

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
December 15, 2021 Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Dan Petersen – UFA, Chairman
Mr. Korban Lee – West Jordan, Vice-Chairman
Mr. David Dobbins – Draper
Mr. Doug Hill - Murray
Mr. Gary Whatcott – South Jordan
Mr. Kyle Kershaw – South Salt Lake
Mr. David Brickey - Riverton
Mr. Nathan Cherpeski - Herriman
Mr. Mark Reid – Bluffdale
Mr. Tim Tingey – Cottonwood Heights
Mr. Scott Harrington - Taylorsville
Mr. Jake Petersen – UPD
Mr. Wayne Pyle - West Valley City

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Scott Ruf – Director, VECC
Mr. Clint Jensen – VECC Deputy Director
Mr. Scott Young, VECC Legal Counsel
Mr. Troy Carr – Herriman
Mr. Derek Maxfield – West Jordan
Mr. Chad Pascua – Murray
Mr. Jon Harris – Murray
Mr. Jon Eining – Draper
Mr. Clint Smith – Draper
Mr. Jeff Carr – South Jordan
Ms. Beth Todd – SLVECC
Ms. Andrea Partridge – SLVECC
Mr. Jonathan Bridges – SLVECC
Mr. Craig Burnett – Murray
Mr. Riley Pilgrim – UFA
Mr. Dom Burchett – UFA
Mr. Dave Spatafore – Capstone Strategies
Ms. Ashley Spatafore – Capstone Strategies
Mr. Josh Collins – South Salt Lake
Mr. Ryan Carter – Riverton
Mr. Bruce Kartchner – Bluffdale
Ms. Laynie Markisich – Stifel

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

Mr. Dan Petersen called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m.

Dan Petersen ([00:02:59](#)): Okay, very good. Let's go ahead and call this meeting to order. December 15th, 2021, VECC board of trustees. We'll start with a consideration of the November 17th trustee minutes. Do I hear a motion to approve the minutes or make any adjustments?

Wayne Pyle ([00:03:22](#)): Move to approve the minutes, Chief. This is Wayne.

David Brickey ([00:03:26](#)): Second. Second, Wayne Harpers. No, Wayne Pyle. I'm going to give you a title of Senator.

Wayne Pyle ([00:03:35](#)): Okay. No comment from over here.

Dan Petersen ([00:03:41](#)): Okay, very good. And just unmute, and all those in favor of approving the minutes, say aye.

Board ([00:03:49](#)): Aye.

APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 17, 2021 BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEETING MINUTES

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Wayne Pyle, to approve the minutes of the November 17, 2021 Trustees meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. David Brickey; the motion carried unanimously.

Dan Petersen ([00:03:52](#)): Any opposed? Okay. Are there any comments, public comments from the group on the call now?

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Scott Ruf ([00:04:03](#)): We did not get any, Chief, by email.

PUBLIC HEARING TO SOLICIT PUBLIC COMMENT ON PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF REVENUE BONDS

Dan Petersen ([00:04:05](#)): No email either. Okay. We need to open the public hearing on agenda item four, to solicit public comment on the proposed issuance of revenue bonds, to finance the cost acquisition and installation of the systems, project refunding of issuer's revenue bonds, and paying costs incurred with the issuance, sale of bonds. So, we'll declare the public hearing open and see if there are any motions. We need to take a vote to open the public hearing, correct? Or can I just open that? Where's Scott Young?

Scott Harrington ([00:04:57](#)): You should just be able to open it, Scott Harrington.

Dan Petersen ([00:05:00](#)): I think so.

Scott Young ([00:05:01](#)): Yeah, I think you can open it. This is Scott Young.

Dan Petersen ([00:05:03](#)): Great. So, we'll open the public hearing now. And any comments, any discussions over the proposed issuance of bonds?

Wayne Pyle ([00:05:18](#)): Chief, I'll make a comment and a motion. We had good long discussion about this, in a couple of different occasions if I remember right. And I think we had arrived at a fairly general consensus as to the best way to approach this, and that we would support it. So with that, I will move to approve item 4.0.

Dan Petersen ([00:05:40](#)): And I think at this point, it's just a hearing, Wayne. We're just going to open and close the hearing, and then we can go into the process that we take from there.

Wayne Pyle ([00:05:52](#)): Oh, sorry about that.

Dan Petersen ([00:05:53](#)): No worries.

Wayne Pyle (00:05:54): I thought you had opened the hearing.

Dan Petersen (00:05:56): Yeah, hearing's open. And without hearing anymore, those good comments, we'll close the public hearing, and then move to 4.1 and let Scott walk us through the funding process from here forward.

CAPITAL PROJECT FUNDING PROCESS

Scott Ruf (00:06:12): Thanks, Chief. So, and Deputy Director Jensen, correct me if I'm wrong, but with the completion of the public hearing, I understand the comment period goes for an additional four days, based on the 30-day clock from the time we posted the notice for public hearing. So, I believe that'll go through Monday.

Clint Jensen (00:06:32): The 21st, actually. December 21st.

Scott Ruf (00:06:34): Okay. So the 30-day comment period will close on December 21st. Following that, the representatives from Stifle and Farnsworth will present Deputy Director Jensen and us, with the documents for review and acceptance for release. Once approved, it'll be released for solicitation of bids for servicing the bonds. There will be a time period for them to turn those in. They'll be reviewed and brought back to this board of trustees at the January meeting, with a recommendation. At which time the board will be asked to accept the recommendation or take some other action on the proposal. Provided it passes at the January budget meeting, I mean the January trustee meeting, they anticipate the closing, and then the funding of the bonds should be end of January. And then the capital project will go ahead and move forward from there. I think we covered all the check marks there.

Dan Petersen (00:07:47): Right. Anybody want to make any comments to that before we move on? We've discussed it quite a bit, I think. We still get that chance to see the final package in January.

LEGISLATIVE AUDIT

Dan Petersen (00:08:00): Moving to agenda item five on the legislative audit, it's in your packet, the audit itself. The story, it's really the 12-month follow-up, along with a letter I submitted on behalf of the board to embed into that. But I'll start with both Scott, and with Dave and Ashley Spatafore to talk about how it was received by the presentation to the committee.

