

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

July 19, 2017 Meeting Minutes

VECC Board Room

5360 Ridge Village Drive, West Valley City

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Gary Whatcott; South Jordan; Chairman
Mr. Kyle Kershaw; South Salt Lake
Mr. Brad Christopherson; Taylorsville; Vice Chairman
Mr. Mark Reid; Bluffdale
Mr. Blair Camp; Murray
Mr. Ryan Carter; Riverton
Mr. Kane Loader; Midvale
Mr. Scott Carver; UPD
Mr. Brent Wood; Herriman
Mr. John Evans; West Valley City; Ops Vice Chairman
Mr. David Brickey; West Jordan
Mr. Jay Kiolkowski; UFA
Mr. Mike Shelton; Cottonwood Heights
Ms. Gina Chamness; Holladay

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Layne Morris; West Valley City
Mr. Carlton Christensen; SLCO
Mr. John Guildner; Alta
Mr. David Dobbins; Draper

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Marc McElreath; West Jordan
Mr. John Inch Morgan, VECC Executive Director
Mr. Mark Whetsel; VECC TS Manager
Mr. Jeff Monson; VECC HR Manager
Ms. Andrea Partridge; VECC Admin. Services Manager

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 21, 2017 BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEETING

Motion –

. . . By Mr. Kyle Kershaw, to approve the minutes of the June 21, 2017 Board of Trustee Minutes as written; seconded by Mr. David Brickey; the motion carried unanimously.

2017-2018 BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEETING CALENDAR

John wanted to just mention this meeting calendar again. The calendar is located in the Dropbox. He wanted the Board to review this and mentioned that in the August meeting, it would be a joint meeting with Operations and Trustees. It will be a time to look at some of the strategic plans and goals we want to have moving forward. This will be held Wednesday, August 16, 2017. John feels it's important for Operations and Trustees members to get together and identify any outstanding goals or objectives that we should look at through the upcoming year. John asked if December's meeting, being so close to Christmas, if the Trustees wished to cancel this or move it to another date. He thought we could tentatively cancel it and then if there was an emergency, we could hold a meeting by phone.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Brad Christopherson, to approve the calendar as stated, and cancel the December Trustees Board meeting; the motion was seconded by Mr. Scott Carver; the motion carried unanimously.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**CAD Project Update**

John Inch Morgan mentioned that the biggest issue we are currently working on right now is making sure they have connectivity between the CAD servers and with each agency. There has been some difficulty in gaining the connectivity for a few different reasons. We are depending on all the TS people in the respective cities to pick up the hardware and implement it and the work with Mark from VECC and Sam from SLC. We need to establish connectivity at both locations. This is one thing that has to be done before we can move on to some of the next phases. They are working with the agencies TS people, but John wanted everyone to be aware of what's happening so that if there are issues, we can all work together to get the connectivity up. Mark has contracted with Sysco to work on the connectivity details and while we may have connectivity from one point to the next, we need to make sure we log in and touch every MBT and mobile at some point in time. The WebRMS is web-based and so that connectivity should not be difficult, but when we are looking at some of the other aspects of it, that's one of the things we have to move up to the highest priority and deal with it right now. On the other hand, as we look at building all of the functions, we are identifying common names and codes so that everyone throughout the valley is calling a certain type of activity by the same name. Then everyone can respond and dispatch will go from any one of the centers to make sure that we have the fastest response. The other issue we are having a bit of a stumbling block is with having Hexagon gain access to BCI. We have negotiated for the last couple of months, trying to get them to come to some agreement with BCI. It's at the Commissioner's Office right now, and if we can get them to approve it, John believes we will be good to go. The one stumbling block we have is BCI is using live rather than test data. So, there has to be a high level of clearance for them to do test data with live data, which is difficult to do. They wanted Hexagon to provide them with all their access to their secure methodologies and policies and Hexagon won't allow it out of their building. John suggested that if there is a breach that is traced to Hexagon, they will relinquish those files that are relevant so that we can track the breach down. Mark Whetsel felt there was a really good map building right now in the CAD. This CAD system is very GIS-syntronic, it's the backbone to everything. Last week they put together a pretty good map and Mark viewed this. He feels that for everyone involved, they will all be pretty impressed with the abilities and functionality of the map and what they are able to do and see. John said that Hexagon would be coming out to do a hybrid demonstration on August 29th, and everyone is welcome to come see it. They will be using some demonstration data and then we will populate it with some of the things that we have input as well, so everyone can see the capabilities of the system itself. John is waiting on confirmation on the location and then he will send it out to everyone. Gary Whatcott asked if any of the stumbling blocks were delaying the project in any way of getting to the final completion date. John said that on the connectivity issue, Hexagon went back and reconfigured the way they were going to do the workshop builds. Even though they have done this in large organizations, it's been one organization. We have tried to bring everything together with the 19 different organizations, which has delayed us a little bit. If we had been on schedule for that, then the connectivity would have put us behind about a month. There is a combination of things that have put us behind a little bit, and they are working through those right now. There are Hexagon representatives here at VECC today. We have CitCom representatives here today as well and they have hammered down many of the stumbling blocks and John is demanding that they bring us across the finish line. There are milestones set up and they are just markers for us. The penalty phase doesn't come in until March of 2018. With the reconfiguration of some of the modifications we have made, it gives us the chance to catch up. We have a significant amount of credits that we are keeping track of as well. John feels like we are in really good shape. If we need their technical people to come out on an extra trip that hadn't been scheduled, we have the ability to do this without incurring any additional costs.

