be coded as a priority one, but through the training and experience we have with dealing with that area, it would use our units before I start pulling West Valley units in, or UFA units in, tying them up on...I don't want to say benign calls but...calls that, where those units could be used in better places for additional priority one calls. Is that correct Scott?

Scott Ruf: Yeah, so on the medical side we already do a one and two, so on the priority two stuff you get all your agency stuff first, that's a traditional old school roll out of equipment. On the priority ones its AVL, and that's this penalty would affect. The Chiefs believe, and I know that like South Jordan maybe South Salt Lake that any...and to some degree Murray, that this fixes 99% of their problem or their concern, I don't want to say it is a problem. This penalty won't impact Draper, at least in some areas of their city and that's where Chief Addison said you know we believe it will fix it, but not all. So, they are separate but also a little bit overlapping.

David Dobbins: So, Korban, as one of the cities that's involved in this, I think it's clear that we can't make a decision today. It may even take more than the June meeting, but I'd be happy to get some of the other cities together, their fire Chiefs and have this discussion, try to bring something back for the entire board, to hear

from both sides of the issue, so that we can try to move this forward. I don't think we can get any further today, but certainly we all have differing opinions on what the best option is, but maybe so the whole board can be more comfortable. I have been discussing this with my Chief for a while, as a few others of you have, some of you are clearly hearing this for the first time, I'd be happy to get together a small group so we can bring something back to the board with some recommendations, or at least with the different sides of the issue.

Gary Whatcott: The other thing I was going to ask, is it possible, as we're going to be there in person, can we see a screen as the calls are dispatched, can you actually see how it functions rather than just read a white paper, is that possible? To get a better feel from that perspective, if you actually saw how it was being mapped and done, versus just reading about it.

Scott Ruf: Let me ask, cause I don't know that we are going to get it. We'd have to do it on the live side of the system, if we want to see it in real time, so not that I want to wish ill will on any of our citizens, but we would be at the mercy of what is happening in the community during the meeting.

Scott Ruf: Because what you will see is the trucks and apparatus moving around the county and things like that, I mean we can do some scenarios, like from Chief Addison's point, if it was South Jordan, that care facility as well, if we wanted to use that and do some scenarios for South Jordan. If you want us to do that individually for you and your administrators, to come to you, I can send Lin and Elyse, and walk you through maybe in a fire commands/city administrative type setting specific to your jurisdiction and do some scenarios on what those impacts are, based on locations.

Scott Ruf: I think some of this, and Chief Addison correct me if I am wrong, at least with Murray, South Salt Lake and South Jordan there is very specific locations that are high volume, I don't want to say like frequent flyers but we have a lot of transports and calls to those facilities, where in Draper say it's more of a geographical issue than it is a specific facility issue, if that makes sense to folks? So, I don't know if Mr Whatcott that would help you if we sent someone to you with yourself and Chief Dawson and Tredeno, I'm sorry, Chief Lessner and Dawson, can go over that so you can see that maybe in scenario. Scenario that for you.

Gary Whatcott: I don't know if I need to, I just thought if it was easy to do that might be something to add to the meeting but if it's not easy to do then I don't want to add more complexity to it. I just thought if it was easy to do it might be interesting to see, but I understand the issue and I am kind of in support of it right now, but I don't think we are going to get there today.

David Brickey: If I can Korban, I appreciate it sounds like maybe Dave can work with maybe Doug and Gary and come back to the next time with an explanation that the rest of us can take a look at. I just think it makes sense. So, I appreciate Dave Dobbins leading out on that and hope we can keep moving along today.

Korban Lee: Dave we're going to take you up on that issue if you want to lead out. I do think Gary that question... Chief Addison you mentioned some specific anomalies, so in the write-up, or the presentation, or whatever, kind of show some specific anomalies you are referring to, that would be maybe helpful, cause the proposal, the response is a global response but it sounds like a global solution to a specific targeted issue, and sometimes there are a lot of unintended consequences when that occurs. So, it would be good if you could consider those or show some of those examples perhaps.

Korban Lee: Okay, with that, does anyone want to blare this issue further...

Korban Lee: Alright, Chief, alright go ahead Chief we are going to go back to you.

Dom Burchett: I'm not, I'm not, I just want to let Mr Dobbins know that I am happy to help out in any way if he wants to pull me in.

David Dobbins: Yeah, we plan on it, I'll reach out to you and as well as Gary and Doug, and we'll schedule a time. You are probably affected more than anyone else, so we can have your side in it.