Scott Ruf (00:08:30): Thanks, Chief. So on the seventh, myself and David and Ashley Spatafore from Capstone Strategies, attended the legislative committee meeting. We were third in line, as things on the agenda. We gave kind of a summary where we were at, the progress we made, the support of the board. It was rather quick. The comments we received from Speaker Wilson and President Adams seemed to be positive. And I think because it was a long day, and we were last, they seemed pleased with our progress and where we are, and the commitment by VECC and the board to do everything we said we were going to do. So it was a short, I don't even think 10-minute presentation with very few questions, a couple of small comments, again in the positive. And I went ahead and left. And I'll turn it over to David or Ashley, for any follow-up on conversations or comments they had following that committee meeting.

David Spatafore (00:09:36): Great, thanks Scott. Thank you, Chief. I sat with Scott during his presentation, and I think if I'm not mistaken Speaker Wilson called me his sidekick, so I'll take that as a compliment. We were third on the agenda, as Scott indicated. And the good news was, is we were not the Department of Corrections health audit, providing healthcare audit. That's the good news. Even the better news is the fact that Speaker Wilson, who's been the most critical and the most vocally critical, was very vocally supportive. As all of you know, Scott's done a great job of providing information to Speaker Wilson, President Adams, Senator Harper on our monthly numbers, and they've gotten better. And the good part about getting better is they've always,

they've been consistent over the last three months. And that's what the speaker and the president want to see, is that consistency.

David Spatafore (00:10:45): So, the comments essentially were Speaker Wilson saying, "You're doing a great job. Thank you," with the motion made and approved by the committee, for the audit to go to the Criminal Justice Appropriations Committee and the Political Subdivisions Interim Committee for further discussion, which is just perfunctory. And they've asked Jake to come back in 12 months as a follow-up, which is not unusual.

David Spatafore (00:11:17): So, I'll say this, two things. To the board, you guys have done a great job in putting forth the effort and the commitment to the legislature of improvements, and we've done it. And I want to give Scott kudos as well. During the presentation, he did a very, very, very good job. And he was actually going into too much detail because you could tell they were kind of getting glassy-eyed, and a couple legislators were walking back. And I touched Scott on the arm, and I said, "You've done plenty, you've said plenty, let's just move on and go home," and that's what happened. And so it was a good day to be VECC last Tuesday.

Dan Petersen (00:12:04): Wonderful. One of the recommendations, well, obviously the standing recommendation that he's made is to fully adopt the standards. That's the only recommendation that remains. We adopted a transitional standard to get to the call answer times, and it's specifically related to how fast, what percentage of time we're answering the call of 911 in 20 seconds. That's the goal. We adopted a 90%, and I think last month or the month before we talked about looking in January at adopting the 95% of the time within 20 seconds, which is when the Versaterm is completely introduced and integrated in everywhere. There's no longer two issues in there. So in the letter, I indicated that that would be a consideration at the January meeting. Strictly because we wanted a single CAD in the center before we adopted that standard.

Dan Petersen (00:13:04): And reminded them in the letter, that that standard is only there for the distribution of a proportional share of additional funds after they pay all the 911 centers. It's not tied to the core funds today, but we will want to consider that in January. Other than that, I do think that Scott put his job on the line, realistically, to indicate that the phones were the bulk of the standard, and it turned out to be pretty accurate. And that's why we, I think, are in a space with the legislature that we are. And I think the effort that we've done, I captured in that letter the additional funding for capital, the substantial additional funding all of us have made to make the center sustainable, and the work that he's done is showing in a good space. And once we get through the issues related to call answer times, we can continue to work on the call processing, and the sustainability of the center, and get us to a spot where we're maintaining the center more than we are rebuilding it. Anybody have any comments or discussions over this report?

David Spatafore (00:14:21): Chief, there's one other legislative issue I'd like to raise, just briefly with you if I may, when you think it's appropriate.

Dan Petersen (00:14:29): Okay. No comments, so go ahead, Dave, on any other legislative issue.

David Spatafore (00:14:37): We know for sure there is going to be at least one more legislative bill that's going to deal with 911 Senator Harper and Representative Handy are running a bill that is going to essentially rearrange the deck chairs, so to speak, on the 911 service fee. And bear with me, the bill is going to do a number of things with two effective dates. And in my Hollywood Squares of screen, I can see Attorney David Brickey, and he's thinking, two effective dates, that's pretty unusual. But effective July 1st, 2022, the 34 cents that's assigned to radio, the radio rebuild, will be reduced to 31. The 18 cents that UCA gets to do radio maintenance will be increased to 21. So that's a net gain of zero. Then whatever... And effective in 2023, that 31 cents for the radio rebuild will be reduced to zero, and the 71 cents that local PSAPs get will be increased to 73 cents, a two-cent increase in July 2023.

David Spatafore (00:16:07): I also neglected to mention that effective in July 1, 2022, the 25 cents that UCA has been using per line, for all the new CAD equipment for all of the PSAPs, that has a sunset date of 2025. This legislation will increase that sunset, the length of that sunset to 2035. And then when the radio money goes to zero, there's going to be a one-time request of whatever's necessary to finish paying off the radio system. So, what Senator Harper and Representative handy want to do is essentially in this legislative session, reduce fees. And they're going to reduce fees by eliminating the radio fee over two years, adding six cents over two years to the radio maintenance for UCA, adding two cents to the local PSAPs in two years, and then extending the sunset for the 25 cents.

Dan Petersen (00:17:13): Any comments, observations? But no discussion at this point in any restructure of how it's distributed, it stays the same method of distribution?

David Spatafore (00:17:24): Based on the meeting we had with legislative research and all of the players, Chief, no. There is not going to be any redistribution of the 73 local cents. So we should be, it'll still be maintained on the number of calls answered.

Dan Petersen (00:17:41): Okay.

Korban Lee (00:17:41): So over time, Dave, is there a net... I mean, how benign is this to VECC, or is this a hidden challenge to VECC?

