

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

July 20, 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. Ryan Lessner – South Jordan
Mr. Brady Cottam – Taylorsville
Mr. Terry Addison – South Salt Lake
Mr. Derek Maxfield – West Jordan
Ms. Colleen Jacobs, West Valley City
Mr. Clint Smith – Draper
Ms. Andrea Partridge – VECC
Ms. Nicole Lopez – VECC
Mr. Bruce Kartchner, Bluffdale
Mr. Troy Carr – Herriman
Mr. Ryan Shosted - Riverton

The meeting was called to order by Korban Lee at 2:02 p.m. The first few minutes of the meeting were not captured on the recording. Korban Lee asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the June 15,2022 Trustee meeting.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Gary Whatcott, to approve the July 20,2022 Trustee meeting minutes as written; seconded by Mr. Tim Tingey; the motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Korban Lee: Is there anyone online who would like to make a public comment?

Korban Lee: Okay, we'll close the public comment portion of the meeting and move on to reports from the operations board. Agenda item number 4.1, Police Operations Board briefing. I believe the police department did not have an Ops Board meeting. Who here that wants to speak about the Police Ops Board?

OPERATIONS BOARD

Scott Ruf: There was no meeting in July, and I think Chief Cottam and Chief Jacobs are the two Police Chiefs, but I don't believe there's any outstanding issues.

Korban Lee: Chief Cottam, is there anything that you need to report on to the Trustees?

Chief Cottam: No.

Korban Lee: Okay. Let's go to Agenda 4.2, the Fire Ops Board meeting. Chief, we'll turn it over to you. Thanks Chief.

Terry Addison: Thanks Mr. Chair. The Fire Operations Board and the Fire User Board are back together through July to discuss the fireworks. Came to a consensus, everybody did pretty good on the fireworks this year, so there wasn't any adverse fires or anything above and beyond. The message that we put out, similar to last year, choose not to do them again. Everyone pretty much taken that to heed, and it was a smaller fire year than we've had in years past. Other than that, that's the big topic. Also, portions of the fire board with Mr. Dobbins, we met regarding the AVL and the penalties. Through that small group, we discussed the bubble that Versaterm is building and as a group, we decided to wait to see what that's going to do and not move further with aid of the AVL. We were told it was going to be built out in August and I believe Versaterm is pushing back in September, I believe?

Terry Addison: I believe by the time they get everything done, see how that works.

Korban Lee: Thank you, Chief. Does anyone have questions?

David Brickey: Would you say you'll wait to see how it changes? Is that...

Terry Addison: I tend to see how operational that bubble is. From what we understand, that's going to fit the needs. I'll use the Men's Resource Center in South Salt Lake, for instance. I can put a bubble around that, my understanding with how it's going to work, I can use all the resources in my city before I start pulling other areas out.

David Brickey: So, the bubble can be put on a specific location address or area?

Scott Ruf: Yeah, we can tie it. We refer to them often as targeted hazards, so we're going to identify properties. I know in South Jordan, there's the... Is it Sagebrush or Sagewood?

Gary Whatcott: Sagewood.

Scott Ruf: So, we can go by street address, and then work with the agencies and build specific responses for those facilities. I know with the MRC and Sagewood, one of the biggest things at least is... I don't want to speak for Chief Dawson if he's sitting in the room, but one of the things Chief Dawson was concerned about was using other resources for people that just needed to be picked up when they fell on stuff. So, some of that we can do today. We're starting to build that because we did it as part of the priority one and two issue when we went live. We're going to take it the next step further for targeted hazards to address the issues or the concerns some in Murray, South Jordan, South Salt Lake, and we're still working through some stuff with Draper, but their situation is just unique compared to that.

David Brickey: I appreciate you guys talking and working something out. That helps out a lot.

Korban Lee: Sure. Thank you. If the, what do you call it? The bubble system or the unique load you call it targeted hazard.

Scott Ruf: We call it retargeting hazard, yes.

Korban Lee: Targeted hazard system and stacked queuing for those targeted hazard system works. I think, I hope it sounds like that's a good solution for this issue for everybody.

Scott Ruf: Yeah, and one of the upgrades is really the command it's, we're adding a then statement. So, we're hoping if it works to Chief Addison's point, if it gets delivered, how we ask it to be delivered, we should say "Okay, at this address, we want engine medic engine 21," but if medic engine 21 isn't available, we don't want to go all the way to say it was a 23 this far away from 21. Instead of 23, it's like "Okay, we'll go to UFA then," so it'll give the Chiefs a lot more...

Scott Ruf: If it gets delivered the way versa term has explained it, and we've asked for it to be delivered, that should be able to mitigate a lot of the concerns on the responses.

David Dobbins: So, so we just felt like rather than try to implement a change, like a penalty of some kind, and then do this as well, let's just see how the new system goes and then we'll revisit it.

