

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
September 25, 2019 Meeting Minutes
VECC Board Room
5360 Ridge Village Drive, West Valley City

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Gary Whatcott; South Jordan
Mr. Doug Hill; Murray
Mr. Konrad Hildebrandt; Riverton
Mr. Wayne Pyle; West Valley City
Mr. Mark Reid; Bluffdale
Mr. Brett Wood; Herriman
Mr. David Dobbins; Draper
Mr. Kyle Kershaw; South Salt Lake
Mr. Jake Petersen; UPD
Mr. Mike Reberg; SLCO
Mr. Jay Ziolkowski; UFA
Mr. Scott Harrington; Taylorsville
Mr. Mike Shelton; Cottonwood Heights
Mr. Korban Lee; West Jordan

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Mike Morey; Alta
Mr. Kane Loader; Midvale
Ms. Gina Chamness; Holladay

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Brickey; West Valley City
Mr. David Sanderson; SLVECC
Mr. John Evans; West Valley City
Mr. Layne Morris; West Valley City
Mr. Corey Roberts; Motorola/Spillman
Mr. Max Jenkins; Motorola/Spillman
Mr. Skyeler King; Motorola/Spillman
Mr. Mike Brown; SLC
Mr. Mark Bohman; SLC
Mr. Bruce Cline; Sandy
Mr. John Eining; Draper
Mr. Jeff Carr; South Jordan
Ms. Lisa Burnette; SLC911
Mr. Rusty McMicken; SLC
Mr. Karl Lieb; SLC
Mr. Jaysen Oldroyd; SLC
Mr. Bill Romsburg; Cit Com
Mr. Scott Teerlink; SLC
Mr. Patrick Leary, SLC
Mr. Troy Carr; Herriman
Mr. Jon Arnold; Sandy
Mr. Chris Armstrong; West Jordan
Mr. Scott Buchanan, West Valley City
Mr. John Inch Morgan, SLVECC
Mr. Jonathan Bridges; SLVECC
Mr. Jeff Monson; SLVECC
Ms. Beth Todd; SLVECC
Ms. Gigi Smith; SLVECC
Ms. Shelly DeJong; SLVECC
Ms. Leslie Devey; SLVECC

Ms. Missy Widdison; SLVECC
Ms. Becky Nielson; SLVECC
Ms. Tracy Houston; SLVECC
Mr. Dominique Carter; SLVECC
Ms. Andrea Partridge; SLVECC

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Gary Whatcott commented that there someone at the meeting who wished to address the Board. Max Jenkins, a citizen of Salt Lake County and an employee of Spillman/Motorola, wished to address what appeared to be item #4 on the agenda and speak to it briefly. He wished to speak specifically to the project of the CAD system in the Salt Lake Valley. This project is a result of a previously failed implementation with a prior vendor. He believes the intention is to move very quickly on this project with the intent to unify a CAD solution in the Valley. Spillman/Motorola is concerned about this; they are concerned about a rushed process. They are concerned with decisions being made quickly and aren't thorough in an evaluation process which can result in outcomes that are not in the best interests of the Agencies they serve or the public. Decisions that are rushed and pushed through quickly without thorough evaluations can result in protest, litigation and other end results that unfortunately, only prolong the process of implementation, which it would have if it would have gone through proper processes and steps, through a published and defined process. He hopes these things are being considered. Max also wants to make sure that the Board knows that several individuals have come to him; some are personnel here at VECC and other agencies that they services, that have come to him with concerns and asked him to step forward; they feel this process is being rushed and being done very quickly and there is not a thorough and fair process in place to do an evaluation to make sure the proper vendor is selected. Max also hopes that an RFP will be issued for this project and will be open to all vendors. He cares that the project is successful. The previous project, millions of dollars of tax-payers money was spent, and that project resulted in failure in communication. Fortunately, there was an RFP that offered protection and the ability to recover some of the costs spent on the project. He thanked everyone for their time and hoped that these considerations would be considered.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 21, 2019 BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEETING

Motion –

. . . By Mr. Doug Hill, to approve the minutes of the August 21, 2019 Board of Trustee Minutes; seconded by Mr. Scott Harrington; the motion carried unanimously.

