

**SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER**

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING**  
***September 20, 2017 Meeting Minutes***  
***VECC Board Room***  
***5360 Ridge Village Drive, West Valley City***

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Brad Christopherson; Taylorsville; Vice Chairman  
Mr. Kyle Kershaw; South Salt Lake  
Mr. Mark Reid; Bluffdale  
Mr. Blair Camp; Murray  
Mr. Ryan Carter; Riverton  
Mr. Kane Loader; Midvale  
Mr. David Dobbins; Draper  
Mr. John Guildner; Alta  
Mr. Carlton Christensen; SLCO  
Mr. Layne Morris; West Valley City  
Mr. Dan Peterson; UFA  
Mr. Mike Shelton; Cottonwood Heights  
Mr. Russ Wall; West Jordan

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Mr. Gary Whatcott; South Jordan; Chairman  
Mr. Scott Carver; UPD  
Mr. Brent Wood; Herriman  
Ms. Gina Chamness; Holladay

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Mr. Marc McElreath; West Jordan  
Mr. John Evans; West Valley City; Ops Vice Chairman  
Mr. David Church; VECC Attorney  
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 JULY 19, 2017 BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEETING**

**Motion –**

**. . . By Mr. Carlton Christensen, to approve the minutes of the July 19, 2017 Board of Trustee Minutes as written; seconded by Mr. David Dobbins; the motion carried unanimously.**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 16, 2017 JOINT OPERATIONS/TRUSTEE MEETING**

**Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. Carlton Christensen, to approve the minutes of the August 16, 2017 Joint Operations/Trustee minutes as written; seconded by Mr. David Dobbins; the motion carried unanimously.**

**OPERATIONS BOARD MEETING REPORT**

Chief John Evans reported that John would be going over most of what was discussed at the Operations meeting, but he did mention that Fire and Police are still working through some of the dispatch codes for EMD and EFD. There is quite a bit of discussion with the new CAD and RMS but it is going along well. The biggest thing still being looked at is station alerting and all being on the same system throughout the entire Valley.

## **PLANNING TOPICS**

### **Organizational Bylaw Review and Revision**

John Inch Morgan reported that there are Bylaws for the Board of Trustees and the Board of Operations. They are both in the same document and were revised in 2013. They weren't huge revisions but it did take into consideration some of the changes that had been going on in 2013-2014, anticipating the merger of VECC and UPD but also bringing on new members coming in as some of the cities were incorporated or changed boundaries. Some of the things we need to identify or at least discuss and confirm the way it is now or to make changes are included in the packet John prepared. John defined the purpose of the Operations Board according to the Bylaws. The way this is operated is the policies that deal with the day-to-day operations are something that has been approved without coming to the Board of Trustees. In other words, what the Users Groups do is talk about the ways that they would like VECC to dispatch certain types of codes and calls, such as fraud cases. These types of policies have been historically dealt with on the Operations Board level and have not come to the Board of Trustees. The Trustees, as far as looking at policies, are HR policies, how we deal with employees, how do we compensate employees and how do we deal with budgets and things like that. The theory that has gone around, based on this, is to let the Chiefs' deal with the Operational types of things where they have the expertise and let the various entities deal with budgetary-type matters and those things that impact the budget itself. The Board of Operations also coordinates the emergency communications needs and requirements to all local public safety agencies, and to John, this is the coordination that comes when all of the Chiefs' come together to coordinate that emergency response. If there is a crash on the road and we are not told at the very beginning that it is a crash with medical, that coordination comes back through this common organization so that we can coordinate that response. This might mean brining in SLC as we look at the borders with WVC and SSL, so that we can reach out and have that unified response coming into the organization. A suggestion that John added in, which was implied in the original Bylaws, is that member entities are to appoint representatives to the VECC Operations Board who will serve as advisors to the Board of Trustees to enhance the operations and will act as agents of the members for the purpose of coordinating each agencies public safety response. Members shall provide written endorsements of the appointments of each Representative from the CEO, Mayor or whoever is the governing authority. This is one thing we haven't really had, it's been practiced and encouraged, but it hasn't been in the Bylaws per se. John believes the endorsement is appropriate each year so that we have a primary and a secondary coming. This has been done with the Board of Trustees, but not necessarily with the Board of Operations. Kyle Kershaw commented that with VECC being on a fiscal year, would it make sense for the Operation committee terms to be July through June to coincide with budget, or if this envisions a calendar year. He asked if there was any advantage to one or the other. Mike Shelton mentioned that elected officials are more calendar year-like and if there is a new set of elected officials, they will be on a calendar year. John said the elections will happen in November and so cities ought to know who will be coming in. He doesn't believe the date is overly important. Layne Morris said that if we are talking about the Board of Operations, elections won't really affect this. Most organizations either want their Chief or maybe an Assistant Chief and there should be some sort of allowance in there to have multiple representatives and then just do it when it changes. John said that sometimes an agency will have 3 BC's who will substitute in from time to time, so if you have an endorsement of a Chief and an Assistant, it would preclude someone else from coming in and voting in that respect. For the Operations Board, they may want to designate positions rather than individuals. Mike Shelton commented that it's probably not the primary responsibility of the Operations Board to oversee the day-to-day operations of the center, but to establish procedures. John understood what he was saying and he added the qualifier to establish procedures, standard operating procedures. Mike just feels that to state oversee day-to-day is probably well beyond the scope of what they really do. It was recommended for the Bylaws to simply say to establish procedures, standard operating procedures. It was also suggested for it to say to review and approve standard operating procedures.