Korban Lee: Okay. Good. Anyone else have any questions for Chief Addison? I have a question. I don't know if Chief, this for you, or Scott, for you. Just in general, over the last five years, cities have migrated more and more towards restricting portions of their community for fireworks, geographic restrictions on firework, lighting firework displays. How has that affected the center? How has that affected fire calls? Are you getting a lot of calls that "People are lighting off fireworks in my neighborhood, and it's illegal," are you getting overwhelmed with those types of phone calls?

Scott Ruf: We get them every year. I'm still working on the report. We ran some numbers. It wasn't any worse than it was last year,

Terry Addison: Sandy Fire said when he was noticing this was the first year where he had no calls east of 1300 East in the interface area, and so the messaging over the last couple years and some of those restrictions is greatly helpful.

Korban Lee: Good. Okay, good. Thank you. I should have paused Wayne. Others who are listening online. Can you hear us, okay?

Wayne Pyle: Yes.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Korban Lee: Good, thank you. Let's go to Agenda item number 5, the Director's Report. Scott, we'll turn the time over to you. Just go through items 5.1 through 5.4.

Scott Ruf: Thank Mr. Chair. Well, the first item is, as you know, we've been part of the reorganization... A couple years ago, we did put a deputy direct of operations in the budget. It was a long process to get to where we got to, but we finally went through a process, so thanks for those chiefs that assisted. I'd like to introduce Elyse Haggerty. She's the new Deputy Director of operations she had about 15... Oh, I can let her give you her CV, but she came originally in January as our CAD administrator when Mary Bain had retired, and then once she was here and we opened up the process for Deputy Director, she had to change of heart, I guess, and decided she wanted to put into that position as well. But Elyse, if you want to...

Korban Lee: Elyse, will you stand up and come to help us get to know you interviews yourself and tell us about your background?

Elyse Haggerty: Yeah, I had 13 plus years at Salt Lake City 911. I worked from police dispatching to fire dispatching, to supervisor, to manager, to deputy director for two years, and then our director retired in April of 21, and I was the Interim Director for nine months, which was enough. Then, VECC very kindly took me as their CAD admin. I have a lot of CAD experience. I helped merge it. I was in process with Mary, and we made it what it is, and hopefully I'll be able to pass that on to a new CAD administrator, plus we have Lin, so don't worry about CAD things. It's still going to function just as well as we can make it. I'm really happy to be here. I live four minutes away, so it's heaven. Do you have any questions or anything? Thanks

Korban Lee: Elyse, we're very glad you're here.

Elyse Haggerty: Thank you.

Korban Lee: We've heard good things about you already very, very, very happy that you're here, part of the executive team at VECC

Elyse Haggerty: Thank You.

Korban Lee: All right, Scott, back to you, let's talk about the performance of progress report.

Scott Ruf: Yeah, again... We've had a pretty consistent month. We're still struggling to get to that 95%, but we're staying steady in that. As you can see, we had a half percent uptick in improvement for the 22nd, which is that middle one is the one we're really focused on. If we round up, I guess we're at 93%, but we're just shy and we've gone through some of the numbers, and a lot of it is activity in the center. We just need a bad hour or two a day and it just skews your statistics a little bit, so I've been very pleased, as you can see, going all the way back to December. One of the things that Senator Harper and President Adams and Speaker Wilson were upset about was the constant rollercoaster ride. As you can see, we've stabilized it. We're still working to get to that 95%. We're hitting the 90-second NENA standard month over a month. We're getting close, but we're working on it. We're between maternity and we're going through another little bout of COVID. But I think folks here are doing a great job and I'm happy with the numbers.

Korban Lee: Scott, what was the call volume like in June? Is this a busy month for you?

Scott Ruf: Usually this spring and summer. It depends on weather. It just depends on things. What I did was I was curious since I got here at the end of January of 20, so I went back, and I'm going to do a more formal report because we're going to change this report. We'll do monthly for the Board, or we're going to tweak this report for the senators to do a quarterly kind of snapshot, look back. I did January to June for 2021 and 22 and 20, we did 137,316 911 calls. We had an overall average answer time of 13.9 seconds, but only 78.8%, less than 20 seconds, which is significantly lower than 21. We went up to 145,009, reduced our average answer, time to 11.2, one seconds, and in 20 seconds or less, we made it up to 81.6, and then in 2022 to date, we're at 146,900, just under 147,000.

Scott Ruf: We pretty much cut the average answer time in half to 5.5 nine seconds, and our efficiency for 20 seconds or less is up to 92%. You can see in the progression with the phones and the staffing and the scheduling, I think we're achieving what they asked like everything else that last little bit's going to be tough, and for me to walk in here and say "Well, I need \$2 million to hire 20 more call takers." It doesn't make sense because we don't know if it's going to be busy in the middle of the night. It's like staffing fire stations. You're not going to go hire entire engine companies because you might get a fire, and that's the challenge we're having, but with the phone system, the staff, and others, we can better paint a picture, articulate where our struggles are.

