

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
October 18, 2017 Meeting Minutes
VECC Board Room
5360 Ridge Village Drive, West Valley City

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Gary Whatcott; South Jordan; Chairman
Mr. Brad Christopherson; Taylorsville; Vice Chairman
Mr. Kyle Kershaw; South Salt Lake
Mr. Mark Reid; Bluffdale
Sheriff Rosie Rivera; UPD
Mr. Blair Camp; Murray
Mr. Carlton Christensen; SLCO
Mr. Brent Wood; Herriman
Mr. Dan Peterson; UFA
Mr. Russ Wall; West Jordan

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Ryan Carter; Riverton
Mr. David Dobbins; Draper
Mr. Layne Morris; West Valley City
Mr. Mike Shelton; Cottonwood Heights
Mr. John Guildner; Alta
Mr. Kane Loader; Midvale
Ms. Gina Chamness; Holladay

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Bryan Roberts; Draper
Mr. David Brickey; West Jordan
Mr. John Inch Morgan, VECC Executive Director
Mr. Jeff Monson; VECC HR Manager
Mr. Mark Whetsel; VECC TS Manager
Ms. Beth Todd; VECC Operations Manager
Ms. Gigi Smith; VECC Operations Manager
Ms. Leslie Devey; VECC Supervisor
Ms. Chris Dunn; VECC Supervisor
Ms. Andrea Partridge; VECC Admin. Services Manager

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2017 BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEETING

Motion –

. . . By Mr. Russ Wall, to approve the minutes of the July 19, 2017 Board of Trustee Minutes as written; seconded by Mr. Brad Christopherson; the motion carried unanimously.

OPERATIONS BOARD MEETING REPORT

Chief Bryan Roberts reported that Gigi had mentioned VECC was recognized at the APCO Conference for winning two awards; one was the Incident of the Year for a large agency for the ammonium nitrate truck rollover that happened on the freeway about a year ago. The second award was a Unit Citation for the response of the Officer Cody Brotherson incident. John was asked to push out a media release to the public on this. They discussed creating a hazard code for transient calls so that these can be tracked better. They also talked about the changes to UCJIS requirements. When an officer makes an arrest and develops the probable cause statement for that arrest, UCJIS will require that this document be uploaded to UCJIS, which is a change from the past. They are working through POST and UCJIS so that there will be a nice, smooth transition in complying with this requirement.

PLANNING TOPICS

Previous Business

John reminded everyone that when they had the Strategic Planning meeting, different topics were identified to address each month throughout the year. John listed these items at the bottom under Additional Information to see the months and topics. Typically, what you'll see is previous business that was discussed at the given month it was prescribed for that month, but is still in process or needs a bit more work. The first portion of this will be previous business. Then new business will be identified and discussed. A lot of times, the issues that we talk about in the Operations Board will be the same issues brought to this meeting. Most the decisions made at the Operations level will need to be voted upon by this Board to confirm any direction or recommendation but also; there might be a budgetary impact that needs to be addressed with the Trustees. The first topic to discuss is Membership Voting and Membership Assessment. John's intent is to next month, bring a Resolution to adopt revisions to the By-Laws, which are located in the Drop box and they were discussed at the meeting last month. John expects that next meeting he will bring that Resolution. The reason it wasn't done this month was because the direction was to defer some of these issues that were particular to UFA or UPD and have them come back with the discussions they have had with their members. When looking at UFA the idea was to have UFA go to their contracting district members and determine how their voting rights will be determined. For the remainder of this year, everyone at the table has a seat and a voting weight they would vote on because it's based upon the previous years' contributions to the Center. Contributions last year included the 9-1-1 fees, which were the only direct fees coming from Holladay and other incorporated areas. The other portion was the 9-1-1 fees coming from the direct providers of these services, but then also member assessments in addition to this. Chief Petersen took it to his Board and yesterday they chose to have the full UFA vote to be represented in whole and have him represent them on the Trustees. John allows all entities to identify their representatives on the Board; it is usually a Mayor or City Manager or someone who is appointed. John knows that UPD has not taken it to their Board yet and he is working with them to have the same resolution before the next meeting. John will then have a formal Resolution which modifies the By-Laws that codifies what has just been discussed. With Millcreek forming their own city this year, the 9-1-1 taxes weren't going to Millcreek residents last year because they weren't a city then and it was asked if Millcreek has any right to representation for the rest of year. John commented that SLCO would represent them for now. Right now, the 9-1-1 fees are no longer an authorization for municipalities and counties, it is a state tax. That authorization to tax up to that \$0.61 per line has now been rescinded. With that, it was replaced by a state tax of \$0.71, not distributed by a subscription address. Every PSAP in the state is a subscriber to a service called ECATS, paid for by the State, and it tracks all the calls from every PSAP. The obligation for UCA was to turn in, by January of each year, the annual call volume for each of these PSAP's and then the State Tax Commission, based upon that call volume, would distribute each month what is collected. This is done to take out any of the anomalies seen from one jurisdiction to another in a given year. Since it's based on call volume, there could be many calls coming in because of an event and no one should be punished or given an unfair advantage based on those anomalies seen in those calls. The County would not receive anything and it doesn't float through the Auditor's office anymore; it comes to the 9-1-1 call taking PSAP's. This has been something for the past year that has been something where PSAP's were the only ones eligible for any of the fees collected by the State. It's been about a year and ago that VECC and SLC agreed to split the money coming in, recognizing that Police and Fire have two different dispatch centers. When the State Auditor came out and said it was illegal for the County to distribute that to a dispatch center, which UVD is, but it's not a PSAP, as it's not receiving 9-1-1 calls directly, the Board authorized John to enter into an agreement where the funds would come here and we would send 50% to UPD for dispatching efforts. As a member of our coalition here, that was one thing we agreed to do. Mr. Kyle Kershaw just verified that contracted cities for Fire no longer has a seat at the table and he wondered if this was the same for the townships in the County or anyone who is a member of UFA. Chief Petersen commented that the townships have never had a seat on the Trustee Board. They chose to have UFA represent them for now. Kyle commented if a similar action was taken by UPD Board, VECC's Board of Trustees would shrink significantly. John said to Kyle's point, representatives as Trustees would be the service providing entities, such as the Sheriff and UPD. The contracting entities would have input to their Boards who would bring it to this Board rather than the contracting cities bringing it to this Board. This just aligns the Trustees with the members of the Board of Operations; Chiefs from the various entities who take their issues and brief members of the Trustees. By the time we meet, the Trustees have information so that we can act expeditiously. John requested a new letter of endorsement that identifies Chief Peterson from the Board Chair as well as an alternate. In addition to this, John would also like to see a paragraph identifying that he would be representing all of these entities. John mentioned that SB198 was designed to bring more money to the PSAP's and also to have that direct contribution coming in. The only way to do this is have it based upon call volume