David Spatafore (00:17:53): Well, actually you're going to increase your revenues by two cents, two cents per line.

Korban Lee (00:17:58): In...

David Spatafore (00:18:00): In 2023.

Scott Ruf (00:18:04): What it does, I think Mr. Lee, to answer your question, Dave, correct me if I'm wrong. With the moving of the fund, I think the reason behind this is their new P25, radio system to maintain that moving forward. The shift in the 25 cents to sunset, and an additional decade, is to allow for the growth and the support for the PSAPs for the 911 phone equipment. And what the PSAPs gain in all of this, and I think we've talked about it previously, is UCA now assumes the payment and support of the entire 911 system. Where if you recall, we were paying about 70,000 a month for the selective routers for old legacy equipment, and all the PSAPs were paying, Salt Lake City, VECC, and Weber 911, I think between the three of us were paying about 130,000 a month for those.

Scott Ruf (00:19:02): And all those go away, so we'll realize savings when it comes to the paying for selective routers and services, with the implementation the new next gen 911 ESInet phone system and radio network. So, I think that's the gain we see in addition to the additional two cents. And the other stuff I think, is the state is going to support the statewide radio system, which again, outside of subscriber equipment which are portables and mobiles, we won't have to pay for of towers, and radio consoles and things like that. Is that a good summary, Dave?

David Spatafore (00:19:38): Yes. Korban, increased revenue and reduced costs. How's that for city management speak?

Korban Lee (00:19:47): Thank you.

David Spatafore (00:19:50): Thanks to everybody, we appreciate the opportunity of working with you. And it's been a good year, and hopefully with this legislation, 2022 will be even better.

Wayne Pyle (00:20:00): Thanks, Dave.

Dan Petersen (00:20:01): Okay, very good. Thank you very much. Move to 6-0, VECC performance progress report.

VECC PERFORMANCE & PROGRESS REPORT

Scott Ruf (00:20:09): I can put it up if you want, Chief. But if the board remembers, we released this a little earlier than usual, because we were anticipating the committee meeting. So we released it a week early, so the elected officials would have it prior to the committee hearing on the seventh. And as we discussed, we continue to not only level the, stop the rollercoaster ride, but we continue to see month over month improvements by a half percent to a percent. And actually, the NENA standard for 15 seconds or less, we actually met that standard by more than a percent. And that's probably the first time in years that VECC has achieved that, and we're just under the 95%, as you can see, at 92 and change for November.

Scott Ruf (00:21:10): So, like Dave pointed out, since the new phone system we've seen month over month incremental improvements. We've actually hit the actual NENA standard above the original VECC adoption of 85%, the NENA standard 90. And I think the plan moving forward, and I'll defer to Chief Petersen as Chair, that with this stabilization, we'll share the report a little sooner instead of holding it. It'll be reviewed and then released as soon it's available.

Dan Petersen (00:21:45): Yeah. I've asked him to review it with whoever, the Chair and Vice Chair, and then push it out immediately and then he just presents it to here. I would assume there's not any objection to that from this group. It's no longer... It's a pretty well packaged report at this point. I don't think it needs to be reviewed and approved by the full VECC board as much as the Chair and Vice Chair, and then it can be pushed to everybody. Anybody have any objection to that? Okay, seeing none, then consider that a done deal for moving forward, Scott.

Scott Ruf (00:22:23): Okay, thank you.

Dan Petersen (00:22:25): Great report, thank you. Go ahead and speak to call processing times.

Scott Ruf (00:22:33): Thanks, Chief. So if you recall in the report we issued, there's a benchmark tied to, actually more so on the fire EMS side, tied to the NFPA standard of 1710, which has a requirement of call to dispatch time of 60 seconds or less. We've been reporting that is not available, and the reason is we're just still working through the issue with Versaterm, and how to cleanly pull those statistics out. While we can pull it out in raw data, we want to make sure it's consistent and it's replica by the agencies. And we're just not there yet, as to meet those two standards.

Scott Ruf (00:23:22): So, we continue to work closely with Versaterm and the agencies, and I think I mentioned last month, we did a deep dive with West Valley. And it was determined we're actually meeting NFPA standards for West Valley at 39 to 40 seconds. And we believe that to be true across the board on high priority fire EMS calls, but again, we can't make sure it's consistent and replicable based on the other data metrics that some of the agencies use to report to their governing bodies. So, we're going to continue to work on that and provide that data as it becomes available.

Dan Petersen (00:24:07): Okay. Any questions for Scott on that issue? Okay, move to item seven, CAD project update.

CAD PROJECT UPDATE

Scott Ruf (00:24:18):_Yep, thanks Chief. So just to report, we're still on track for South Salt Lake Police and West Valley Police to go live on January 1st at 00:01 hours. We'll be prepared for that. At that point, everybody will now have transitioned to the Versaterm CAD platform, will be on a common CAD. I will reengage Salt Lake City as far as call taking and triaging, to start working on eliminating the need for transfers. And then sometime in 2022, the University of Utah will come on board as well. As we previously discussed, we have an agreement in place with them to do that and fund their portion of that.

Scott Ruf (00:25:04): We've also engaged Versaterm for the cloud project, which was approved to move forward by this board and Salt Lake City last month. We went ahead, to not stall this any longer, we went ahead after review by Scott Young for VECC's legal and Salt Lake City's legal, with a letter of intent with Versaterm, to have initial conversations, and some back-office communications to beginning to set up the cloud and what it would look like, while we work through the bigger contract for that transition.

Scott Ruf (00:25:42): We did have a meeting with all the stakeholders, so Salt Lake City, the county, UPD, and VECC. And we'll be looking to move forward with a single contract for the cloud, and for the valley under the coalition and the VECC members. It'll make it cleaner; it won't necessarily change how we, how we deal with the vendor, but it'll make it cleaner. And VECC will be the manager of that agreement, that will be signed and by Salt Lake VECC and then Salt Lake City, under the auspices of the coalition which will be addressed here in item eight. So, in about another 30 days, less than 30 days, we will have officially finished the CAD project as it relates to the mission and vision of the agencies long before I showed up here, and the grant provided by UCA.