Scott Ruf: We can look and say, well here we had a hundred calls three times during this day. We can provide more transparency, which I think only helps us, and if people are still not happy with it, we're still working on it. I don't know how to get us the rest of the way. Transfer rates are still hovering well above the 2% rate. I can tell you we stopped transfers. You're only seeing now, these transfers are, for the most part, 100% between VECC and UHP or DPS. Here, in Salt Lake County... Matter of fact, this afternoon, they were testing the CAD-to-CAD aggregator, we did as part of the CAD project. That should be complete. Our side of it, for the most part, is done. My understanding is the DPS side.

Scott Ruf: There's some translation issues, but when that's done, we should be stopping all transfers between us and DPS, and as you can see, if we stop those transfers, we go well below the threshold to seven tenths of a percent for transfers, because we're never going to get away with the Utah county thing for now. But our core volume is so great, that 2% a month is still five or 600 calls out of the 28,000 we do a month. It will be in a good place once that's done. There are a couple of concerns we have with that CAD-to-CAD aggregate that I'm going to have to bring to the board in the future, but to start thinking about, and I do have a meeting tomorrow with Colonel Rappich and his executive staff on some other issues in Salt Lake County, but one of the things I'm really concerned about is...

Scott Ruf: I think transfers is a safe and efficient way to handle 911 calls out of your jurisdiction. I understand the frustration when you bounce from Salt Lake VECC to DPS, then you leave the highway and the call transfers back to VECC and then get transferred to DP. That frustration I understand, but the concern we're going to have to look at is... Right now, for DPS the interstates, we take 911 calls for emergencies. If they're not police or fire, they go to DPS, and we move on. We're now going to be expected to answer those calls, triage them, enter them into CAD, send them over to DPS. Well, all that time is going to be now time we're handling another almost 20,000 calls a year in the center that we never did before, and I don't know what the impact is going to be to our efficiencies. DPS doesn't pay us to do any of that work, but I really think we're going to have to check the impact there and find out what that's going to do to our center.

Scott Ruf: Because right now, if it's DPS, I'm broken down on I-15, we just transfer it. Now it's two, three, four, five, six minutes on a call to figure out what's going on, direction of travel, there's all the stuff that they normally will be expected of us, and that's not unique to VECC it at Salt Lake City. I don't know if they're going to have the same issue. I know Weber dealt with it. Weber charges for all their services, but they're also a special district, so I know that changes things a little bit. Anyway, I know I was kind of a lot in the group, but the one thing I do want to point out about the transfers and hitting the standards is we're pretty much there, which would qualify as for additional... I call it carrot money, so UCA Mr. Whatcott, correct me if I get this wrong, takes a percentage of the UCA administration makes a recommendation to the UCA board every year of a percentage of the nine one tax money that goes into the... We call it carrot money, so if you have a special project or a need and you meet all the standards, you can apply for those funds, if you have a project in your pap. For the last 10 years, we weren't hitting the standards, so we didn't qualify. I'm also a little hypersensitive of how I landed in Utah, that the smaller PSAP's with all the money that gets isn't worth to go fight a smaller county for \$20,000, so I'm weighing all those things as well, knowing I have a target in my back. But, as we improve, we do have those options in there. Any comments or questions on the progress report?

Korban Lee: Scott, the CAD-to-CAD aggregator on the DPS side feels like it's been delayed a couple of months. Is it?

Scott Ruf: Well, part of it was our fault. There was a lot of data we had to capture and build it out, and then they have to translate it all, so it's been a combination of things. Some of it was on VECC. We'd lost a couple months. We kept getting new project managers between staffing issues and changes here. It took a lot to get the data there and then upload it, and then do our housekeeping on our side to know we were comfortable enough to say "Okay, everything we've said we were going to do; we are now pushing to this data exchange hub." Now DPS to Tooele County, during this live testing now, they've realized there's a couple of translation issues on the other side to allow for the two-way. We can get the calls, go from VECC to DPS. What we can't

get that I'm aware of, unless it worked out this afternoon, was if DPS is, say on I-15, and all of a sudden, they need fire medical or something, they can't send the call back. They actually still have to call us. That's the piece we're working out. So, once we work that bug out, it'll be a bidirectional seamless information sharing system with...

Korban Lee: DPS and to anyone on that...

Scott Ruf: Well, well Tooele County, Davis County, Bountiful, Layton, Central Utah, have all expressed interest, and the nice thing is once DPS fixes their part for the interface, they can just resell it to these other centers, because they all use the same CAD system, so we don't have to reinvent the wheel every time a new agency wants to come on board, and we've designed it in a way here under the coalition if you recall, a year or so ago, when we brought this up, we put it into the CAD project to deliver it like we've told the legislature and UCA as part of the grant and everything, and we control it. We're not charging people to join it, but they have to pay 100% of the fees to get connectivity and make it work for them, but we're sponsoring it on our side of it for Versaterm, and Salt Lake County with Salt Lake City.