and eliminate and rescind authorization. There were some PSAP's that were receiving funds that if you look at a call basis, about \$30 per call, and others that were receiving funds from the 9-1-1 at \$6 per call. To have it be equitable, it had to be a State fund where everything went into the pot and then was distributed out equitably based on call volume. What we'll see coming out is clarification in the By-Laws and then there needs to be a discussion on the Interlocal Agreement and what that means bringing in Millcreek. This probably should be something to assign to a few attorney's to look at and to look at the function and operation so that as the Interlocal is redone, we can identify anything that maybe an unintended consequence going forward. Right now, we have Herriman, Riverton, Taylorsville, and Holladay all as signators on this agreement. John is saying do we need these to be signators to the agreement or is it just UFA and UPD. If they do need to be signators, then we need to bring in Millcreek. John would like to volunteer Brad Christopherson and Brian Roberts to review this and requested a discussion before the end of the year. John will reach out to those who volunteered and schedule something.

Member Assessment

John just wanted to remind everyone that this was put out to an Ad Hoc Committee, who met on the 12th, and they looked at the methodology, which is the three-year rolling average and then looked at how those final budget assessments come out. These numbers are located in the budget itself. One thing that came up was it may not really matter what methodology we use in the assessment as long as there is consistency from one entity to another. We found over time that there have been some anomalies and discrepancies that have crept in, for example, one entity would do a building check every night and have 365 cases generated where another one would just have the same case pulled up and one have 1. If you are looking at call volume being the point at which we charge \$9.00, this could be a difference itself. Once we discovered that this was something that was happening, it was stopped, but again, the main thing is that we wanted to be sure everyone was applying the same rules at that same call volume is being applied to everybody as we do the assessment. They looked at a formula based upon call volume, based upon population, based on taxable value, and there were debates as to which one of those would be the best way to do it. The Ad Hoc group asked John to come up with two different methodologies; the one we currently have and then run a comparison on what that would look like if we did call volume and population. It was determined that taxable value probably wasn't a relevant factor and it may not really relate to calls coming in versus a low taxable value. John will report back to the Committee at the next meeting.