Dan Petersen (00:26:35): Okay, very good. Any questions on that issue? We'll move to the-

Korban Lee (00:26:53): Just about the RMS, sorry. Scott, thank you for the update about CAD. How are, and this is a question for the other trustees. How is your RMS implementation changeover going? Does anyone have any problems with that?

Scott Ruf (00:27:10): Other than just some changes in process by the agencies, I have not personally heard of any major challenges by the agencies. Anything that's been specific to some of the agencies has been worked through. I can say, I check in daily or every couple of days with our team here, that's been working with West Valley and South Salt Lake, and West Valley has been moving really smoothly and very quickly ahead with their plans for the transition. But I would have to defer to any of the trustee representative or anybody else on the call that would have input regarding that question. I have not heard anything directly of any challenges or issues that weren't able to be worked through or discussed as far as workflow and processes for the agencies.

Wayne Pyle (00:28:10): So Korban, the RMS switch over was a big concern for RPD especially, back when we were getting going into the process, but it's a little early for us because we're still just implementing, but I haven't heard any complaints or major concerns thus far.

Korban Lee (00:28:31): You were one of the main ones I was wondering about, Wayne, thank you. Chief Carr, you guys, in your valley chiefs or in the ops board meeting, is it coming up among the other chiefs?

Troy Carr (00:28:46): No. It seems as though everything's going quite smooth. We've had some valley outages, but that's more driven by some issues that are being experienced up in, I think some one-offs, Scott, right?

Scott Ruf (00:28:56): Yes.

Troy Carr (00:28:56): That we experienced. But other than that, it seems as though it's going on very smooth. Another valuable thing is we have agencies that are using it, and they're able to jump in and help the other

agencies when they onboard. So, we have some experienced individuals that were on Spillman, and as these agencies switch over, and I'll use one of my guys, Sergeant Brad Bailey as an example. He's able to go to those other agencies and say, "Hey look, this is where it was in Spillman, this is where it is in Versaterm." So, I think it's been a good team effort and I haven't heard anything negative yet.

Korban Lee ([00:29:32](#)): Thank you. Thank you, sorry to interrupt. Thank you.

CONSIDER OF RESOLUTION T21-08 APPROVING UPDATED SL CONSORTIUM INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH SLC

Dan Petersen ([00:29:38](#)): Okay. Moving to item eight, the consideration of resolution approving Salt Lake consortium interlocal agreement. Scott Young, I'll have you kind of just overview. I think it was mostly Scott Young, right, in reestablishing this interlocal? Just share the why, and what's in front of us today.

Scott Young ([00:30:04](#)): Yeah. So, what's in front of you is the revised interlocal agreement. This deals with the common CAD. And we've been working on this for some time with Salt Lake City, got to an agreement. The main change, there's kind of two main changes. One, the old agreement was just old and didn't quite reflect what we're doing with the common CAD. And that brings to the second point, which is we've reduced the kind of... Like for example, there was a board that was created between the two agencies, and some different things that weren't actually happening. And so, we've reduced a few bureaucratic layers to make sure that we can do things in a timely fashion. However, the authority always has to be given to our director by this board. So there's still the oversight, but it's not in the day-to-day management of this. And Scott Ruf can speak to this a bit, but we're actually pretty close to the end of this thing. So, this should see us over the finish line.

Scott Ruf ([00:31:23](#)): Yeah. And the other thing that we wanted to address as we move to the cloud, is the ongoing support, maintenance, and management of the system, and how the payment of different things would be applied that would maybe be more global, and a cost share between VECC and Salt Lake City, and things like that. Because if we move to a single contract, there will be a lot of pass through as far as invoicing and billing back. So we just wanted to make sure that we had something in place, that allows us to manage it long-term, and then make it equitable for all parties involved. Without having to manage it three or four different ways, and every time we have to do something, we have to go to UPD because they hold an old contract, the city holds an old contract and VECC holds a new contract.

Scott Ruf ([00:32:14](#)): So to Scott's point, we kind of streamlined a lot of the bureaucracy tied to it, and then putting language there to allow for the enhancement of the system, whether it be global countywide, or necessitated by the need of an agency or a jurisdiction specifically.

Doug Hill ([00:32:37](#)): Scott, when would you estimate that this agreement would terminate?

Scott Ruf ([00:32:43](#)): I think it has a five year renewal, doesn't it, Scott?

Scott Young ([00:32:46](#)): Yeah.

Dan Petersen ([00:32:56](#)): A minor spot for you, Scott Young, going underneath the public safety agencies, just to get this list accurate for you. Draper City needs to be on its own line for fire department.

Scott Young ([00:33:12](#)): Okay.

Dan Petersen ([00:33:13](#)): And underneath unified fire, Granite Township is not a municipality, so they shouldn't be on the list. So you can scratch Draper City and Granite Township under UFA. And then, but you'll need to add a few townships and cities. Are you ready for me to just run them off real quick?

Scott Young (00:33:37): Sure, yep.

Dan Petersen (00:33:38): Immigration Township, Brighton Town, Mill Creek City, Midvale City and unincorporated Salt Lake County. And you probably should put unincorporated Salt Lake County under unified police as well.

Scott Young (00:33:59): Okay.

Dan Petersen (00:34:00): Any other adjustments to, or proposals to any of these segments that you're looking at?

Kyle Kershaw (00:34:09): Chief, This is Kyle. I don't see South Salt Lake Fire Department on that list.

Dan Petersen (00:34:17): Okay, we'll need to add that as well.

Scott Young (00:34:19): Okay.

Dan Petersen (00:34:19): I think this was pulled from a pretty old list and transferred over, so it would be good to get this right.

Scott Young (00:34:28): Yeah, I agree. And you're right about that. I didn't go through to check and make sure, so I appreciate the help on this.

Dan Petersen (00:34:39): Any other segments to this?

Doug Hill (00:34:42): I just want to go back to my question again, Scott. You're saying that you anticipate that the completion of funding and implementation will go beyond five years?