Korban Lee: Any questions? All right, Scott, let's go on to the 5.3, CAD project update. We covered that adequately.

Scott Ruf: Yep. Yep. But we're still waiting on some routers and switches to do the cloud migration. So, we're hoping sometime, after Labor Day weekend, that stuff shows up and we can move there. I can tell you we've been in working with the University of Utah. They're coming on board, and just a week or two ago, we met with UTA and Chief Terry, I believe, the interim chief or knew the new chief he's from west... I believe he was a Lieutenant at West Valley City. UTA is coming on board to the Versaterm project as well, so we'll have everybody in Salt Lake County, plus the University, plus UTA. We don't have any of the school districts, but that's a whole separate discussion.

Korban Lee: The migration of the cloud that was in the budget. That's funded and done, so now you're just waiting?

Scott Ruf: Yeah, we put it in the budget and then, hopefully, once we finish the CAD to CAD aggregated, we'll come back. Clint and I will come back to the board because we believe we have savings in the actual CAD project of unrestricted funds that our proposal is going to be to use those CAD funds to go towards the cloud migration. We haven't got there yet, because I don't know how much money is there, but we'll bring that back to the board. We think we'll be able to offset some of the expenses that we propose to the cloud, which is about 300,000, probably almost by half. Hopefully, we'll be able to bring that back to the board here, in August or September for either a budget, I don't know if the budget adjustment or just some direction on approval to spend that those funds on the moving to the cloud, and hopefully, that'll mitigate the expenses to us in Salt Lake City.

Korban Lee: Any questions about the CAD project? Next agenda item is the capital project updates. Scott, give us a brief update on that, but then just walk as we walk the center, you'll fill us in a little bit.

Scott Ruf: I'll just give you high level. It's on track. We had a... Thank you, Chief Jay. Yeah, Chief, I'm sorry. Chief Taylor has been made... Looks like permanent UTA. Thanks, Chief Jacobs. It's on track. We met with our every other week call yesterday with the architects. We went through a whole process procurement, did a statement of qualifications for general contractor. We're finalizing the contracts with them and start the process for the mechanicals. We'll do the bidding. Beginning on August, I think was it the seventh or the ninth of August, we should have that part of it wrapped up, so by the mid late August, we should be able to get the contractors in here and start moving forward. The first phase of furniture and everything should be delivered in the middle of the week of September 12th, or 17th. Things are moving along. The first week of August, they'll start putting in a lot of the tech, a lot of the video walls, a lot of the brackets and that kind of stuff, so

it's on track and you'll see, half of its already gutted. If you haven't been here, we're stuffed into some different rooms around the building, but in the long run, it'll be a huge benefit for everybody involved. Questions?

Korban Lee: Scott, can you also brief us about the proposal to correct the equipment issues at the two radio sites for the alerting system?

Scott Ruf: Sure. I can...

Korban Lee: Fill us in on that but take it away from the start.

Scott Ruf: Say what?

Korban Lee: Explain what the alerting system is, what the radio sites are and then what the issue is.

Scott Ruf: Okay. If you recall back in 2018, the board with my predecessors had moved forward with you as digital fire station alerting system project for all the VECC agencies in the Valley. Part of that project was to upgrade some of the two sites we have tied to that system, so there's the mahogany site in the granite peak site, which is really a water tower, there sit some equipment on there that we still utilize for backup back haul for the digital fire station alerting. There's a handful of the battalion chiefs still use on hip pagers, some of them do anyway. We use it for that notification system, and over July 4th weekend, a repeater had failed or went bad at the granite water tower, and when we started looking into it, realized that his old legacy equipment that should have been replaced as part of the station alerting project, but wasn't. When that repeater failed, there have to be a repeater that gets replaced to avoid the same issues we have at mahogany. We want to remediate both sites at the same time with repeaters, new antennas and some cabling and coupling and stuff like that. It's about \$26,000. It was an unplanned expense. Clint and I believe we can cover that in the existing operating budget.

Scott Ruf: I'm already moving forward because it's an emergent failure. I can't not do it, so we've ordered the repeaters to get that work done. I don't know if that's high enough level to go back. I mean, that's pretty much it in a nutshell, and what I did was, just so you're aware, I talked to Chief Burchett's team, I talked to Chief James, who had some historical knowledge about the two sites of what really served mostly UFA versus other valley departments, and if other chiefs are in the room and no more than I do, please let me know. But, since it's a VECC, it supports all the VECC agencies some way or another, I felt it should get put back under the vet umbrella for support and maintenance and service and all that stuff as part of the US digital system.