Fire Station Alerting Update

John has started exploring being on the same Station Alerting System that SLC and Sandy are on, the US Digital Design Phoenix G2 system. John has a demonstration scheduled for tomorrow at 10:30 a.m. in the Board Room for anyone interested in attending. Chief Evans has been collecting from the different stations their basic floor plans and it's based on those floor plans which they will propose three different levels of equipment to go in. Those proposals will come back and then we will do an evaluation of the system itself. John feels it's something that everyone will want to pay attention to. This will allow us, with a multi-alarm fire, the capacity of whoever is controlling the call taking and dispatching to go across borders and 9-1-1 systems and dispatch the right people with the right recommends. There won't be a delay in doing this, there will be immediate station alerting going on. Once the first alert comes in, it will be up to each individual department to determine what to do. Chief Evans commented that they will save over a minute on their times.

Policy Discussion, Modification and Adoption
Financial Planning and Policy Adoption

John introduced into the packets two separate policies that he would like to talk about today; one is the financial and one is the budgeting policy. They do overlap and John does reference in each of these, one to the other. He took different principles and put them into the policy, which is very standard, but gives us very firm guidelines for the Board in approving the budget and looking at quarterly updates. John will provide a monthly reconciliation of the activities every month and then a discussion every quarter on the budget itself. It also identifies the fact that the financial plan is our major planning document. John would really like to look at a two-year horizon when we begin planning. It requires the Administration, primarily Mark Whetsel, to do a five-year capital improvement plan, which can obviously be modified, as well as the two-year horizon as we go forward, but it does hold us accountable to the things we are doing. One thing we may want to discuss as we get into budgeting each year, is to set an amount of fund balance for operations and cash flow and those types of things. This will be up to the Board to determine what that amount will be. Kyle Kershaw read through it and he asked about the bi-annual references in the document and mentioned that it doesn't say in there, per state law, that the Board has to adopt an annual budget. In the policy, Kyle isn't sure how they will reconcile that the Board has to do this annually, but John wants to look at a two-year budget. He said somehow those two have to be in the policy. John said he could make it more clear, but his intent in doing this is that we look at the two-year horizon, but acknowledge that we are going to adopt an annual budget. Kyle also had a question with regards to the general current operating expenditures being paid from current revenues and cash carried over from prior budgets. He mentioned when carrying over cash from a prior budget, excess expenses of current revenues are being budgeted. There would need to be discussion from the Board whether they want to appropriate it and fund the fund balance. The way it's written, he feels the Board is allowing themselves to budget more expenditures than revenues for operating purposes in a current year. John said that was his intent as he looks at the operation here as an enterprise fund. But each year, the expenditures have to be approved by the governing board, which are the Trustees. As we look at revenues coming in, which we have two major sources, the State 9-1-1 tax and the member assessments, that may or may not in a budget discussion cover all of the anticipated expenses. In dealing with this gap, if there are under-expenditures from the prior year, this would be something the Board could identify and put into anticipated expenditures, but only with approval. If John's estimates are off then decision as we get closer to the budget would be do we allocate from the fund balance, or as we get down to the adoption of the budget, does John need to crunch down on expenditures. Kyle would feel better about it if the wording says from current revenues and appropriations from fund balance rather than cash carried over from prior budgets. John said he could update this. Gary Whatcott asked if John needed anything from the Board on this. John would like it adopted formally at some point in time. He will go in and make these changes and will bring it back to the next meeting with a resolution.