Scott Ruf (00:35:01): Well, the project completion and funding tied to the UCA grant, which was the initial reason for the formation of the coalition, will terminate when we close the grant early in 2022. But because it's a countywide system, and the changes in technology, we felt we still needed an agreement in place to allow for the global management of the network and the system, especially moving to the cloud, and under one contract under the coalition. And it provides, Scott Young, correct me if I'm wrong, more of a checks and balances between the city, and VECC and the agencies we serve. So, there will be ongoing support and maintenance. And it also provides a mechanism to assess any enhancements to the network, or the product or applications, based on requests of either the city, or VECC, or independent agencies or jurisdictions. So I think it serves two purposes, the initial CAD grant and the solicitation or the request for the money to do the project. And then we needed a mechanism to continue to maintain and support the system moving forward. Is that a good summary, Scott Young?

Scott Young (00:36:22): Yeah, yeah. That's exactly right.

Dan Petersen (00:36:25): To that end-

Doug Hill (00:36:28): Is that clear, Scott, then? Is that clear in the recitals that the intent... As I read the agreement, it seemed to me like it focused, the intent was primarily to focus on the funding and implementation of common CAD. I didn't get an impression, unless I just skipped over a paragraph or something, that it talked about a long-term relationship for these other things that Scott talked about.

Scott Ruf (00:36:59): So section 13, Mr. Hill, where it covers fiscal year annual budget, and 13.3 I think would address the operational and maintenance expenses. And then also in section...

Scott Young (00:37:23): While he's looking that up, it's a fair point about in the recitals, the ongoing maintenance isn't specifically mentioned in there. If we want to mention that, I would change, I would add it to recital B. And I don't anticipate any issues from Salt Lake City's end on including that if we want to in the recitals.

Dan Petersen (00:37:52): To build on what Doug is saying too, I think that we really received these funds to try and operate as close to one style as we can. There could be value, even if it's not tied to the maintenance costs, of staying together at least enough to make sure that we don't at some point become two separate CADs, and hold on to, even if this is strictly an agreement to settle disputes and conflicts that might arise by having some sort of governance of this agreement, that we might want to say not only maintenance, but to maintain a common CAD throughout the valley long term. We don't want to see us just walk away from this and then have either party just arbitrarily move to a way that doesn't allow us to work together anymore unless we are consciously deciding to not work together anymore.

Scott Ruf (00:38:55): So Chief, to that point, I think in E of the recitals, the last sentence about, "Additional funding made available in the future for the purposes of this agreement." And under the agreement, section one for general purpose, item one, "Condition, will operate, maintain and approve the party's public safety communication data by implementing this unified CAD." And then the term in item two and three kinds of outlines... And this is my opinion, I don't know, defer to Scott Young, "Continue for an indefinite... To allow for the completion of funding and change by each party." Anyway, I just wanted to put that out there.

Scott Young (00:39:35): Well, I think definitely the intent that we've conveyed and we've gotten from Salt Lake City is for that relationship to continue, and for this to operate as a common CAD. So, we can add some language to make that more clear. I think those are good inputs.

Dan Petersen (00:39:57): Yeah. I'd be supportive of a long-term agreement that could be revisited every five years, but our goal is to have a method here to settle some of the conflicts that we might anticipate, that's entered into an agreement to try and hold onto a single CAD. Anybody have any objection to asking a bit of a revision in the recitals, and in the language to make sure that that's obvious? Is that what we want as a board? Seems like that's the nod, maybe we could just get that clarified in there, Scott.

Scott Young (00:40:42): Okay.

Dan Petersen (00:40:42): And maybe bring back to us, unless, there's not a critical time moment on this, is there?

Scott Ruf (00:40:49): No.

Scott Young (00:40:52): No. We can do that, we can make changes. And like I said, I think this is all in line with Salt Lake City's view of the agreement, so I don't anticipate pushback from them on this. I think they'll like it.

Dan Petersen (00:41:09): And the part I'd like to have in here for that, is just the chance to say that if the city or we create a policy, or a change, or a procurement process that causes us not to be able to operate with a single CAD, that it offers a solution process through this interlocal that we've agreed, to work through the issue in a way that governs it properly. With the statement that we don't want to do those things, but I absolutely believe at some point in time, we're going to have issues that will drive a wedge between the two. And it

would be nice at least to have this document that we can refer back to, to try and hold onto a more common CAD. Functionally common, not just in name.

Scott Young (00:42:01): That sounds good. I'll work on it.

Dan Petersen (00:42:05): Great. We'll pause, and we'll put that back in consideration then when you're ready, for that language. Any other questions? Doug, thanks for spotting that gap in the recital. That's good for us to get clear, I think this is important on us.

OPERATIONS BOARD BYLAWS

Dan Petersen (00:42:26): Item nine is the operations bylaws, that's in your packet. This has been worked on through us as the executive board, and then given time for the ops board to review. I wanted to give time for the ops boards to really look at it carefully. And before we even consider it, just know that I want to provide time now for Chief Carr and Chief Maxfield to share. And then based on what you want, you can either consider this set of bylaws today, or pause for a month if you want. Don't feel like we have to adopt this, but I did want to give time first for, we'll start with Chief Carr, just share the feedback you've got and the thoughts relating to the set in front of us.

Troy Carr (00:43:16): Thank you, Mr. Chair. The feedback we got was overwhelmingly positive. We got zero negative feedback. It seems as though the feedback I did get, felt like it was about time that we did that type of change, that the rewrite was needed. And that the way it was rewritten is how we do business, versus as you know, we experienced a lot of language in there that just didn't mean anything. So from the police board ops, it was overwhelmingly positive.

Dan Petersen (00:43:53): Okay, good. Chief Maxfield?

Derek Maxfield (00:43:58): Yeah. From the fire side, it was positive as well. We did just have some comments about ensuring that we still have the users' group, and that we use them, because of their closeness to what's happening out in the field. But other than that, it was overwhelmingly supportive, and we're happy to see it brought up to, like Chief Carr said, what we're currently doing.

Dan Petersen (00:44:26): Okay. Okay, with that, any questions from the board on this packet?