Scott Ruf: That's what we're doing instead of... Because I think originally, when VECC told them as part of the project "Well, we don't have the funds students that are VECC's not going to pay that cost." It should be the agencies. I think UFA stepped up and bought one repeater at the time, and then the Valley Chiefs were supposed to split the cost for Granite, but the way we're doing everything together now, and more globally, it's \$25,000. Hopefully, this is the last thing we find after two and a half years, and we just move it forward, stick it into an equipment expense and an operational expense for the fire side to get it fixed, so that's what we did, or doing.

Korban Lee: When you say you think you can cover it in your operating budget, there is a particular line item you're eyeing that, and they think we'll be a little short on this. We'll cover it here. You mentioned CAD. You'll probably have some money on the CAD.

Scott Ruf: Yeah, I think we just looked at a high level and we're just so early in the budget cycle that \$26,000... If this was May or June, we might be having a different conversation, but.

Clint Jensen: In our equipment expense budget, we do have an amount in there for these types of unforeseen events, not to the full \$25,000 that it covers.

Korban Lee: Question on this issue? Everyone comfortable with VECC covering these towers, the repairs with these towers, for this station, the learning system.

Scott Ruf: And I did find...

Korban Lee: Out of station these aren't for the towers to get it to the...

Scott Ruf: They're repeaters, to relay the...

Korban Lee: Agencies. We're on the hook in our own stations, right?

Scott Ruf: Well, no, we work. We cover the US digital station, learning for the agencies under VECC.

Scott Ruf: What we don't cover is they're on hip pagers or paging and radios, but we cover the infrastructure.

Korban Lee: Okay.

Scott Ruf: We don't actually own the sites. They're UCA sites, and we have permission to put equipment there, so I didn't suddenly find out we own property and towers and...

Korban Lee: Where are the sites?

Scott Ruf: I knew you would ask that question.

Clint Jensen: Mahogany is straight West of here, past U-111 and Granite Peaks is near the foot of little Cottonwood Canyon.

CONSIDERTION OF RESOLUTION T22-06 UPDATE TO VECC ADMIN. POLICY

Korban Lee: Okay. Comments? Questions? Okay. Let's go to Agenda item number 6, consideration of Resolution T22-06, which is an update to the VECC administrative policy regarding parental leave and bereavement leave. Scott let's turn it over to you or Clint to give some background on this topic and then we'll look for a motion on the resolution.

Scott Ruf: Long story short, as you're aware, a couple years ago, for the year before I got here, that got approved parental leave policy for employees having children, and then recently, we had an unfortunate situation with an employee that lost a child, a miscarriage. I started saying "You know, we really should look into our policies about how do we address this issue." Especially with everything in the news right now. So, as I did some research, I forgot about this Utah code that was updated and went into effect in May of this year, about... It's 10.3-1103, about providing three days of bereavement leave for an individual or a family that loses a child through a miscarriage, stillborn or shortly after.

Scott Ruf: It was a VECC review to make sure we're taking care of our employees. But two, it's also a housekeeping issue because there is state statute that requires public agencies to incorporate this into their policies. That's the background on this, so we pretty much took the language directly out of the title and just added it to our... We have funeral leave and then we added a separate bereavement leave to address this on the back end of the parental leave policy.

Scott Ruf: The fiscal impact is we give funeral leave as it is. It's three days. Fortunately, this is not something we deal with on a regular basis, so the impact of the budget, but it's also the right thing to do, so 36 hours at 20 or 30 or 40 bucks an hour is not going to break the bank.

Korban Lee: What's proposed is to kind of mirror state law and now required by state law. You're not taking state law and going a step further. You're just going matching state...

Scott Ruf: We're just taking the state law and incorporating into our parental leave policy as a bereavement leave option.

Korban Lee: Anyone have any questions, mark?

Mark Reid: If state law changes, we have to change ours or do we just accept the state law and say, "That's our policy, too."

Scott Ruf: In this particular case, I thought it was the cleanest fastest, safest way to do it. I guess we can bring it back to the Board when this happens. This is only the first time that I've actually had a statute change. I felt I had to change my policies.

Mark Reid: Sometimes, when you refer to state law and your code, and then you put down what state law, every time the state law changes, you have to come back and change your code. Or if you just say, we accept state code this as our policy, then whenever they change, you change that amount.

Scott Ruf: Oh, it's a long, oh no, I get okay. That makes sense. I can figure that. Good idea.

Doug Hill: Although I assume that this is a policy manual that the employees have that lists out the benefits. It's good to change it so that the employees know what benefits they have.

Lisa Hartman: So, Scott, is it only the employee that's pregnant? Does it cover the spouse or the parents?

Scott Ruf: Yes, already former spouse or partner.

Lisa Hartman: Okay.