#### **Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. Mike Shelton, to approve the recommendation to change the wording in the Bylaws, removing "oversee the day-to-day operations of the Center" and add "to establish procedures, standard operating procedures"; seconded by Mr. Carlton Christensen; the motion carried unanimously.**

### **Membership and Voting**

John explained that in getting to the Bylaws that govern this group itself, it mentions that membership on the Board of Trustees is to include one representative from each municipal and County agency providing funding for

VECC operations to each participating Interlocal jurisdiction. Senate Bill 198 changed the funding sources to all PSAP's, one of those changes being rescinding the local authority to assess a 9-1-1 fee or tax on every phone line, phone system, and VoIP. It rescinded that authority and transferred it to a State tax. The reason they did that is because in looking at these funds coming in, they started to shift. Part of the research that went into this looked at these funds being assessed on subscriber addresses. In Utah County, for example, the revenue compensation per call was \$30.00, while other areas in the State were down to \$6.00 per call, the revenue coming in. The tax initially set up by the FCC was to accommodate Call Taking capabilities. It was broadened 3 or 4 years ago to allow us to apply some of those funds to dispatching. In some of the big college towns, there were a lot of subscriber rates for college students that really didn't equate to the call volume that was coming in, and they would continue to assess those and distribute those funds to those counties. The distribution going forward that began in July redistributes these fees based on call volume. What it does, however, is takes away the contribution from each city that was being made on a subscription basis, the addresses, that then flowed back to VECC. In some cases, those funds being collected by the State Tax Commission were sent directly to VECC. In other cases, it was sent to the cities and the cities returned it to VECC because it was the only thing that the money could be used for. And again, some of the funds were just put into a general fund and then it just melted into different kinds of things; in some cases it was reallocated and in others, not. What this does, if you look at the Interlocal agreement, paragraph 9, it indicates that each member shall have one vote on the Board of Trustees and each vote shall be weighted. The weight shall be determined by the proportion of the members' contribution to the total Center budget for the previous fiscal year, expressed as a percentage. Some of the entities, especially those that contract with other agencies, would not have any contribution directly to VECC because the only contribution they had before was the 9-1-1 fees that were authorized by their cities. With these fees gone, there is no longer a contribution. However, there is still a contribution to the contracting agency for dispatching services. It becomes an issue that has been discussed in the past, but a conclusion hasn't been determined yet. The recommendation from the Operations Board last week was to allow those entities who are contracted with UFA and UPD to identify and have discussion on preferences on how they would like to deal with this.