Dom Burchett: And with that I am done Mr Chair.

Korban Lee: All right, anyone else?

Korban Lee: Chief Addison I don't know if we let you finish before we kind of hijacked your report, let's go back to you.

Terry Addison: Well I made that the last of my report because I knew it would have quite the discussion like Chief Burchett said we've been discussing this for quite a few months, and so we finally got to the point where we thought we would bring it to the trustees, because we did determine according to Director Ruf that we can't really try it and see if it works in development, it has to be live so, we'll work on it, thank you.

Korban Lee: Thank you Chief. Any questions for Chief Addison before we move off of the fire operations board briefing?

Korban Lee: All right Chief, thank you. You're off the hook, thank you for your report, and thank you for bringing up these issues.

DIRECTORS REPORT

Korban Lee: Okay, let's go on to the director's report agenda number 5. Scott let's turn the time over to you.

Scott Ruf: Thanks, I'll be brief. Something that was touched on by the Chiefs, we're still moving the Versaterm Cloud project forward, we're just waiting on equipment, and then we will be ready to move as soon as that equipment shows up.

Scott Ruf: We're looking to hire about another six or seven people and that will get us pretty close to or at full staff. So, we are hoping to have them trained up and on the floor by over the summer, but we're in good shape going into the summer. The Capital project is underway, we relocated the 911 call takers to the training room and the fire rescue is moving into the IC room which is right off the dispatch floor, and next week we are going to start demoing half of the dispatch center floor and rip all that old furniture and carpet and all that stuff out in preparation of doing all the new cabling and wiring, so that project is moving forward, as projected and as scheduled.

Scott Ruf: All our supply issues and things like that, that we were worried about are turning out not to be that big of a concern. In fact, some of our tech, we just got notified today, it was supposed to be here at the end of June, it's supposed to be delivered by Friday of this week, so things are starting to fall into place and moving along well. So still within scope, still well within or under budget so we're good there. Unless you tell me to stop, I am just going to keep going.

Scott Ruf: The progress report like you said, we're still going to report monthly. As you can see April, we've had even again a better month, well above the 90% at 15 even though we're going to stop reporting on that and I guess technically if we round up to 95 we hit the NENA standard for 95%, 20 seconds in less than 95%, sorry 95% less than 20 seconds. So, as you can see, we've continued to make progress and work towards obtaining and maintaining the goals or the standards for UCA.

Scott Ruf: You'll notice a little bit in April our transfers have gone down, we've stopped transferring calls between Salt Lake City and VECC. We had a call this morning for the CAD to Cad aggregator for UHP, that should be done here in the coming weeks, and then it will be incumbent on UHP or DPS to finish their half of it but as far as the project is concerned in delivering the data exchange hub we will have completed everything we've told everybody we were going to do as part of the CAD project in the grant, and we will just continue to bring the university on, later on throughout the year.

Scott Ruf: Other than that, I don't have a lot else to report.

Korban Lee: Let's open it up for questions. Any questions for Scott?

David Brickey: Not a question but just an appreciation of those guys, your folks are hitting the time that Senator Harper and others were expecting, and I appreciate their efforts.

Scott Ruf: Thank you, I'll make sure we reinforce that with the folks here.

Korban Lee: Thank you, David. Yes.

Korban Lee: Other questions or comments?

Wayne Pyle: Yeah, the same Korban, I also don't have a question, but was also going to say the same thing as David that the stats look good, it looks like good direction, thanks Scott.

Korban Lee: Anyone else? Thank you, Wayne. Anyone else?

Korban Lee: I've got a couple questions for you Scott. What happened on that abandonment rate? It really shot up this month.

Scott Ruf: Yeah, so we're not sure that's a good number, back in around March 9th or something, the Vesta system had a major hiccup and they had to do some changes, temporary changes to the call flow, so we think it was just an anomaly in the system that they took our queue audio out because it was creating a problem in the network. Then when that happened was like, today when you dial 911, you'll get a recording that says "911..." and while you're getting that recording it drops in the ear of our call taker and then we just take the call over and take it. Without that recording people were hearing like beeps and they were thinking they were getting disconnected or hung up on, so they would hang up the phone and try to call back, so that's why that abandon rate went up. They would dial 911 and they would just get a "beep, beep" and even though it was in the queue, and we would go to answer it, they thought they got disconnected so they were hanging up prematurely on us.