Scott Ruf: Yeah, and the employee would've been a biological parent of the child born as a result.

Lisa Hartman: We just recently changed this in Salt Lake County, just last week in terms of our policy and that's comforting.

Scott Ruf: Yeah. No, it just went into effect May 24th. Like I said, I just found it and forgot about it.

Korban Lee: I read this in the agenda and in agenda prep thought "Oh shoot, I got to go fix it in our policy." Thank you for being on top of it. Any other comments or questions? Anyone willing to make a motion or resolution of T22-06?

Tim Tingey: I'll make a motion to approve resolution T22-06.

Korban Lee: Hey, we have a motion by Tim Tingey, seconded by Josh Collins. Let's do 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: 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: Mr. Harrington, Taylorsville.

Scott Harrington: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Chief Burchett, UFA

Dom Burchett: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Under Sheriff Petersen.

Jake Petersen: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Pyle, West Valley City.

Wayne Pyle: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Unanimous Mr. Chair.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Tim Tingey, to approve Resolution T22-06; the motion was seconded by Josh Collins; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION T22-07 REAFFIRM SL VALLEY COALITION AGREEMENT

Korban Lee: Great. Thank you. Let's go to item 7, consideration of Resolution T22-07, reaffirming Salt Lake Valley coalition agreement related to the common cat RMS project. Scott, I turn this over to you or to Elyse?

Scott Ruf: I'll do this one. She can if she wants, but I'll do it. I wasn't here. So, in 2016, when it was decided to move forward with a common CAD and you secured the original grant from UCA, my understanding was this was done between VECC and Salt Lake City corporation to create an interlocal or a Salt Lake Valley coalition to pursue the grant money for UCA, but it also laid out a governance for how we were going to manage and support the common CAD. It expired in early 2022. I forget. I got to look. And one of the things we realized was there's a lot of pass throughs and there was not a lot of clarity into the cost share, and the governance of this interlocal and...

Korban Lee: Scott correct me if I'm wrong...

Scott Ruf: Cause Scott Young and Jason Oldroyd from the city's legal went through this a lot. A lot of the governance was really... I don't want to say overbearing. There were a lot of steps. There was a board over a board to make decisions, but they really didn't have authority who had to come back to the governing bodies of the city and VECC and the directors had no authority, so we tried to clean all that up with the understanding of... to manage the system is fine, but to spend money or to make agreements, they still have to come back to the board of trustees and get approval if there's a fiscal impact or course share or any expenditure. But this allows us then to move forward, especially as we move to the cloud. Today, we have a Salt Lake City contract, there's what is now a UPD contract, and then there's the VECC Versaterm contract, which was an offshoot of the old Salt Lake County UPD.

Scott Ruf: But when we moved to the cloud, one of the things we want to do is go to one contract, and the city has agreed we're going to manage it, and under VECC, and then we're going to pass through the actual costs for Salt Lake City and Sandy to the city, and so we wanted to call out how we were going to do that, what's a cost share versus what's 100% of actual cost related to the agencies. That pretty much hit all that. That's what this is. It's just a restating or reaffirmation with some edits to allow the coalition agreement to remain in place going forward,

Korban Lee: Elyse, is there anything you would add?

Elise Haggerty: No. Scott got it, even though he wasn't here.

Korban Lee: I'll say it's nice to have you here having been on both sides of the CAD issue for Salt Lake and VECC. Thank you. Anyone have questions?

Scott Ruf: One more thing, the Undersheriff did. That was you, right? The Undersheriff had sent an email in questioned about a couple of jurisdictions that are listed on page three that we just need to clean up, and we just want to remove the serving jurisdictions and just leave Unified Police and Unified Fire.

Jake Petersen: Got it.

Scott Ruf: Because they're original signatory, for some reason, we missed Salt Lake County.

Jake Petersen: OK.

Scott Ruf: So, we'll put Salt Lake County back in, but take all the little towns and resorts out and just leave Unified Police and Unified Fire.

Scott Ruf: I'll get with you after to make sure it's okay. We'll just tell Jason we removed it, execute it and send it back, because it's a VECC agency.

Korban Lee: And Scott, you're okay with that? A motion? If it's adopted subject to cleaning up that section or would you rather it come back after those, I guess the trustees too, would you rather it come back or approve it in the motion? Say approve it, subject to these edits where, where it's that minor?

Scott Ruf: It's just removing those few townships. I don't think it has anything to do with the...

Tim Tingey: Which section is it?

Scott Ruf: It's right in page three, sir.

Korban Lee: Can you show...

Scott Ruf: Oh yeah. I'm sorry. I got it on my screen. I'm sorry. Hold on. Sorry.

Korban Lee: You just cleaned that up.