New Business – Call Taking Protocols

John mentioned that over the past few years, there have been questions as to whether or not, especially on the Police side, if the protocols we are using from Priority Dispatch are appropriate. As we go through this CAD process and the process for Records Management and Field-Based reporting, this question comes up several times. SLC has taken the lead in looking at these protocols; they have a demonstration scheduled for tomorrow, to look at the protocols and see if what we are doing is the right thing, or if there is a better way to modify things or maybe move in a different direction. This past year and a half, VECC has worked on and met the Accreditation, meaning we are complying with protocols in and of itself going forward and we do it at a high success rate. John will say that since he's been here, the protocols are very good for training, having individuals go through a protocol that's prompted on a computer screen is very good. The question is are those questions right. Pro-Qa, Priority Dispatch and that entire group has made modifications based on SLC and VECC's recommendations, which are hundreds, to make this product better. It is an issue we are looking at; this and other protocols as well. John feels that from a legal stand point, to not have a protocol where we are asking the right questions puts our dispatchers and the entity in some legal jeopardy. John asked Leslie Devey to come and educate everyone a little bit on the protocols we are utilizing because as we progress down the road to this analysis, he would like to bring this back at some point in time and make sure the Board has a foundation.

Leslie began with explaining the EMD protocol, Version 13. It is the oldest protocol that Priority Dispatch has; they started out with medical and then as they have seen the need, they've diversified into the Fire and Police protocol. Bryan and Kim, who are with the Accreditation were out here about 3 weeks ago meeting with her and went over what and how we are doing. They gave some suggestions and ideas to keep our Center accredited. Leslie has identified a few proposals for change in the EMD protocol that will be submitted to the committee and she suspects that both will go through. Leslie also found out something they have available to us is a college of emergency dispatch that we can get on line and do on line continuing dispatch education,

which is free to our agency and provides very good support for us. On EFD, we are currently on Version 6.1A, but we know they are going to have a major update, Version 7, coming out in Spring 2018. The updates we have heard about include the outside fire, which is grouped with brush, grass, outside fire and other things, which they will be splitting up into separate protocols. The EMD/EFD DRC meeting meets the last Wednesday of the month at 1330 and they go over things in the protocol or the call takers will bring something specific up to go over and questions. Dr. O'Driscoll is our Medical Director, who comes to those meetings and assists us. We also just completed an EFD refresher training course for everyone which was really good for the employees. EPD, we are on Version 6; it was just updated in August 2017. One of our proposals for change we submitted was to have the search for the chief complaint be similar to like a Google search. This has been put in and we now have the ability to search for a sub-chief complaint just by typing in what they are looking for. We also now have the ability to turn on or off certain key questions. In this version, we decided to turn off 11 questions and we left 7 questions on. These gave officers more information without slowing call takers getting to a code to dispatch on. These DRC meetings are held quarterly. John mentioned that one of the questions this Board may be faced with at some point in time, while looking through PD protocols, is that the endowment granted to VECC and SLC was a gift of the software to us for all 3 protocols. However, in this endowment, it does state that we have to use all three protocols. If we don't use one, we cannot run another vendor's protocol on the same servers. SLC legal is looking into this, but there has been continual complaints from the police side that there are too many questions being asked, and Pro-Qa responded by telling them that some of these questions can be turned off. One thing John has been asking Police agencies over the past few years is what exactly they don't like about it because we will try to make some changes, but they have a hard time articulating it other than we are just asking too many questions. John thinks that sometimes from the caller standpoint, which falls on us with training, people believe if we continue to interrogate them and ask questions, we are delaying the response, whether it's medical, fire or police. This is not the case. Leslie explained that police is a little different in that as soon as the caller statement goes in before we go into the questions, the dispatcher can read the caller statement and based on that information, either dispatch right away on it or wait until it gets to a final code. A time lapse is also put into the caller statement so dispatch knows it's in progress or it happened two days ago. On almost all the protocols, if it's a high priority call, dispatch is dispatching after we get very basic information. Call Takers will continue to get additional information but it can be dispatched on after the basic information is received. On medical and fire, we launch a code so that it goes to the dispatch screen, they can see it's incoming and read it and then as it gets to the final code, they can start to dispatch on those codes. They are set up to go in the order delta, charlie, bravo and alpha so that we'll get to a final code quicker if it's a higher acuity call rather than something that could wait a bit longer. John said the bottom line is that continued interrogation does not slow units from responding but its incumbent upon us to identify that officers are on the way but there are more questions to be asked before they arrive. This is an issue we need to deal with but it's also an educational issue we need to somehow get out to the public as well. There will be more to come on this as we delve more into this, turn off questions and do our assessment. It may come down to an assessment of the endowment contract accepted about 5 years ago with whatever we do.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