Scott Ruf: That's been corrected, the queue audio and everything, and the upgrades were put back in place last week by Motorola, so that abandon rate should come back down.

Korban Lee: Okay.

Scott Ruf: It wasn't anything we were doing, or we're not answering the phones, it was just a quirk. Unintended consequences of a hiccup in the Vestas system.

Korban Lee: Thank you, Scott. Thank you for answering that and clarifying that. The other thing I wanted to ask about was the data exchange hub, last month you mentioned you thought you were maybe 30 to 60 days out, this week you kind of mentioned kind of any week now. What is your best guess on that?

Scott Ruf: Well, we had a call at 11:00 this morning, a status call, so the two vendors are finalized, so everything is done, there is one piece we just have to finish between Versaterm and Central Square which is the hub, and that's just a matter of editing a URL and they are going to test the flow of data, and the project is done. It's done, like I said earlier, it is done as far as us pushing the information to the exchange hub, but until DPS or UHP or Tooele or you tell other people join it, it is going to sit idle, and I have no control over that half of it.

Korban Lee: Yeah, just interested, I know, I am just interested in the timing on us delivering on our half of it. For our side.

Scott Ruf: It be, I would say, by the next meeting I hope to be able to report that it is completed.

Korban Lee: Okay, thank you Scott.

Korban Lee: Anyone else have any questions?

Korban Lee: Okay, you covered five one and five two, give us the Capital update, glad to hear that you got the call takers are out and fires are almost out, so you can start demoing in that call center space. Okay, when we meet in person in July Scott can you give us a little walkthrough of what is happening in the building to kind of show us where things stand?

Scott Ruf: Yep, oh you'll see it.

Korban Lee: Thank you, good. Well, I'm glad it's moving forward, glad you haven't had any supply chain delays on any of the things you had to order.

REVIEW OF FY2023 BUDGET DOCUMENT

Korban Lee: All right. Let's go on to agenda item number 6, a review of the FY2023 of the budget document, we'll turn the time over to Clint Jensen, our Finance Director.

Clint Jensen: Thank you, Mr Chair, and I appreciate this opportunity to show the budget again today. Just for the record, the noticing had gone out to the Salt Lake tribune and public meeting notice website, so legally we are compliant with having this meeting today. Just maybe Scott can you go to the budget page 27 and we can just look at the overview. I think most of these numbers are going to be familiar to you, we haven't made any significant changes since this came out back in February, but we are now to the point where all of the little tweaks, and we have audited a couple of numbers, we're now to the point that we're feeling very confident in these numbers for us.

Clint Jensen: The overall revenues for the center, are \$18 million, are budgeted to be \$18,923,693. That's an increase of 7%, if you take away the pass-through revenues, which is outlined just above the total revenue of the overall increase to the budget revenue is 5.8%. This is made up primarily of two areas where we've been able to capture a few dollars, first of all in franchise taxes of about \$150,000 dollar increase, and then of course the member assessments which for both police and fire, are proposed to increase 8.8%.

Clint Jensen: We've had a couple of adjustments; you'll see that the interest and miscellaneous revenue items I've decreased those. Historically, we just have not done well in interest income, maybe that will change this year, we are hopeful. The miscellaneous revenue again has not panned out to be nearly what we had budget, so little decreases there. Overall, this looks pretty good for us. You can see the member assessments and the impact that, that has on each of the individual law enforcement and fire agencies.

Clint Jensen: Maybe we just move along to the expense side. Of course, the center budget, 80% of our budget is made up of wages and payroll benefits. You can see those numbers there, as far as the increases that we have proposed in this budget is a 5% COLA for all staff, and in addition to that there are operation staff who are in the step system who, if qualified, they would receive their step increased during the year on their anniversary.

Clint Jensen: Additionally, in the wages we reduced a couple line items, one would be the part time wage budget. We're not utilizing part-timers as much as we used to, so we backed that off. And we had some savings, if you recall last year's budget, we had some retirement incentive put in there, and we had five employees that accepted that retirement incentive, which allowed us to restructure and reduce our full-time employee count.

Clint Jensen: Down below, in the administration and operations, the big-ticket items there, no surprise to anybody, is our software maintenance. Primarily the increase is due to a Versaterm Cloud implementation, so that is picked up in the software maintenance budget.

Clint Jensen: We have increased our facilities maintenance budget, we continue to try to keep this facility operational and we have some challenges with the HVAC and other systems, so we are adding a little bit of money to that in order to make sure we can continue to maintain our facilities.