Scott Ruf: I want to say it was probably page 16 now that I'm thinking about. Yeah, it's page 16. I was trying to remember the email. So right here, if you look, it says Unified Fire Authority, serving Alta, Granite Township is really White City. Is that what it is? Oh, it's different? Okay. I don't even know that. So, we're going to take all these servings out this 15.1 through 11 and then under unified police, one 7.1 through 7.6, because my understanding in both those organizations, the agreement is that UPD and UFA represent their towns and cities on the VECC board, and then we'll put Salt Lake County back in.

Korban Lee: With that, is someone willing to make a motion on this resolution? Yeah. Sorry chief, go ahead.

Josh Collins: Is South Salt Lake listed on there. I need to be, or...

Scott Ruf: Sorry, go down is South Salt Lake fire missing on the fire section. I don't know, hold on.

Scott Ruf: Oh probably, because I think Mr. Collins also sent me an email questioning that. It should just be South Salt Lake City. It shouldn't be Police or Fire cause you're not separate. I'll fix this entire member section. How many times have we touching? We probably looked at it 500 times.

Josh Collins: Yeah. I mean the serving part was led.

Scott Ruf: Original. Yeah, the original.

Josh Collins: I apologize for not getting it right. I'm embarrassed that... Let's just pass the motion, we'll get it right.

Tim Tingey: I'm willing to make a motion. We'll get it right. I'm willing to make motions.

Korban Lee: Tim, will you make your motion and clarify in the motion what we're allowing to be edited I guess.

Tim Tingey: Okay. I move to approve resolution T22-07 subject to modifications to section six, which modifying and making the appropriate names of the jurisdictions that this applies to...

Nathan Cherpesk: Second.

Korban Lee: Thank you. We have a motion by Mr. Tingey, a second by Mr. Cherpeski. Scott, will you give us a roll call vote, please.

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 Ruff: 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: Mr. Harrington, Taylorsville.

Scott Harrington: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Chief Burchett, UFA

Dom Burchett: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Undersheriff Petersen

Jake Petersen: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Pyle, West Valley City.

Wayne Pyle: Yes.

Scott Ruf: It's unanimous, Mr. Chair.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Tim Tingey, to approve Resolution T22-07, subject to modifications to section 6, modifying and making the appropriate names of the jurisdictions it applies to; the motion was seconded by Mr. Nathan Cherpeski; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

FINANCE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Korban Lee: Okay, thank you. Let's go on Agenda item number 8, the Finance Director's report. Clint, let's turn the time over to you

Clint Jensen: Got ahead myself. Thank you. Preliminary report this month, we are beginning our year end audit process, but I did want to get in front of you a report just to let you know where we're at budget to actual as of June 30th. If you look at the report, I've highlighted a few numbers. These are numbers that are likely going to change. Hopefully not significantly, but the franchise taxes, for example, I have already assumed and estimated collections for two more months of property or sales tax projecting about an \$8,000,000 revenue for Fiscal 2022. Under the personnel expenses, you've got some adjustments to payroll because you have a pay period that straddles a fiscal year end. There'll be some adjustments there, and same with the expenses on the Admin Operations. There'll be a few utility bills and other things that float in after July 1st, and we take those back into the previous year.

Clint Jensen: Also, depreciation. That's a big-ticket item that'll be figured out and included on this in the future as part of our audit. The good news is you look at the bottom line, the net revenue line of \$1.2 million. Even once we make these adjustments and take even depreciation into account, this is a very good-looking budget to actual report, especially if you look back to the previous two years, you see those big red numbers at the bottom, this is looking very good, so thank you for your support as we've worked through some difficult times to kind of right the ship on the budget.

Doug Hill: I think this is great news, showing that we have net revenues that exceed our expenses. Would it be possible in future reports to include, now that we're building our fund balance line item, showing what that fund balance is as we move forward?

Clint Jensen: The next page we'll get you..On the next page is our current fund balances as of June 30th. So, you just go to the bottom of that, Scott.

Clint Jensen: We'll show where we sent right in our two accounts, our checking and our saving account that we use for operations. So, \$255,000 in our checking, \$488,000 in our savings, so that's our operating fund. I think what we had talked about earlier in the year is projecting at a fund balance of somewhere near three to \$400,000 at the end of the fiscal year. This shows us a little bit better than that. Now, just one caveat there, we did receive one payment for assessments early, so that does increase that balance by about 185,000. Overall, you're looking at about a half a million-dollar fund balance in our unrestricted operating funds. Scott

mentioned earlier that Zions Bank attorney trust account is the CAD project, as we're waiting to close that out and get to the final, so that still has \$225,000 in it. Then, our bond funds having 2.94 in those accounts.

Clint Jensen: Does that answer your question. You need something...

Doug Hill: Just spoke soon. Thanks.

Clint Jensen: No, you're good. And then a check registers attached.

Korban Lee: Any highlights on the check register you need to point out?