OPERATIONS BOARD REPORT

Chief Jeff Carr reported that on the TS Users report, there is an upgrade to Spillman scheduled for the DI-9's tomorrow morning. On the Fatpot side, there are still issues which are being worked on. There is limited support due to the size of the company and there is some concern from the TS Users about the diminishing support on the Spillman side. They discussed staffing and retention which will be addressed at this meeting today. VECC is losing folks to other agencies, which is concerning. Those people that we are losing are those that we've invested time and money in; they are the 4+ year employees. There was concern about the 2 CAD systems and the vacancies we have and the trouble it creates with 2 CAD systems and not being able to have an employee from the Versaterm side be able to work on the Spillman side and visa versa. Chief Evans commented that the Fire Chiefs had signed a letter, which is included in the packet, regarding their thoughts on Versaterm and that it meets the fire services needs.

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION T19-11

Beth Todd explained that this Resolution is regarding an agreement between SLVECC and SLC Corp; it's regarding our Emergency Notification System. This agreement is a renewal, it's been in place since 2011 and we just wanted to update everyone that they are going through the renewal and amending some of the cost-sharing involved with the system as the costs have been updated for this renewal. This agreement is better known to the public as a reverse-911 system and it includes public alerting and the portal to the IPAWS system. The agreement said that the system is owned by SLVECC and we agree to maintain the hardware and train the SLC911 and SLC Emergency Management Personnel in the use of the system and allow them access to make emergency notifications. On SLC's part, they agreed to maintain their data in the system and to provide the

geo-coding of the 911 addresses to the GIS information. This would go for another term of 2 years and the costs involved are \$9647 for SLC for maintenance and another \$1200 for the semi-annual 911 data base updates. The cost-sharing is a blended formula based on population and the percent of telephone numbers in the system; it's about a 66/43 split. Beth asked if there were any questions and requested a motion on being able to move forward with this.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. David Brickey, to approve Resolution T19-11; the motion was seconded by Mr. Mike Shelton; the motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION REGARDING PROPOSED RESOLUTION T19-12