Clint Jensen: The training and travel budget went up almost 20,000 dollars and that is primarily due to our center point leadership management course that we use for our staff. We're hoping to get our supervisors through that this year and so that is the primary increase in that budget.

Clint Jensen: And then the general administrative budget went up and that is due to some assessments we are hoping to do, pre-hire, and ongoing assessments for our operations staff.

Clint Jensen: A couple line items went down. Of course, telephone budget is reduced once we got the new phone system in, and we got through some of the challenges there, we are now able to discontinue about a \$60,000 dollar expense per month of telephone expense.

Clint Jensen: And let's see, another one that went down a little bit was the equipment maintenance budget, not significant there.

Clint Jensen: The final item that went up was the debt service, about 15%. We all know that we went through that re-issuance of debt and the difference there being about \$40,000 dollars or so. With this budget we are hoping to have a net revenue of \$50,000 dollars after all is said and done. We interrupt that as being additional cash available that would then flow into the fund balances, the projected fund balance at the end of this fiscal year is about \$367,000 or so. If we add \$50,000 to that, that gives us the \$417,000. That is moving along the lines of the goal that was adopted by the board at the last trustee meeting, to get us to a fund balance of between \$850,000 to maybe up to \$1.5 million by the end of fiscal year 2025. We hope to do that through this careful budgeting, and also through the under spend that we realize in some of these line items.

Clint Jensen: So that is kind of the quick overview. Mr Chair I'll turn it back to you, or if you want me to answer questions, however you would like to proceed.

Korban Lee: Thank you yes. Let's turn it over to trustees. Does anyone have questions for Clint? About this budget.

Doug Hill: Clint, can you remind me, where is the settlement expense?

Clint Jensen: It is not included in this budget. That will be something that will need to be discussed once that settlement is finalized.

Doug Hill: So, that could be an additional cost to our cities this year.

Clint Jensen: Could be yes.

Doug Hill: Probably likely will be.

Clint Jensen: Yes. The one thing I did not mention either, on page 13 of this report is the RMS piece which for the law enforcement need to consider that as part of your law enforcement budget in your entities.

Korban Lee: Other questions?

Korban Lee: Clint, you mentioned the general administrative line item going up, it has gone up by 17%, I think 17%. That was primarily for assessments, pre-hire and ongoing, can you elaborate on that? What do you mean by that?

Clint Jensen: Yeah, there is a psychological assessment that we are looking to enter into a contract with a provider that can go through some testing of these hirers or pre-hirers. And then an ongoing assessment just kind of as a check in to make sure mental health is good for our employees. Scott might have additional detail on that but that was kind of the idea behind that.

Korban Lee: Thank you.

Korban Lee: Okay, any other questions?

PUBLIC HEARING TO SOLICIT PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE FY2023 BUDGET

Korban Lee: Scott, will you stop sharing your screen? Okay, let's go on to agenda item number seven then if there is no other questions for Clint about the budget. We are having a public hearing today to solicit comments about the FY23 budget, is there anyone here on the meeting with us that would like to make comment about the VECC fiscal year 23 budget as it has been presented and distributed?

Scott Ruf: Mr Chair, I believe you have to have formally opened a public hearing, is that correct?

Korban Lee: I have to open the public hearing, sorry. Correct.

Scott Ruf: We have to open it, I don't know if it has to be done by roll call and then officially close it when we are done, I believe.

Korban Lee: You have to open the public hearing by roll call votes? I think we just need to formally open the public hearing a little bit more. This is the public hearing now, agenda item number 7, this is the public hearing, to solicit public comment on the proposed budget. Let's open the public hearing, is there anyone here that would like to speak up about the proposed fiscal year 23 VECC budget?

Korban Lee: Okay, seeing no public comments on the call, is there anybody that has submitted any correspondence wishing to be shared with the trustees regarding the FY 23 budget?

Scott Ruf: No Mr Chair.

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION T22-04 ADOPTION OF FY2023 BUDGET

Korban Lee: Okay, with that I will close the public hearing, we will move on to agenda item number 8 and consider resolution T22-04 resolution adopting the fiscal year 23 budget for VECC. Is there anyone that would like to comment or make a motion in regard to that resolution?

Gary Whatcott: Mr Chair, I will make a motion that we approve the resolution stated.

Wayne Pyle: I will second it, Korban.

Korban Lee: Great, okay we have a motion to approve resolution T22-04 adopting FY 23 budget by Gary Whatcott, a second by Wayne Pyle. Any comments, or questions? All right Scott, will you take us through a roll call vote?