Bylaw Review and Revision

John said the Board started talking about this at the last meeting, but the background of this is with the passage of SB198, it changed from a local option to charge a 9-1-1 fee for every municipality and County \$0.61 per month on every phone device and phone line. The State has now taken this and rescinded the authority for municipalities and Counties to charge this fee and has now made it a State tax at the rate of \$0.71 per phone line. It increases overall revenue to the PSAP's and also directs these funds collected by the State Tax Commission directly to the PSAP that is answering for the municipalities. What it means for VECC is an estimated \$1.5 million. John put another \$900K into the budget, being very conservative in budgeting, because of this. Our Interlocal agreement, section 9, does indicate that every member is a signatory to the agreement and has one vote. However, that vote is weighted based on the financial contribution to the organization as a percentage of the total overall revenues coming in for the previous year. For this year, in looking at 2016, the contributions that each entity made during that period of time provides that weighted vote for everyone who sits at the table right now. With the rescission of the 9-1-1 fee for every organization, that changes the amount of contribution that comes to the table. In looking at total contribution, we look at two different parts. The first part is the contribution of the 9-1-1 fee, which everyone has an amount of. Every city with a police and/or fire department contributes based on their call volume. We take a three-year rolling average of the call volume and charge that entity based upon the number of calls, less duplicates and other things. Those two components together combine to give us a total revenue and then the percentage is figured. One issue is with the 9-1-1 fees going away from a city contribution and no way of tracking this. The contribution now would be solely based on the dispatch calls, on a call volume calculated on a three-year rolling average. Police calls are a little

under \$10.00 per call and Fire calls are around \$32.00 per call, which is the assessment that goes out to each entity. John mentioned it was talked about last time putting together a study group which would look at representation here at the table. John has begun to put together some information and would like to get this group together to sit down and come up with a few recommendations to bring back to the Board. This information has been placed into the Dropbox for review. John is looking for members to volunteer to explore some options. Those who volunteered were Ryan Carter, Mark Reid, Mike Shelton, Scott Carver, Dave Brickey and Jay Ziolkowski. John will schedule a meeting and send out an invite. The Interlocal agreement still identifies each entity throughout the Salt Lake Valley as members and John would hate to have members with no voting rights and he believes this is one of the things to be looked at. Gary Whatcott asked if the Bylaws require the weighted vote. John said that the Bylaws don't, but it is in the Interlocal agreement. Gary wonders if the weighted vote is really that important anymore. He's wondering if one of the options could just be one vote one entity. John said that the way it's worded in the Interlocal is that each member entity will have one representative vote and that vote will be weighted based on the contribution to the overall center. Gary believes the weighted vote has more merit to someone like the Sheriff's office or UFA, but he doesn't know it's that important any longer. As John looks at the weighted vote, coming into this, the biggest contributor is West Valley City police and fire. UPD and UFA have a significant amount, about 8% each. We need to look at UPD a bit differently because their budget hasn't been merged with ours yet and so we have given credit based on the call volume. When you look at the calls that VECC transfers to UPD and apply that same rate to identify the weighted vote, it's probably one we need to discuss as well. In SLC, through the 9-1-1 fees, has contributed \$1.2 million on an annual basis and according to the agreement done about 5 years ago, this money is split. When the audit came out in October 2015, it indicated that you had to be a PSAPS in order to receive any of those funds. That split because difficult and so what we have done is the funds are now being sent to VECC and then we are still splitting this between the two with the theory that they are a member of the organization, that we could have paid dispatchers here on this floor, and we have decided not to merge until at least the CAD is set up, and so it would be like paying dispatchers here or there. John displayed the weighted votes based on 2016. It indicates in the Interlocal that each January, the Executive Director will re-calculate the weighted voting based on the previous year. In looking at taking the weighted vote away, it doesn't significantly change the vote from the paying members. It just takes away the vote from those who didn't have the revenue coming in. Kyle requested that when John sends out documents for this working group, he make them available to every board member. It was also mentioned to be considered by the group how many voices are really needed at this table. Scott Carver commented that as Ryan was saying, back in history when it was a big issue with who had what vote, it was because of situations and the organizational structure. All of this has changed dramatically over time and especially with the CAD decision. There are also the UPD board members around this table who will exercise a lot of influence. There was a commitment to merge the budgets and one reminder on the merge is that UPD's expenses went down and everyone's went up. He doesn't believe this is an issue any longer, especially with the bond paid off on the building. John remembers on the adjustment was that salaries were significantly higher with UPD than they were with VECC and we have now moderated this so that we are now almost equal. There isn't going to be a big change but there duplicates in a number of different things. Scott still believes that merging UPD dispatch into VECC is the best idea. We are all working together, in the same direction, trying to achieve the common goal. Scott would suggest that the governing board of the CAD project and the Board of Trustees make the determination based on an audit of the organization as to whether it's better to merge or have a third site. John said he doesn't suspect to bring this to the August meeting because that is the joint strategic planning meeting, but he'll bring it in September along with a recommendation. Kyle asked if the Interlocal is being changed, will this need to be taken to each City Council for approval. John continued that if we stay with the Interlocal, it will be just the determination of the Board on the voting. It's based on weight based on revenue contribution. As John is calculating, each contribution assessment is based on call volume at \$10 per call. Attributing this to UPD, it is about an \$862K investment into the Center, which gives them voting rights. Total budget for dispatch is around \$3.2 million, but that excludes a number of other things that are not related to dispatch. There are calculations that go from cost center to cost center, contributions by the County for different services in IT and TS and facility maintenance. The other aspect when looking at this is the requests John has received from DPS to join either in a separate Interlocal, or join our Interlocal and become part of the overall valley-wide dispatching and call taking types of things. Kyle said the question now is what is the relationship between UPD and UFA to their cities. Maybe this needs to be resolved between them. Also, coming into the CAD, not necessarily coming into this organization, we have had requests from University of Utah PD, Airport Authority, UTA, and Granite School District about joining. It could become a very large organization if we allow all the organizations to come in.