John Inch Morgan presented the proposed Resolution and read through it. We have been discussing an alternative method to unifying the CAD and the other public safety software. John doesn't feel we have been rushing into this; we've been analyzing this and Bill Romesburg, who is here, has been our Project Consultant throughout this process since 2015. He has been writing the RFP's and has provided us with information on the various options we have available. John included in the packet a memo that looks at the Utah Code and Procurement, which identifies options for us for non-competitive procurement. Following the procurement process, we have a few options available to us. Over the past several months, we have seen exigent circumstances in staffing. If we have a call-off or a sick individual, we can't just move a person from one CAD to another to fill that in. We must be able to maintain day-to-day operations. With all the calls coming in, and when there are several calls going into our queue due to inadequate staffing, we need to take some drastic measures. One of these drastic measures reported to the Board 2 months ago is double pay offered on overtime to try and fill seats and make sure we can answer calls. When someone calls 911, the expectation is that someone will be there to answer, and they won't be put on hold. There are times where this will happen, when we have a fire and hundreds of calls are coming in within a short period of time and calls will go into a holding pattern where we will get to them as quickly as we can. There is no way to staff for this. One thing that has been discussed, which has probably not been labeled correctly, is sole-source; this isn't a sole-source as there is not just one vendor out there. There are 2 vendors under contract in VECC right now; Spillman/Motorola and Versaterm. Both have contracts that have gone through a legitimate process and one of the options we have would be to expand one contract and terminate the other moving ahead. We have talked about the difficulty in putting out a full-blown RFP because of timing and the exigent circumstances we have with staffing. Right now, doing a full-blown RFP doesn't make sense and is not John's recommendation. The whole RFP process is very time consuming. People are leaving here due to pay, but also the burden we are putting on them because as people leave, that burden is pushed onto other individuals. The second issue would be cost; as we have gone through this before, a full-blown RFP with all vendors being able to respond comes somewhere between \$2 - \$13 million dollars. Transitional costs are one of the reasons you can avoid a full-blown RFP if those costs are greater. Right now, we have virtually half of the county on one system and half of the county on another system. If we are only buying licenses for half of the county, it will be a lot less expensive than someone else coming in and trying to replace all licenses. The other side of the transitional costs are the soft costs; we have dedicated every department in populating a CAD and public safety software system. Again, we have half the county with this already populated, so the soft costs would be less as well. Someone will have to dedicate a lot of time on the fire side putting recommends in and identifying the type of equipment, but on the police side, we will have to look at hazards that we put in. A new legacy system would be very expensive. Training would be another issue. John also believes that for us to go out and solicit from everybody a response that is expensive to put together with the expectation that they might be awarded the contract, money has not been budgeted for this. Holding it out as an RFP would indicate that we have full intent to fairly evaluate every response and we can't do this, it would be disingenuous. Bill Romesburg commented that in looking at the procurement laws, the non-traditional laws allow for exigent circumstances. They offer non-traditional acquisition in the even there are exigent circumstances or when the transitional costs exceed the budget. As the budget stands today, we would not be able to afford this. Wayne Pyle asked Bill for his opinion on the two vendors we currently have and where we should be with that. Bill commented that the question put forth to him was could either vendor be used; and the answer is yes. John commented that this Resolution authorizes John to begin negotiations so we can see where each vendor stands and then provide the information. Another option would be to go ahead and designate one of them, which would be the Board's decision and prerogative based on the information that we have. John included the memo, which is in the shared Dropbox which goes through the 3 different statutes that allow a non-competitive bid given certain

circumstances. Doug Hill mentioned the letter in the Dropbox from the Fire Chiefs and asked if anyone could speak to it, as far as one of the vendors not being able to meet their needs. He wondered what needs it didn't meet. It was mentioned that with regards to Versaterm, it was determined by the Chiefs that it meets their basic needs for a fire service because it's being used right now. They believe it will meet all the other aspects looked for, with upgrades, and they believe it will be relatively inexpensive. As a group, the Fire Chiefs believe it's in their best interest to look at Versaterm valley-wide for fire and it was agreed upon. Gary Whatcott said that Chief Petersen contacted him showed concern with Versaterm and requested a third-party person to help evaluate whether it would work or not work. At the Fire Conference, in collaboration with the Fire Chiefs and the third-party who did the scrub, they were quite comfortable moving forward with Versaterm as a body of Fire Chiefs and moving forward now rather than postponing it is beneficial to those in our community. Gary Whatcott mentioned that there was a second question raised by Chief Petersen about whether it would work and have the capabilities of meeting the needs, and they basically came back and said after that review that it could meet their needs. It wasn't necessarily pitching one against the other but more evaluating one to see whether it would work.

Brett Wood commented that he's put effort outside of this Board to go talk with many individuals, and he attended the UCA meeting last week and he's been involved for over 20 years with all the issues. He mentioned this at the UCA meeting; the message he took from the UCA is they are looking at this Board to make some decisions and get moving. We need to move forward as a Board of Trustees and get to one CAD system. Mark Reid commented that he's heard that Fire is comfortable with the Versaterm system, but he hasn't heard if they are comfortable or not with the other system. Wayne Pyle asked if the Resolution is designed for the Board to open the process for John to select between the two, what is the timeline and does John have detail on where he's moving. John commented that he is advising that we have an exigency public safety need for an emergency procurement. He recommends that we choose a vendor now, today at the meeting, as part of the Resolution. Gary commented there has been a lot of dialog back and forth but there is a Resolution in front of us and it will determine what the motion is and whether it carries or not. There are many choices to include tabling, disregarding, voting, or putting vendors into the motion. He feels that the Board can make a choice in the process and move forward down a path, keeping the coalition alive and create a common CAD within SL County.