Clint Jensen: Pretty standard stuff for the month.

Korban Lee: Anyone have any questions for Clint? Clint, we just got through the end of a fiscal year and the start of a new one. In previous years. It's been a very stressful tight cash flow time of year. How was it this year?

Clint Jensen: Way better. Usually, about June 30th, we had a payroll this year on July 1st or second. It was early in the month, and I didn't have to sweat about making that payroll.

Korban Lee: Three in June.

Clint Jensen: Yeah, we did have three pay periods in June, so it just kind of lined up that we had the cash available and that one little check that came in early helped get us over the top, but...

David Dobbins: Y'all make fun of me, now. Right?

Clint Jensen: Last year, I was begging for early payment, and I know it's tough for you guys with your fiscal year, but this year, not so much, but I do appreciate those early payments coming in from the early part of July, getting those in.

Korban Lee: Clint, we had a settlement and the assessments on settlement. Is everything going okay with that?

Clint Jensen: Yes, that has been paid, at least the first installment has been paid.

Korban Lee: And the assessments to us as agencies, you're getting those.

Clint Jensen: Yes. They've all been billed out and I collected, I'd say three-fourths of those special assessments.

Doug Hill: Whatever happened to the... We had some discussion about being able to pay both years this year.

Clint Jensen: Yeah. If you still want to do that's okay with us. We'll just account it accordingly so that we don't bill you in next year. That's up to you.

Korban Lee: OK. We did that. It was easier for us to just take it out of risk management fund and settlements fund and pay it all at once rather to...

Clint Jensen: From those that...

Korban Lee: Well, if you want to do that, you can.

Clint Jensen: Yeah. It's, it's been 50/50. Those who wanted to can pay ahead, those who want to just wait for another bill next year. That's fine too.

Scott Ruf: We're also seeing the benefits, too. We renegotiate with our vendors to chop our annual payments, so we're not getting these big million-dollar invoices in July, either versa term stuff. We've we like birth determining stuff. We, we negotiate. We negotiate with them to bill them out at least twice a year quarterly so we can spread them out.

CLOSED SESSION

Korban Lee: Other comments? Questions? Thank you very much. Okay, with that, let's go to agenda item number nine, which is a closed session consideration for the purpose of a person's character, competence, or health. I'm looking for a motion to go into closed session, and then because it is closed session, we'd need a roll call vote,

Gary Whatcott: Make the motion closed session.

Korban Lee: Thank you.

Dom Burchett: I'll second.

Korban Lee: Okay, we have a motion by Gary Whatcott, seconded by Chief Burchett to go into close session for character competence and health discussions. Any discussion on the motion? Okay.

Scott Ruf: Do you have to say why we're going post session motion.

Scott Ruf: Oh, I sit in the room. Disregard. I'm sorry. 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.

Gary Whatcott: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Collins, South Salt Lake.

Josh Collins: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Oh, sorry. 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: Mr. Harrington, Taylorsville.

Scott Harrington: Yes. .

Scott Ruf: Chief Burchett, UFA.

Dom Burchett: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Undersheriff Petersen.

Jake Petersen: Yes.

Scott Ruf: Mr. Pyle, West Valley City.

Wayne Pyle: Yes.

Motion –

. . . By Mr. Gary Whatcott, to go into a closed session to discuss character competence and health; the motion was seconded by Mr. Dom Burchett; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

Scott Ruf: Okay. Give me one second.

Clint Jensen: You want me to stay, or do you want me to go? I'm leaving.

Korban Lee: Clint, we'll excuse you, but we may call on either or both of you to join us.

Clint Jensen: Okay.

Korban Lee: We may need your assistance.

Scott Ruf: It's all running. So, whatever.

Korban Lee: Are we recording close? Not a person. Not for personnel.

Scott Jensen: Is it okay to stop it now?

Korban Lee: Yeah.

RE-OPEN PUBLIC MEETING/TOUR/MOTION TO ADJOURN

Korban Lee: Okay. As we are back in public meeting, we have one last agenda item. The agenda item number 11 is to take a tour of the facility. We have put on the agenda that no formal action will be taken during or following the tour, and that we plan to adjourn the meeting from the tour. I would like a motion from a trustee to proceed to the tour and adjourn from there. Is someone willing to make that motion?

David Brickey: I'll make the motion that we proceed to a tour where no formal action or discussion of items takes place but adjourned from there.

Mark Reid: I'll second it.

Korban Lee: Okay. We have a motion by David Brickey, seconded by Mark Reid. All in favor, say aye.

All: Aye.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. David Brickey, to proceed with the VECC tour and then adjourn the meeting from there; the motion was seconded by Mr. Mark Reid; the motion carried unanimously.

Korban Lee: Okay, any opposed? All right, we'll go on the tour. The tours optional and we'll adjourn at the end of the tour. Thank you everyone.

The meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.