UFA has 15.15% of the total contributions coming into the center. If Taylorsville, for example, had 10% of those fees coming in, one option would be to diminish the 15.15% by their percentage and give Taylorsville a vote at the table. Another example would be Cottonwood Heights; while they have the same scenario with Fire, they are directly contributing to the police side and so their vote would be a fractional amount of Fire's vote plus whatever their percentage of police would be and it would be combined together. Another way would be to have those contracted cities delegate their voting authority to UFA or UPD and have their input come through their representatives. Or, like the Operations Board, each entity would have a seat at the table, identifying issues within their organization and their vote would either be a full vote or a delegation. The recommendation from the Operations Board is to direct John to sit down with UFA and UPD and anyone else who is contracting and facilitate a discussion on the issues and they can facilitate their own discussion on how they would like to take that contribution and split it, or how they deal with that vote. The Interlocal agreement could also be opened and paragraph 9 could be changed. It may need to happen anyway because of Millcreek. Millcreek is not a member. David Church said originally the Interlocal did not have weighted voting. Everyone who was a signatory had an equal vote. The issue with the weighted voting came up with the UPD merger and the other issues with some cities being contracted. Layne Morris asked why it couldn't just be based upon population. John commented that population is definitely an option. Another easy option would be to base it the way assessments are made, on call volume. Assessments are calculated on a dollar basis based on a 3 year rolling average of calls. John asked if there were any more questions on this from the Board. For this body, the main concern is the weighted voted percentage, but it's a large internal issue with UPD and UFA, how they want to do it. Kyle Kershaw asked this Board if they were comfortable with sending this to UFA and UPD, or should there be more discussion on using call volume used to calculate member assessments and splitting up voting rights. Ryan Carter asked if they couldn't maintain the current weighted voting strength which is based upon the number of accounts that are being assessed for the 9-1-1 tax. This is still a noble number even though the State is revamping the way the tax is levied and collected. If telephone accounts that were once assessed by the cities directly, there is still a model by which you can assess voting strength. John commented that one of the obligations of the Telecom's is to do an ongoing assessment, which hasn't happened. It doesn't matter whether it's call volume or member contribution because both correlate. The 3-year rolling average determines member contribution and that percentage should be identical no matter which way you look. It was recommended that the decision on this doesn't have to be unanimous, but rather that each city will decide

which way they want to go. John reminded everyone that one of the primary responsibilities of this group is to approve a budget. If there is a budget increase, it may be very affordable if you have a very small budget, but for someone like West Valley City, this could be millions of dollars. Kane Loader commented that it affects every city and he would expect that the members of this Board would vote as a whole in what's best for the organization and facility. John said he thinks this is the way it's gone. In looking over the past 3 years, there has only been one vote where it came down to weighted voting. Everything else has been either unanimous or the simple majority. John is meeting next week with Sheriff Rivera and will talk about the merger. Scott Carver, at the last meeting, mentioned that he is still moving towards the consolidation and that that's his recommendation, to move ahead with a physical consolidation. It was recommended that John go back and meet with those Boards and groups individually or together and then come back to this Board. Chief Peterson commented that he would prefer to have a conversation with his Board, with John Morgan present as well, rather than John to go to his Board around him.

**Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. Russ Wall; to have John Inch Morgan meet with the UPD and UFA Boards to discuss preferences and then report back to this Board; seconded by Mr. Ryan Carter; the motion carried unanimously.**

**Policy Development and Approval**

John was just letting the Board members know that VECC is in the process right now of re-writing all our policies and part of this is a conclusion of several years of trying to have common policies with VECC and UPD, but also bringing in SLC as well so that as we do our dispatching, we all have the same parameters we are dealing with. Beth Todd commented that we had a basic storage location of Policies and Procedures, but over time, people have taken copies of this and put it on a location where they felt it was easier for them to access when they are looking for references. So now, we have many versions of different policies around. We are gathering all of this information, pulling it together and then going through it annually reviewing our policy and procedures. It will then go back through the User groups and the Board of Operations to be sure we are all in line with where we want to go. John also commented that periodically he will bring those policies to this Board for final approval and then that will be the original copy we will distribute to all.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**CAD Project Update**