The Salt Lake Valley Police Chiefs have had several discussions and most of them would like to move with Versaterm. West Valley still has some concerns, South Salt Lake was comfortable with the CAD portion, but he wanted to keep his Spillman records. Wayne Pyle mentioned he was most pleased with any party's participation in the process of Versaterm themselves. They, throughout this whole thing, has provided information and moved the process along when we asked them to do it, doing it very timely. He can't say the same thing about our own process or the processes with our other parties and Boards that we work with. From West Valley's standpoint, this has never been a question between Spillman and Versaterm, but what is the best process and product for the whole organization. If the feeling or consensus is to go with Versaterm, he is comfortable with this as well.

Motion –

. . . By Mr. Wayne Pyle, to adopt Versaterm as the legacy vendor to be negotiated with for moving forward; the motion was seconded by Undersheriff Jake Petersen; the motion passed by roll call vote with 90.8%.

There was further discussion with the motion. Kyle Kershaw mentioned that one of several problems we ran into was that there wasn't much consideration on an RMS system. Many agencies are using different legacy RMS systems which puts everyone into a situation where they will incur extra costs to keep the system going for years in order to access records while new data is dumped into a new RMS system. It then forces their people to be proficient in two systems. Conversely, they must pay for some sort of conversion of data from one legacy vendor to another. Kyle wants to make sure there is some consideration given to the increased costs that half the Boards will have to bear when dealing with the RMS side. John said that in looking at RMS systems and any CAD, there are several options available including conversion. Also, when maintaining the legacy system, it's not like maintaining a full-blown system but rather preserving a data base that can be accessed and utilized which would only need a few licensees, which is a minimal amount. Kyle agreed with this but said there would be cost involved and certain agencies will be forced to bear these costs to keep their cases

in these systems. He just wants to be sure as we go through this process that there is consideration into RMS systems that may not be compatible. These costs and options will need to be identified. David Brickey commented that Salt Lake City would be around to help those of us in these situations and he wondered if they still had that capability and what that help would look like. Lisa Burnett approached the Mayor Chief of Staff on this. Salt Lake City has already incurred costs with Versaterm. Their upgrade to 7.6 is already scheduled and they have the hardware in place to bring SLVECC onto their servers. When she approached Patrick about this, her thought was that because they have already incurred these costs, they might be able to help everyone else comply with SB198. She still believes that we can do this. What that looks like, she can't say too much right now. However, the reason we can offer this is because this is something they have already budgeted and paid for. SLC wants to be good partners and they believe this is in the best interest of public and responder safety. Wayne Pyle asked Gary to update the Board on the UCA situation that Brett referred to in terms of what happened and where they are at. Gary Whatcott reported to this Board earlier in the summer that he had conversed with Dave Edmonds and Quin Stevens about whether the grant was in jeopardy if a vendor didn't perform right or we had complications with it. They reported that they didn't see any, and then over the last week there seems to be some concerns with whether the grant should be recalled once the original grant for its purpose and its vendor were chosen. There were conversations with some Board members; not everyone agrees that it should be. Gary believes people are going back to what the intent was for the reasoning. The Board had in front of them an agenda item by Dave Edmonds to take a vote on whether the grant money should be recalled now that this is reaching a termination point. He got the impression that the Board wanted a lot more information about what's happened at VECC and where things are going. There were several questions asked by Board members on if there was a solution recommended on where we were headed. They curtailed any voting; John and Lisa gave a presentation to the Board about the grant. They were asked to come back in a closed session to give more particulars of the settlement and to discuss where we are headed in the future. This may have some bearing on how the Board feels about the grant. Gary also expressed some of his personal feelings and opinions. As a Board member, he will do everything he can to help educate Board members to understand what the intent of this grant was and that it hasn't changed; nothing has changed in our rationale for why this money was appropriated. The mission and intent of the Legislation is clear, to move people to a common CAD in the County of the first class. Brett Wood commented that he doesn't believe the Board members understand how the money was funneled through and that they do need some education. Ryan Carter recalled from the last time we went through the RFP process, a policy that had been adopted by VECC years before that governed the way in which purchases, and expenditures were to be governed. He is unclear if this has ever been amended, changed or revisited. John didn't believe it has been, to his knowledge. Ryan believes that this then raises a question as to whether the Utah Procurement Code even applies to VECC as a governmental entity. He feels it merits a second look at our exiting procurement policy as to whether we feel we have legal room to make the decisions that are before us today under that policy. John believes we are in compliance, but he would have to go back and look with our attorney.