Doug Hill (00:44:41): The only comment I have is in the resolution itself, I'm just trying to understand. I'm reading the resolution, and it talks about the interlocal agreement with Salt Lake City Corporation. I wonder if the right resolution got attached to our packets.

Dan Petersen (00:45:12): I think that resolution-

Scott Ruf (00:45:14): That could be my mistake, Chief. Yeah, that could be an error. Hold on.

Dan Petersen (00:45:19): You're right, that's a 2109.

Scott Ruf (00:45:24): Yeah, it's my fault. I didn't change, I got to change the title on the resolution. The context of it is right, the title on the resolution was wrong. That's my fault.

Dan Petersen (00:45:41): So if you stretch from adopting, just put after that, the bylaws. Do we see any other issues down in the meat of it, Doug, besides the title?

Doug Hill (00:45:59): No, no. And with that in mind, unless anybody has any discussions, I'd be ready to make a motion.

Dan Petersen (00:46:06): Okay. I think we're ready for that.

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION T21-09 ADOPTING THE OPERATION BOARD BYLAWS

Doug Hill (00:46:09): So, I would move approval of a resolution adopting the Salt Lake Valley Emergency Communications Center board of operations bylaws, as amended.

Jake Petersen (00:46:24): I'll second that, this is Jake.

Dan Petersen (00:46:27): Okay. Scott, let's do a roll call.

Scott Ruf (00:46:28): Chief Petersen, UFA.

Dan Petersen (00:46:34): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:46:35): Mr. Lee, West Jordan.

Korban Lee (00:46:37): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:46:38): Mr. Dobbins, Draper.

David Dobbins (00:46:40): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:46:40): Mr. Hill, Murray. Mr. Whatcott, South Jordan.

Gary Whatcott (00:46:46): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:46:47): Mr. Kershaw, South Salt Lake.

Kyle Kershaw (00:46:49): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:46:50): Mr. Brickey, Riverton.

David Brickey (00:46:52): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:46:52): Mr. Cherpeski, Herriman.

Nathan Cherpeski (00:46:52): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:46:53): Mr. Reid, Bluffdale.

Mark Reid (00:46:58): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:46:59): Mr. Tingey, Cottonwood Heights.

Tim Tingey (00:47:01): Yes.

Scott Ruf (00:47:02): Mr. Harrington, Taylorsville.

Scott Harrington (00:47:04): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:47:05](#)): Undersheriff Petersen.

Jake Petersen ([00:47:07](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:47:08](#)): Mr. Pyle, West Valley.

Wayne Pyle ([00:47:10](#)): Yes.

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION T21-09 ADOPTING THE OPERATION BOARD BYLAWS

Motion –

. . . By Mr. Doug Hill, to approve Resolution T21-09, adopting the Operation Board Bylaws; the motion was seconded by Mr. Jake Petersen; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

POLICE AND FIRE OPERATIONS BOARDS – NO MEETINGS HELD IN DECEMBER

Dan Petersen ([00:47:12](#)): Great, thank you. Next item is the police and fire ops board. There was no meeting held, but I thought Chief Carr or Chief Maxfield, if you wanted to make any comments, you're welcome to take a minute.

Derek Maxfield ([00:47:29](#)): I don't have any.

Troy Carr ([00:47:32](#)): Nor do I, Mr. Chair.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Dan Petersen ([00:47:34](#)): Okay. Item 11 is director's report.

Scott Ruf ([00:47:41](#)): Thanks, Chief. I think we touched on a lot of the things already. One of the things I was asked for back in August was a continued update of where we are with recruitment and retention, related to the compensation plan the board approved back in July, that we implemented in September. It has, we continue to retain folks. We had, I believe, eight people start in November. We're looking to start another group of new hires on Monday, the 10th of January. And we've also allowed us, with the retention and the cross training of call takers for dispatch and vice versa, that we ended up with a more dynamic and flexible workforce to allow us to accommodate the needs of the agencies.

Scott Ruf ([00:48:32](#)): So, I think we're in a positive place there. We've lost two individuals for life events, but they were on the newer end, barely out of training or off probation. We have not lost any seasoned, or anyone that's been around for VECC or UPD for a while, so I think that's a positive step. The compensation plan should be fully implemented in January. So we're seeing some positive results, we're getting an uptick in applications and testing, and we're changing the process a little bit for our background, and some of the testing we do pre-hire. As well as ongoing testing of current employees to make sure their mental health is well, and we're taking care of our folks. So again, we appreciate the board's support, and I think it's starting to show positive outcomes with regard to the retention, and the engagement from the newer folks, and the training, and the willingness to really learn more about different jobs within the operations side of the center. So, thank you for that.

Scott Ruf ([00:49:41](#)): As you know, last month we presented you with a one time, and you approved the one time retirement incentive plan related to restructuring. Four of the five individuals were excited about the opportunity, and grateful for what the board had supported and was presenting to them, are going to take us up on that offer. So while we're going to miss them, we wish them well in their retirement, and those will take effect starting in January and throughout the first few months of the new year, into the early spring. And we'll

announce those as they come up, because there's a lot of years of service that are taking advantage of this opportunity. So, it allowed VECC to move forward, but also folks to go ahead, enjoy their next chapters in their lives as we relieved some of the stressors they had tied to retirement over the next several years for them. So, thank you again for that opportunity for them. And I'm sure at some point we will, or you will hear from them as well, so thank you for that.

Scott Ruf (00:50:56): And then finally, I meant to touch on it last week, but as we restructured and reorganized VECC back, and went through an overhaul soon after, eight months after I got here, and put some new people in some different situations, and bringing on Deputy Director Jensen, and that, we went ahead and I was fortunate enough to be sponsored and went through a leadership program that UFA sponsors annually, with their captains and battalions, and people that want to move through the organization. We brought that program here to VECC. We had our first, I guess, cohort is the proper way to I think discuss that. Because it's not a one and done, it's not a training that checks a box. It's really an investment in the employees, not only for the organization, but in the individual employees and their personal growth, both professionally and personally. And it ties into ongoing resources with, I guess a mentor or a coach, if you will. And that allows them to bounce ideas off, and deal with things they're dealing with, either again, work or professionally.