John has placed a monthly CAD update in the Dropbox for everyone to view. There are a few things to highlight at this meeting. He has colored those items with a high priority and a medium priority and those that are on schedule. The biggest issues are struggling to have BCI give Hexagon access to the records. This has been a long, arduous project that John has reported on in the past. A number of agreements have been rewritten coming forward, and it came down to one issue, if there is a breach then Hexagon would immediately turn over all records and pay for any investigation costs. Hexagon has come back and said not any breach but a breach related to what they are doing. This is what BCI has rejected. They want Hexagon to cover any breach. We are still dealing with this issue right now and it's up at the Commissioner's Office being reviewed. John feels we can come to an agreement. Because there are so many agencies coming together and having these connectivity's go through each firewall in each agency, we have had some connectivity problems. We have good connectivity here at VECC with most of the agencies, but Salt Lake City and Draper have had some issues. They have been legitimate in trying to figure out how to still maintain security and at the same time provide that connectivity. This past week, we've had the pilot program for mobile public safety. Gigi Smith reported that last week they had Police and Fire meet separately and had some one-on-one sessions with each group. In the Training Room, the CAD was set up as well as MPS so that we could visualize what the field units would see. They went over the different buttons and ran scenarios assigning them to calls, having them arrive, call a tow truck, and different things like that. We were very successful here at VECC and learned quite a bit. There were a few bugs that need to be fixed and worked on, but that's what they are looking forward to doing in pilot #2. Gigi mentioned that SLC and UPD have a few bugs they wanted to talk further about and there is a follow up meeting scheduled this coming Tuesday where we can compare notes and scenarios and see what each other is doing to make sure we are all doing the same thing. Beth also mentioned that it was a 10-day period that VECC did and there was quite a bit of difference between day 1 and day 10. They improved almost every day and we saw better movement and communication through the MPS and CAD server. Beth believes that SLC also saw the same things. John said there are 3 pilots scheduled; the first is to identify bugs,

especially the connectivity, between the mobile units in the field and dispatch. Gigi also mentioned that testing was done on both desktops as well as the mobiles and they saw both working. Carlton Christensen asked if VECC was trying to go through 2 different firewalls or through each agency's firewalls. John mentioned it was with every agency. Carlton asked if there was a thought about trying to consolidate the access points. John says there are sec tunnels to go in, to make sure the connectivity is there, but most technical services people say that there are better ways of dealing with this. John wants to take things one step at a time. There are ways to do this and we will do this, but this is a difficult process and it is very time consuming for every agency because even though Hexagon is an off-the-shelf product, we still have to enter in our own data. John said we are modifying as we go along and this is part of statement #3, modifying the arrangement with Hexagon to make sure we are getting the right people the right assets to develop these projects. Gigi is the coordinator of the RMS group where they are meeting every other week where they identify valley-wide so that we have those common data points entered into the system and then making sure they all work. For RMS, we have all the information but what is the format to pull this out so that operations are still smooth.

### **Fire Station Alerting Update**

Beth Todd mentioned again that VECC has been looking at a new fire station alerting system, US Digital, which is the same alerting system that SLC and Sandy use. The overall goal is getting everyone on the same CAD and RMS but also getting the fire departments on the same fire station alerting system to make it seamless dispatching no matter which center it comes out of. All the Fire Chiefs have been meeting with the company and a meeting next week will further the discussion with the Fire Chiefs bringing in some subject matter experts to discuss the system and what some of the options are. John will propose to the Board as a budget adjustment is that we utilize some of the fund balance; we have put an additional almost \$1 million, to provide a base-level in all of our fire stations so that we are all on the same page and VECC can dispatch for SLC and vice versa. Total implementation could be anywhere from \$10k to \$50k, the base is probably closer to \$10-\$15k. If this is not the case, looking at the Zetron system, VECC and each station, at some point in time, would have to upgrade anyway. John will be coming back with a recommendation once the numbers are refined as to what the cost will be for individual stations, above and beyond that each city would bear, or the base amount that VECC would cover. Beth also mentioned that each station itself would have to have someone go out and look at the equipment they have and the wiring and do an assessment of whether the base package is all they would need, or if there might be additional needs. Chief John Evans commented that they all want to be the same and it will cut down the time it takes. John Inch Morgan said that all the Chiefs will meet and talk about these things and identify options, trying to flush out the costs and they should be available to you to report back.