The Board then did a roll call vote on the motion; the motion passed with 90.8%.

DISCUSSION OF BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS

Consideration of Resolution T19-13 Use of Discretionary Compensation Fund

John Inch Morgan commented that in the budget, in the miscellaneous line item in the Administrative section, we added 2 years ago \$190k for compensation adjustments. We did it again in the 2020 budget and this first Resolution, as one of the conditions, as we did market studies, John brought this back to present to the Board and get ratification on our plan. Beth will discuss staffing, the critical point, with the first \$190k we are asking to be placed into the compensation/market adjustments. Last month, Beth reported that this Board heard some of the Operational challenges we are experiencing as well as some of the staffing issues. With the 2 CAD systems, we have dispatchers on both sides of the room that only know one CAD. We have started cross-training; we currently have 8 Spillman dispatchers that have almost completed their training on the Versaterm side. A few months ago, we lost the functionality of our CAD2CAD system between Spillman and Versaterm. This was an antiquated one-time system which we are unable to get fixed. This completely broke the communication link between both sides of the room. We also have two disparate phone systems due to the physical merge. This broken communication between CADs has resulted in an increased workload for our dispatchers. Call-volume for August 2019 total number of calls we received was just under 88,000. 26,000 of these were 911 calls, 26,000 came into the Versaterm line and 35,000 came into the Spillman line. All these calls were handled with 18 911 call takers, 73 dispatchers and 11 supervisors. To combat this, we are speeding