CAD Project Update

John reference the status report located in the Share Point. Each month, he publishes this status report, which gives where we are at with the CAD project itself. It shows what has been accomplished as well as where we are currently and those things we still need to deal with. Hexagon has had some problems getting credentials through BCI. John thinks most of these issues have been resolved and they have agreed, finally, to everything they have asked for. The Statement of Work has been reviewed. Major Brian Red with UHP manages the Palenteer, which is the first step to get to that statewide record sharing; there are only 38 agencies throughout the state that contribute on an ongoing basis and not all of those have their records up to date, so we don't really have a statewide records management system. This is one of the Legislative things that John has been asked to participate in and looking into getting funding so that we can truly throughout this state share records, whether it be through Palenteer or some other integration of our records management system. In Salt Lake County, once we are all on the same system, with integrations and things, that's a significant portion of those police records throughout the state. John has the two Co-Chairs on the Public Safety Appropriation Committee who have agreed to sponsor a \$2.5 million dollar one-time assessment that does have to go through UHP; we are working with the Commissioner and Mike Rappich to clarify what that means. Jerry Stevens, the Executive Appropriation Chair, is willing to kick it up to \$3 million if we can get everyone to agree throughout the State to be on the same records management system. We have a good group working on this, we just need to flush it

out and identify how it works. John feels like right now, this is one of the most important things we can be doing in public safety is making sure we share records. The overall Hexagon project is about 8 weeks behind, but John believes it can be put back on track. We are still looking at a stand-up date in March or April and John's message to Hexagon was if we cannot meet that because of a delay, he is not interested in standing it up through the summer; we would be looking at fall if we cannot meet this.

Fire Station Alerting

This has been discussed for some time now, but as part of the overall process itself is if we are truly integrated with SL City, one thing we want to do is be on the same Station Alerting System. We've done some research and looked at upgrading the Zetron system or moving over to US Digital Design, which is what SLC and Sandy are on, and we have been given the authorization to go ahead and investigate this system. It appears this is the direction we would like to go. We have asked a retired BC Warren James to go forward and work with US Digital to identify a few things; a base program for stations and what is the minimum equipment needed. John put a spreadsheet in the Drop box which goes through each station and identifies minimal amounts as well as other things that we might want included. John has requested pricing for this and John has mentioned before that may be a consideration for this Board would be to provide for everyone this base level of implementation so that we assure everyone is at least at that base level going forward. This would be something that John would ask be allocated from our reserve account. John anticipates that next month he will have monetary figures so that it can be looked at and make a determination as to whether or not that is a direction we want VECC to go. We need to do one or the other, we are going to have to expend some funds for station alerting as we are at a point now where we need to do an upgrade. Beth Todd commented that the groups are all working together to identify what the base information is and as a whole, they are all in agreement that there are some fire stations either under construction or will be and those are the ones looking at needing to purchase additional equipment above and beyond the base, whatever is decided that will be. They all agree that even if we don't go in this direction, we need to do something with the current system because it's over 17 years old and we are experiencing pretty significant delays on the system.

Utah Legislature Interim Session & Committee Schedule

John commented that one of the tasks we have moving forward is looking at having money channeled through BPS. If we can find \$3 million, and there is money available for allocation for special purposes this year, it will be debated whether or not it comes to a state-wide record management or backfilling behind the Rio Grande project. Rio Grande has to match up troopers with local entities because they each have to write their own reports on separate systems. If there is anything that argues for being on the same system, this is a great example. If these are separated at some point in time, they have no real way to communicate with each other. This is why they are walking around, trooper and local, whether it is SLC or UPD or anyone else there. John feels this is a good argument for being on the same system, and John would like to see this at all the Highway Patrol areas and then have as many local Sheriff and Police Departments sharing those records. John would like to recruit Chief Jeff Carr to help in dealing with this issue, or at least to explain what the intent is and the advantages are of doing this. The next Interim Committee meeting will be November 15th and there are a few things that will be topics to deal with. John said he is also working with BCI on a few issues; one being the probable cause statements. This is a separate thing that officers enter in as they are doing an arrest. We would like to see that integration so that there is only one key stroke and not necessarily different entries.

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION – INTRODUCTIONS OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

Kyle Kershaw mentioned that with all the video evidence that is available and the likelihood of those getting GRAMA'ed at some point by new individuals, his city is running into a bit of a challenge of having someone specialized in knowing how to get that video footage and redacting it correctly, eliminating any compromising information. He wondered if RMS comes into play here at VECC, if there would be any notion to have a specialist at VECC who is trained to know how to redact video footage and prepare it for a GRAMA release. Kyle gets maybe 6 a year which doesn't justify the cost, but if we all pooled together, maybe there is a way we can contract with UPD or SLC to assist with video evidence. John suggested pushing it to Operations for discussion.

There was nothing else to discuss at this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:22 p.m.