Scott Ruf (00:52:02): We've received positive feedback, we're going to try to sponsor that annually moving forward. And similar to UFA's vision, is to as we continue to move the program forward in the years to come, is to maybe reach out to some of our partners in the region and other PSAPs, to afford that. I don't know if Mr. Lee would like to, or the chief, make a comment, but I know Mr. Lee came for the last day of the last cohort, and met with the groups. And the original group here were all the managers, and the new shift commanders here at VECC, as well as Deputy Director Jensen went through the process. So, we had eight folks go through the initial cohort, but I'd like an opportunity, I don't know if Mr. Lee, you want to comment on your experience, or the feedback you received. Or Chief, more globally, as to the impacts the UFA has seen by the implementation of the program that you're using.

Korban Lee (00:52:59): Sure. Thank you, Scott. I think it was very impressive the program you're doing, and I'm happy that you're developing the leadership in VECC. I liked how much the program, what do I say? It didn't come, the issues, the development was self-identified, and kind of self-driven. I thought that was very impressive. So, I think it's a good program. I hope you keep doing it, Scott. Thank you.

Scott Ruf (00:53:32): Thanks.

Dan Petersen (00:53:36): Wonderful. Yeah, that's been a great program for us, and I'm glad you were able to make that fit. And it's good to see that support in the leadership that you picked. Anything else on your report, Scott?

Scott Ruf (00:53:51): No, I think that about covers everything. Thanks, Chief.

FINANCE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Dan Petersen (00:53:53): Great. Move to finance director's report, Clint?

Doug Hill (00:53:56): Hey, Chief? Before we move on, I've got a request of Scott. And Scott, I don't know if this is really your request, but as Dave Spatafore for was talking about, 32 cents and 73 cents, and whatever makes up the call fee, would it be possible for you to outline that in an email to us or something? I'd like to better understand where that money is going, and I don't know, I'm just trying to... Because otherwise none of those figures meant anything to me. I didn't understand how that impacted us, kind of back to what Korban asking earlier. Is it possible, and maybe you're not the right one, but would it be possible for you to outline that, those costs to us?

Scott Ruf ([00:54:55](#)): Sure.

Doug Hill ([00:55:01](#)): Thank you.

Scott Ruf ([00:55:02](#)): Okay.

Dan Petersen ([00:55:05](#)): Okay, very good. Clint?

Clint Jensen ([00:55:09](#)): Okay, thanks Chief. Financial reports in your packet. We'll put it up here on the screen, so you can take a look at it. The budget to actual report, page one, probably the biggest thing you'll notice there is we did send out the billings for the second half of our fiscal year. We certainly appreciate many of you who paid that very timely, it certainly helped our cash flow as we came into December.

Clint Jensen ([00:55:38](#)): The second page of this report, Scott, if you'll scroll down to the cash flow. You can kind of see how tight things were under our restricted funds. Go down just a little bit more, right there. You can see where we work cash-wise at the end of November, \$18,000 in the checking account, \$173,000 in the PTIF, that things look much better today with each of you paying your assessments. The next two pages is a summary of all of the ins and outs of the checking account. And with that, if you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them. That's it for me, thank you.

CLOSED SESSION

Dan Petersen ([00:56:36](#)): We do have a closed session, looking for someone to make a motion related to item B there, the strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation.

Wayne Pyle ([00:56:50](#)): Chief, I'll make that motion. Move to move to closed session to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation.

Tim Tingey ([00:57:01](#)): I'll second that, Tim Tingey, Cottonwood Heights.

Dan Petersen ([00:57:04](#)): Hey Scott, could you do a roll call please?

Scott Ruf ([00:57:06](#)): Chief Petersen, UFA.

Dan Petersen ([00:57:07](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:57:07](#)): Mr. Lee, West Jordan.

Korban Lee ([00:57:10](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:57:11](#)): Mr. Dobbins, Draper.

David Dobbins ([00:57:13](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:57:14](#)): Mr. Hill, Murray. I gotcha.

Doug Hill ([00:57:20](#)): Yes, sorry about that.

Scott Ruf ([00:57:21](#)): That's okay. Mr. Whatcott, South Jordan.

Gary Whatcott ([00:57:24](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:57:25](#)): Mr. Kershaw, South Salt Lake.

Kyle Kershaw ([00:57:27](#)): Yes. And Chief Petersen, may I, following this vote, can I just take a minute before we go into the closed session?

Dan Petersen ([00:57:36](#)): Yes.

Kyle Kershaw ([00:57:37](#)): Thank you.

Scott Ruf ([00:57:38](#)): I believe Mr. Brickey left. Mr. Carter. You're the alternate for Riverton, is that correct? You're here?

David Brickey ([00:57:45](#)): I'm here, and I'll vote. I'm just going to let folks know, I've asked Mr. Carter who's previously appeared for Riverton, to participate in the closed session.

Scott Ruf ([00:57:53](#)): Oh, I didn't know you were still here. Sorry, Mr. Brickey.

David Brickey ([00:57:53](#)): Thanks, bye.

Ryan Carter ([00:57:57](#)): Yeah. And I'm also here, so I just took a minute to get unmuted. Sorry.

Scott Ruf ([00:58:00](#)): Mr. Cherpeski, Herriman.

Nathan Cherpeski ([00:58:00](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:58:04](#)): Mr. Reid, Bluffdale.

Mark Reid ([00:58:06](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:58:06](#)): Mr. Tingey, Cottonwood Heights.

Tim Tingey ([00:58:09](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:58:10](#)): Mr. Harrington, Taylorsville.

Scott Harrington ([00:58:12](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:58:13](#)): Undersheriff Petersen.

Jake Petersen ([00:58:15](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:58:15](#)): And Mr. Pyle, West Valley City.

Wayne Pyle ([00:58:19](#)): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([00:58:22](#)): Okay. Do I need to start moving people, or did Mr. Kershaw need to say something while we're still open?