up the time in between hire groups; we used to hire every 2-3 months and now we hire every 1-2 months. We currently have 23 people in training across the Center, which maxes out our trainers and trying to get off and on their own independently as quickly as we can. We are cross-training dispatchers on both sides while maintaining radios until the full transition is done. 76.7% of our employees have less than 5 years of service. 84.5% have less than 10 years of service. In 2019, we've lost 40 employees; 26 have been to other employment; 7 of these to SLC. In the past 3 years, we hired 25 people, which was also the year that SLC allocated \$500k to SLC911 for market adjustments and lateral hiring. In 2018, we hired 20 employees and our turnover was lower last year. So far this year, we have hired 29 dispatchers. SLC has also received another \$500k to increase the number of positions they have. Our current staffing includes 69 police positions with 60 dispatchers, 13 fire positions with 12 dispatchers and 24 Call Taking positions with 17 call takers. We are at 16 hours of mandatory overtime per month per employee. We are offering double time for working overtime hours as an incentive to work the additional hours. A year ago, the national standard for answering 911 calls is 90% of 911 calls answered within 15 seconds, during the busy hour of the day. Last year, we were at 83% with 28 call takers. This year, with 17 call takers, we are at 49%. We are proposing to do a mid-year budget adjustment due to the exigent circumstances we have. John has 2 resolutions on the agenda. One is to utilize the money in the budget right now, the \$190k, the second one is to do a mid-year budget adjustment to take funds from the fund balance to complete the other issue. After the new budget year started, Jeff Monson called around to some of the dispatch centers to see what market adjustments they made this year. Bountiful did a 5%, Layton did a 6.1%, David Co did 12.1% and Weber Co is 12.4% increases. There are dispatch centers doing retention bonuses; Weber is doing a \$10k bonus every 5 years, Highway Patrol does a \$5k hiring and signing bonus, other centers do \$1k hiring/signing bonuses. These are the numbers we are competing with. We are proposing increasing where we are at in the market with the market adjustments. When Jeff spoke with SLC, they went from \$17.85 starting to \$18.31, Weber went from \$16.36 to \$18.37 and we are currently at \$16.86 for the first 6 months and then they bump to \$17.37. Our request with the 2 Resolutions is a 15% market adjustment for the starting wage, taking us to \$17.61 and after 6 months up to \$18.47. 18% of the funds would go to employees based on years of service from years 1-3, 27% would go for those working 4-10 years of service, 20% for years 11-29 and 10% for supervisors. This will bring up into the 90th percentile and more competitive. John said with the 2 resolutions, he is asking is for a total increase of \$500k; \$190k already budgeted in the Administration call center and then \$310k from the fund balance to help bring us to this total. This would require an increase to the budget, taking money from the fund balance, and it would require us to schedule a budget hearing. The second resolution is to set a Budget Hearing in October to complete this proposal. John mentioned there was a schedule for this in the Dropbox. Our current fund balance is around \$2 million right now and the \$300k reduces the balance to \$1.7 million, which is about 16%. Doug Hill asked the Board if these issues could be dealt with separately; he'd like to see a spreadsheet showing what the market analysis would be, in how we do compare with the other agencies. Rather than doing retention bonus, that other centers have done, John is recommending base-pay changes as he feels this is what's driving away based on the market analysis. The market analysis doesn't include the \$10k every 5 years and he isn't sure how we would compete head on with something like that and if it could be sustained. On base-pay, if someone is leaving because they are being paid \$3 - \$4 an hour more at a different location and we are looking at something slight just to catch us, he's more for base-pay now rather than a bonus. We do start preparing our budget and presenting it to the Board in January based on our best estimate. Jeff does the market study as to what the Cities and other PSAP's are doing right now. What doesn't help right now is that the economy is so good. We have people leaving for other PSAP's but for other jobs as well, with weekends off and no shift work. Lisa commented that we are trying to compete with normal schedules and with public safety being 24/7, it's very difficult to entice a market. But this is the reason we need to offer a competitive wage because there are alternatives out there. Beth commented that our employees on the floor are experiencing those employees who have left our organization to go elsewhere are reaching back out there and asking them to move over. If we don't do something to make us competitive and give them a reason to stay, we will continue to lose people. If we continue to lose people every month, we will not catch up. Gary mentioned that everyone is dealing with public safety and the training and cost is huge. Wayne Pyle commented that his issue with this whole premise is we are talking like this is going to solve the problem, which it's not. Everyone is dealing with this exact same problem with every class of employees they have. He is not opposed to making these changes, though he doesn't know of another agency in here who's making a mid-budget year adjustment to address these same exact issues. He would be in support of the first Resolution and may vote in support of the other Resolution. However, his main concern is that this isn't going to solve the problem. There is no answer for what we are going to do next Spring, and there has been no discussion on how to make up the fund balance liability we will