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, Hermann?

Nathan Cherpeski: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr Reid, Bluffdale?

Mark Reid: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Deputy Mayor Hartman, Salt Lake County?

Lisa Hartman: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Tingey, Cottonwood Heights?

Tim Tingey: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Harrington, Taylorsville?

Scott Harrington: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Chief Burchett, UFA?

Dom Burchett: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Undersheriff Petersen, UPD?

Jake Petersen: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Pyle, West Valley City?

Wayne Pyle: Yes.

Scott Ruf: It carries unanimously, Mr. Chair.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Gary Whatcott, to approve Resolution T22-04, the motion was seconded by Mr. Wayne Pyle; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

Korban Lee: Thank you, Scott. Okay, great. Before, we move on, Clint, Scott, I want to thank you both for your hard work on the budget, you know a unanimous vote in favor of the budget, I know you had some questions but generally I think overall relatively few questions and I'd take that as a sign of a very good budget, a very well composed document made it easy to understand, easy for us to follow as trustees and well-reasoned, well justified and well proposed. Good job, thank you Clint, thank you Scott, both of you.

Clint Jensen: Thank you.

FINANCE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Korban Lee: Okay, let's go to agenda item number nine, the finance director's report. Clint let's go back to you.

Clint Jensen: Okay, the report for this month, I am just going to skip through it real quick. We are where we expect to be this time of year with our personnel costs about 80% of budget, compared to being 83% through the fiscal year. Our total expenses 76% of budget, and overall total expenses were well within our budget allotments. You can see some line items starting to sneak up there a little bit, on the phones, that should stop hemorrhaging, we are now through paying that extra \$60,000 dollars a month, and I think we talked about overtime last month, so we are really in a good spot this year with our budget to actual.

Clint Jensen: The next page shows the cash balances about two million dollars in the bank, unassigned funds as of April 30th as we sneak into May and June, we will start getting closer to that balance, that I showed you in the budget. Again, in a pretty good cash situation considering where we are at this time of year.

Clint Jensen: And the last two pages being the check register, and so I would be happy to answer any questions on any of those items.

Nathan Cherpeski: I have a quick question, just on the... I think it is on the franchise taxes, not being real familiar with those, but would those come in at... I am assuming those aren't a uniform rate in, is that okay that we are trending low there?

Clint Jensen: Yeah, so there is a two-month lag on the collections there, so that represents through February, and so there will be an accrual at the end of the year to get that caught up, so we're actually slightly ahead of what we would expect it to be this time of year.

Nathan Cherpeski: Thank you.

Korban Lee: Nathan good question, thank you. Clint, I have a question about what we are looking at remedies too, can you comment about the Pass-Through Revenues - CAD Project in 62% of budget, is that where you expect that one to be also?

Clint Jensen: Yeah, and that is going to represent the project with the University of Utah, since that has not rolled out yet and we haven't collected that, so that is actually going to roll over into the new budget and is considered part of the fiscal 23 budget. So, I don't think we are going to have much more happening on that revenue line.

Korban Lee: But it is kind of irrelevant in terms of our expenses because that is a separate pass-through revenue, pass through expense, it won't matter in terms of your budget revenues.

Clint Jensen: It has zero impact.

Korban Lee: Yeah okay, thank you.

Korban Lee: Any other questions for Clint?

Korban Lee: Okay, thank you Clint. Well done.

CLOSED SESSION

Korban Lee: Alright, agenda number ten is a closed session if necessary.

Scott Ruf: We don't need it.

Korban Lee: Scott? Sorry, Scott Ruf or Scott Young? My understanding we don't have anything to update anyone on regarding pending litigation.

Scott Young: That's right.

Korban Lee: There is no property sale, hence no need for a closed session.

Scott Young: Correct.

Scott Ruf: Correct.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Korban Lee: Okay, with that then, I will skip to agenda item number 12 and look for a motion to adjourn.

David Brickey: I will make the motion to adjourn.

Korban Lee: Okay anyone want to second that?

Josh Collins: I will second that.

Korban Lee: Was that Gary? Was that you seconding that?

Josh Collins: Josh Collins.

Korban Lee: Josh. Sorry I missed you. Okay, motion by David to adjourn. All in favor say "Aye".

Speakers together: Aye.

Korban Lee: Okay thank you everyone. See you in June.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. David Brickey, to adjourn the Trustee meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. John Collins; the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:16 p.m.