### **911 Fee Distribution**

In SB198, the distribution would be based on call volume that would be determined and sent to the Tax Commission by the UCA each and every year. We have identified a program that touches every PSAP in the State, called ECATS, which identifies the call volume. Based on the call volume, the \$0.71 generates just about \$25 million, but the legislation also says that anybody who would receive less money than they received the previous year, they would be held harmless for 2 years, which is about a \$600k deduction from the \$0.71. The way the State Tax Commission calculates this is every penny assessed on phone lines generates about \$350k for the state. John showed the Board a spreadsheet which shows the money we have received in the past and what we have budgeted this year. Of the \$6.5 million, we put \$950k into reserve, not knowing how much we would receive, but calculating a conservative amount for our operating budget and then putting it into reserve as well. These new fees were assessed beginning in July. We should receive our first payment in September, based upon when they normally distribute the funds; there is a 2 month delay in receiving the funds collected. Anytime there's a change in taxes, there is a slow ramp-up to the total amount as people collect and hold onto money and they look at it to make sure they are distributing it appropriately. It will all come out in the end, but John feels being conservative was a good thing for us and shows that we are very conservative.

The other thing that SB198 did is it re-established the UCA Board and also the 9-1-1 Committee. It did away with the 9-1-1 Committee and in its place, identified an Operations Advisory Committee. John displayed a letter showing the qualifications they are looking for. John feels it's in our best interest to submit a name for encourage someone to submit their name to sit on the Operations Board. Their Operations Board would be comprised of 19 individuals who have Police, Fire, Paramedic, Public Safety, PSAP-kind of experience. John asked if the Board had someone who was interested or they wanted to assign one of their people to participate,

they need to send in an application and letter of interest to either the NENA or APCO; they have come together to identify a recommendation. This was one of the things in legislation that said they would have members that could be recommended from the Police Association, the Fire Association, the PSAP Association or any other Association that might be out there to deal with this. Their operational, they make recommendations to the UCA Board, and it's kind of fashioned after what we do here with an Operations Committee and then a Board of Trustees. This information is also in the shared Dropbox. We have 2 individuals from VECC who have expressed some interest; one is a Supervisor and one is our TS Manager. John thinks we would be willing to support them in participating in this.

John also displayed a letter from the State Legislature, which is to the Board Members of the Utah's Limited Purpose Entities. If anyone is participating in another Board, Independent Agency or other, they have probably already received this letter. This has been a topic of discussion at the legislature for some time. John highlighted a portion of the letter that talks about fraud and poor management among Utah Special Purpose entities. In response to these concerns, they have asked the Legislative Auditor to conduct a survey, and they provided a link that Board members can take a look at. What it's really saying is that each of these entities has to have good physical policies in place. John brought these to the Board last time and put those in place. One thing we have done is identified a Budget Committee to do a review, we are doing trimester reviews for this group as well, in looking at it. We will have our audit report coming up in the next couple of months for the past fiscal year and any credit card expenditures that John makes will be reviewed each month by the Chairman of the Board of Trustees. John also reviews and reports on the credit card use and the purchasing practices that we have to the Chairman as well. Kyle Kershaw asked if John has gone through the checklist attached to the letter, and does he feel that what we are doing covers both pages of recommendations. John said yes, and said he would cover it at the Budget Meeting tomorrow as well, in greater depth. John will have a formal report from the Budget Committee going forward that is encompassed here as well so that it's not John reporting but members who are reporting to the Board of Trustees.

There were no round table discussions or items to bring to the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:17 p.m.