Dan Petersen ([00:58:28](#)): What would you like to do, Kyle?

Kyle Kershaw (00:58:31): Chief Petersen, yeah. Could I just take 30 seconds here? Just pursuant to us going to a closed session, I needed to announce that I'm going to be retiring from the city here in the next week or two. And Josh Collins, who is our city attorney, letter's being currently drafted, or maybe has already been drafted to Chief Petersen, that he will be South Salt Lake's member of the board of trustees, upon receiving that letter. And with that, I was wondering if it would be appropriate to have Mr. Collins join us in the closed session.

Dan Petersen (00:59:16): I fully support that. Any objections to his request? No objections.

Kyle Kershaw (00:59:23): Thank you.

Dan Petersen (00:59:28): Is he on the call now?

Josh Collins (00:59:30): I am, yes.

Dan Petersen (00:59:32): There he is. Good, very good. Congratulations and welcome.

Josh Collins (00:59:37): Thank you.

MOTION TO MOVE INTO A CLOSED SESSION

Motion –

. . . By Mr. Wayne Pyle, to move into a closed session; the motion was seconded by Mr. Tim Tingey; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

The meeting went into closed session at 2:56 p.m.

Korban Lee (01:09:14): I'll move to come out of closed session, and reconvene in open session.

Gary Whatcott (01:09:19): I'll second that, Chief.

Dan Petersen (01:09:23): Hey Scott, can you do a roll call?

Scott Ruf (01:09:27): Chief Petersen, UFA?

Dan Petersen (01:09:29): Yes.

Scott Ruf (01:09:30): Mr. Lee, West Jordan.

Korban Lee (01:09:31): Yes.

Scott Ruf (01:09:32): David Dobbins, Draper.

David Dobbins (01:09:35): Yes.

Scott Ruf (01:09:35): Mr. Hill, Murray.

Doug Hill (01:09:36): Yes.

Scott Ruf (01:09:37): Mr. Whatcott, South Jordan.

Gary Whatcott (01:09:39): Yes.

Scott Ruf (01:09:40): Mr. Kershaw, South Salt Lake.

Kyle Kershaw (01:09:43): Yes.

Scott Ruf (01:09:43): Mr. Carter, Riverton.

Ryan Carter (01:09:46): Yes.

Scott Ruf (01:09:48): Mr. Cherpeski, Herriman.

Nathan Cherpeski (01:09:49): Yes.

Scott Ruf (01:09:50): Mr. Reid, Bluffdale.

Mark Reid (01:09:51): Yes.

Scott Ruf (01:09:52): Mr. Tingey, Cottonwood Heights.

Tim Tingey (01:09:54): Yes.

Scott Ruf (01:09:55): Mr. Harrington, Taylorsville?

Scott Harrington (01:10:00): Yes.

Scott Ruf (01:10:00): Undersheriff Petersen.

Jake Petersen (01:10:03): Yes.

Scott Ruf (01:10:04): And Mr. Pyle, West Valley.

Wayne Pyle (01:10:06): Yes.

MOTION TO MOVE BACK TO OPEN SESSION

Motion –

. . . By Mr. Korban Lee; to move back into open session; the motion was seconded by Mr. Gary Whatcott; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

The meeting re-opened to public meeting at 3:09 p.m.

Dan Petersen (01:10:10): Okay, let me know when we're ready.

Scott Ruf (01:10:15): Everybody's back in, there's one person hanging.

Dan Petersen (01:10:21): Okay. We are back in open session, and I want to do a move back to item 11 on the agenda, director's report, and ask Scott to give us an update on the procurement process. Scott, the floor is yours.

Scott Ruf (01:10:34): Yep. Thanks, Chief. And I apologize, I overlooked it in my director's report. But I just want to let the board know that we are moving forward with the procurement process, as directed by the board of trustees previously. I've been working with Scott Young and engaged a third party to start that process. So, we anticipate that being completed and back to the board for review to release it, hopefully late January, early February of 2022.

Dan Petersen (01:11:03): Okay. And just clarify what we are procuring.

Scott Ruf (01:11:11): So, we're going to do a request for proposal to provide emergency medical dispatch protocols, and triage processes for the handling of incoming 911 emergency medical calls for service

DISCUSSION OF BOARD CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON ROTATION

Dan Petersen (01:11:26): Great, okay. Thank you for that. Look forward to the next update on that process. Item 16 is a discussion on the board chairperson and vice chairperson rotation, the two years is up. And generally, I would propose that Korban as the vice chair would rotate into chair. And we can make that official next meeting in the discussion, but wanted to put on your radar, the potential of VP. And the VP would come in and be a partner to the chair. Last year, what we did was we had the VP, the vice chair run the finance committee as a whole, and then would rotate into the chair in two years.

Dan Petersen (01:12:17): So, think about interest and dialogue, Korban and I may be reaching out to a few to make sure that we have that set. And Korban hasn't expressed any concern about rotating into chair whatsoever, so that's a good component.

Korban Lee (01:12:36): Well, I don't know about that last statement, but...

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION T21-10 BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEETING SCHEDULE

Dan Petersen (01:12:42): Good, thank you. Item 17 is a consideration of resolution on the Board of Trustee meeting schedule. You see that Resolution T21-10. Scott's identified the dates for of the year. If there's no objection, I'll take a motion for approving Resolution 21-10.

Doug Hill (01:13:06): Yeah, I'll move adoption of Resolution T21-10, adopting the 2022 Board of Trustee meeting schedule.

Tim Tingey (01:13:15): I'll second that, Tim from Cottonwood Heights.

Dan Petersen (01:13:18): Okay. If you unmute, we can do a mass vote. All those in favor, say aye.

Board (01:13:24): Aye.

MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION T21-10 2022 BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEETING SCHEDULE

Motion –

. . . By Mr. Doug Hill; to approve Resolution T21-10, 2022 Board of Trustee Meeting Schedule; Wayne Pyle, to approve item 4.1; the motion was seconded by Mr. Tim Tingey; the motion carried unanimously.

There was nothing more to discuss at this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:12 p.m.