Other Issues by Board Members

John asked if there was anything that the Board wanted him to look at, to bring back information. Gary Whatcott said he wanted to make sure that John and the Board members felt comfortable with the relationship financially. He said there have been so many things happening with these quazi-govermental scenarios and he wants to make sure the Board feels well-informed about the financial decisions and the expenditures being made. Gary talked about maybe getting some kind of monthly report and John said he had this information in the financial documents in the Financial Policy. They will receive documents each month and then a verbal report every quarter. It can be changed to a verbal report each month if the Board wants this. Gary asked if everyone felt comfortable with this. One thing that came out of these scenarios suggested that the Board wasn't involved enough and didn't have enough oversight over the Director of the entity in seeing what was happening. He's not looking for more, he's just making sure everyone is comfortable with the current arrangement now and asking if there needs to be any changes to this. Kyle asked for not only monthly statements to be available but also a scheduled disbursement on this so that everyone can look at things. There was also discussion at some point if someone was reviewing credit card purchases. John mentioned that there is already a credit card policy in place, which he can distribute. Kyle thought the Chair of the Board would be reviewing these credit purchases by the Executive Director. Gary said it was never formalized, he just didn't know how John felt about it. John has no problem with this whatsoever. Gary wasn't sure if the Board would need to sign off by vote that they are comfortable with a review of the credit statements. He just wants to make sure we are satisfying the need of the State Auditor in some fashion, that there is enough engagement from the Boards on the financial side of things and that everyone is comfortable. John is comfortable with the financial and budget policy, which he will bring back and ask for a vote at the September meeting. Also, he will amend the credit card policy to state that the Chair of the Board will review credit card expenses, and he will bring it to the September meeting as well.

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION – INTRODUCTION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

Scott Carver wanted to mention, with regards to UCA, with the reorganization of how that works, he has a concern with the SL County's representation on those Boards anymore. He said they are establishing an Executive Board, make up of individuals not connected with the industry, but have knowledge of the industry. Below this will be the Operations Board, those people who know and deal with the industry. This Board gets their information from the Regional Boards that will be created based upon the AOG that we are in. John mentioned that the AOG and Operations Boards are all advisory committees and we can have people sit in both committees. John believes we should have representation attending these meetings who are very vocal because we also have the ability to present outside of those advisory committees directly to the Operations Board and directly to the UCA. The AOG is to establish the Regional Advisory group of up to 12 members and we need to select and put membership on along with the other counties this Advisory group. This is where we formulate our needs and requests. Then the 2 representatives will take this to the Ops Board and the UCA. Scott doesn't know who is coordinating these groups. John says it's slow to happen because the UCA committee is all appointed by the Governor. Speaker of the House and the Senate President each have a representative, and only Mike Waddups has been formally appointed. Following this, because the Operations Board needs to be approved by the UCA Board, they are a little bit behind. The UCA Board is being paired down from 29 members to 12 members. It will be a more streamlined Board, but the problem is it can't be a vendor and can't be a current user. They can be former users of the system with knowledge of public safety communications, but they can't be actively involved. The Governor doesn't want any conflicts of interest out there or anyone who could be enriched by making a decision to purchase \$200 million worth of equipment as they go through the State. In January 2018, a new assessment is coming out which will generate about \$16 million for replacement and refurbishment of the radio system. This will all be distributed by the Board, which is why the Governor didn't want anyone on who might benefit one way or another.

There was nothing else to discuss at this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:03 p.m.