either must replace or potentially must pay again because of the usage of one-time money to make the market adjustments. John commented that the \$190k is part of the budget and was for the past 2 years, but the second one will need some discussion. John will be presenting information so that he can justify what they are doing. Right now, he's just asking for the budget hearing, as it must go through the process. John has always presented budget information and he has always provided detailed information. Wayne is not looking for justification for the issue, he's looking for management answers to solve the problem. Kyle asked with the fiscal year that just ended June 30th, how much over budget were the 911 revenues. Dave mentioned it was about \$200k over budget. Kyle requested a one-page income expense statement for FY19, realizing VECC is still in the audit process and mentioning that we came in \$200k over budget in 911 revenues. Maybe this is the first step in replacing the amount or funding the ongoing liability. Mark Reid mentioned he struggles with the fact that the Board gave the entire area a raise at year end. He wondered if the \$190k should be increased rather than giving increases across the board. Built into the budget, SLVECC got a 2% COLA and up to a 3% pay for performance. When you say across the board, we are not giving everyone the same amount; we are doing it by those vulnerable areas where we are losing people and where the market study says we are relatively low. John understands there are some business and management decisions that need to be made, but there is a cost to doing business.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Kyle Kershaw, to approve Resolution T19-13, authorizing the expenditure of the budget funds of \$190k for market compensation adjustments in FY2020; the motion was seconded by Undersheriff Jake Peterson; the motion carried unanimously.

Consideration of Resolution T19-14 Amending the FY 2020 Budget

Gary Whatcott requested a motion to schedule a public hearing for next month.

Motion –

. . . By Mr. Wayne Pyle, to set a Public Hearing for the October 16th meeting; the motion was seconded by Mr. Mark Reid; the motion carried unanimously.

Based on the earlier motion to a single system, it was asked how long the process would take before some of the issues we are creating with people wanting to leave would resolve some of the problems. John felt that from the time we have a contract until everyone is fully trained will take approximately 15 months. John mentioned that Lisa Burnett has suggested that we could maybe cut down some of the training time by offering her employees overtime to accelerate the training process. Lisa mentioned that John Inch and herself have met to talk about these issues and discussed that once we are on a single CAD, there is a possibility that we can do some employee sharing programs. SLC is staffed and because they are, if we are all on the same system, there is high probability that they could send staff to VECC to get everyone where they need to be. It's in SLC's best interest to have SLVECC as a redundant dispatch center for the purpose of affording that to public safety for our citizens. Lisa has a vested interest in making all this work as well. Lisa also mentioned that on Monday, SLC did away with Police ProQa, which has increased their moral substantially. Mark Reid asked Beth if she mentioned anything about Utah Valley, as they used to be way ahead of us in terms of pay. John mentioned they weren't listed in Jeff's lists, however, they were way ahead of us because they were receiving a lot of 911 funds, as it was subscription based. Utah County had the highest number of addresses where cell phones were registered. They have not been as aggressive in their compensation because they are net-losers as of this year from where they were when it was subscription based and since it has gone to call based. This is why we have an excess in our 911 fees coming in is because of that switch in legislation 3 years ago. Kyle asked John with regards to the 911 fees, if there is any movement with the Tax Commission to audit the fees. John said they take 1% of the proceeds coming from that, which is supposed to be used for audits. They are doing limited audits, but it's not as aggressive as what the Legislative Auditor suggested.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

John Inch Morgan mentioned that there were some vendors and policies to make everyone aware of. First off, Rapid SOS is a policy we have implemented, and he has asked Gigi to discuss it. It's gone through the User committees and through the Board of Operations. Gigi mentioned this is a web-based software program that will supplement what we currently have in trying to identify a location of a caller. If someone calls in, it doesn't replace ani/ali that comes through on 911, but if they dial 911 on their smart phone and they cannot tell us where they are, we cannot understand them, or they just don't know where they are, we can use this software

program to log in, locate them and send out a responder. One thing to be noted, information is only available for about 10 minutes after we receive the call and if they don't dial 911, we aren't able to access information. Also, not all carriers are part of Rapid SOS. They are working in conjunction with the Uber app, and if they dial 911, if we receive it through the Uber app, it automatically tells us it's an emergency call and we need to go into the Rapid SOS software to pull out the information. Lisa mentioned on Versaterm, in Version 7.6, this will be an integration and it will not be a separate application. Gigi also mentioned it is free to public safety. It's been implemented as a policy for VECC. Gigi mentioned Banjo, an AI, which is a company based out of Park City and initially out of California. They have a clearing house that gathers information through resources such as social media and partnerships with different businesses with camera systems. Now, they have tapped into SLVECC and are asking if we will work with them in conjunction with our data base. Their goal is to get information and notify 911 Centers of information or detailed incidences that are happening even before we are notified by the public. We are still in process with this, and what it would take to work with them and our TS department and the security/safety of our information and data. John commented that at this point, this is just information. There are still several questions we have asked Banjo to provide us. John included in the packet a standard letter of engagement, they have contracted with the State of Utah, and David Church is going through their letter right now. If anyone hears about it, just know we are following up on those types of things. From our ProQa, you heard Lisa say that as of the 23rd. SLC is no longer doing EPD. This Board gave John the instructions to go ahead and begin negotiations with ProQa. Obviously, it took 4 months for SLC to get where they are, but we have just been approved with another accreditation. Leslie Devey reported that we have continued utilizing ProQa as intended, and with that we were set to expire the end of October. We put our accreditation packet together and just received word back this morning that we have been reaccredited in EPD but as a triple-ace as well. John said that regardless of what happens, we will continue our quality improvement.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RECRUITMENT

South Jordan has taken this task on and has put together a brochure on this. There were several individuals here who volunteered to be on the recruitment committee. South Jordan and Teresa Cook, the HR person, has put this brochure together as an announcement to go out quickly. John, Gary and Teresa got together and identified some of the challenges and opportunities as well as what is in the current job description. The target dates are mentioned in the brochure and the application process is defined; we are asking them to submit their credentials and application but also a short essay on their background which will be reviewed and presented to the committee and Board. Gary Whatcott wanted to make sure everyone was okay with the process. Chief Peterson asked if Gary would be using a recruiter. Gary didn't believe it was necessary, at least in the beginning as they are very expensive. There are several places they plan to send the recruitment announcement to which will generate plenty of applicants. Wayne Pyle thanked South Jordan for supplying the internal staff to run this. Also, Chief Petersen also spoke with him about a recruiter. He doesn't remember how adamant or firm he was on that subject; there are pros and cons to it. In the past there has been difficulty in the number of candidates that were viable, which is a pro argument to getting a recruiter. Gary felt it may have been where the announcements were placed in the past. He believes we have a good outline of the process. Kyle asked if the committee will get to a shorter list, interview, and then make one recommendation to this Board. Gary said the Committee hasn't met yet; they have been waiting for the material to get settled and outlined so they can meet. They will discuss this at that point. He wanted to make sure no one had reservations about the path we are heading down. They will evaluate in the next coming weeks, if they aren't seeing a big return of interest in the job position, we could discuss a recruiter further. This brochure is completed and can be found in the Dropbox. All applicants are due, according to the timeline, by October 18th. Brett Wood asked if they wanted to put a hard deadline of applicants or until the position is filled. Gary doesn't believe there has to be a hard deadline; he likes the flexibility in it, but he would like to start moving forward on it to keep the process moving timely. There were a few slight modifications done to the job description, but the previous job description did not require a degree. This new description requires at least a bachelor's degree with a preference for a master's degree, and there is a broad scope on the type of degree.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW BUSINESS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

John wanted to make everyone aware that the patch for Spillman is going in tomorrow at 8:00 a.m. We have tried to encourage them with the last 2 to provide the upgrade earlier in the morning as we get busy starting at 8:00 a.m. Just so everyone knows, the system will be down for an hour to two hours. We will be taking 911 calls, running paper over to the dispatchers, but this will disrupt our operations to some degree. Spillman was

asked to reconsider doing it at an earlier time and their response was that they could not accommodate it based on the schedule with developers and others that help with the patch.

There was nothing else to discuss at this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:49 p.m.