

**SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER**

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING**

*February 21, 2024 Meeting Minutes*

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Korban Lee – West Jordan, Chair  
Mr. Tim Tingey – Cottonwood Heights, Vice Chair  
Mr. David Dobbins – Draper  
Mr. Doug Hill - Murray  
Mr. Dustin Lewis – South Jordan  
Mr. Josh Collins – South Salt Lake  
Mr. Nathan Cherpeski – Herriman  
Mr. Mark Reid – Bluffdale  
Ms. Lisa Hartman – SLCo  
Mr. Scott Harrington – Taylorsville  
Mr. Dom Burchett – UFA  
Ms. Rosie Rivera – UPD  
Mr. John Evans – West Valley City

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Mr. Ryan Carter – Riverton  
Ms. Gina Chamness – Holladay  
Mr. Mike Morey – Alta  
Open – Midvale

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Clint Jensen – Interim VECC Executive Director  
Ms. Elyse Haggerty – VECC Deputy Director  
Mr. Scott Young – VECC legal Counsel  
Mr. Robbie Russo – CHPD  
Mr. Terry Addison – SSLFD  
Mr. Troy Carr – HPD  
Ms. Crystal Makin – South Salt Lake  
Ms. Danielle Croyle – South Salt Lake  
Mr. Jay Ziolkowski – Taylorsville  
Mr. Clint Smith – DFD  
Mr. Chris Dawson – SJFD  
Mr. Joey Mittleman – MFD  
Mr. Chief Maxfield – WJFD  
Mr. Matt Evans – BFD  
Mr. Jeff Puls – MFD  
Mr. Dustin Dern – UFA  
Mr. Brady Cottam – TVPD  
Ms. Melanie Crittenden – UCA  
Ms. Jodi Morris – VECC  
Mr. Jonathan Bridges – VECC  
Ms. Nicole Lopez – VECC  
Ms. Lin Shaffer – VECC  
Ms. Leslie Devey – VECC  
Mr. Colin Baenziger – Baenziger & Assoc  
Mr. Scott Krim – Baenziger & Assoc  
Ms. Lynelle Klein – Baenziger & Assoc

The meeting was called to order by Korban Lee at 2:00 p.m.

Korban Lee:

Welcome, trustees online, a number of chiefs online, VECC employees. Welcome. We're glad you're here. Agenda item Introduction. We do have Colin Baenziger. He's with us. Scott Krim is here in the room from Baenziger & Associates. Colin's joining us online. They are on the agenda and will be presenting a part of our discussions a little bit later in the meeting. With that, let's go on to agenda item number two, review and approval of the minutes from our last trustees meeting on January 17th. Does anyone have any changes or comments to the minutes from last month? Would anyone like to make a motion to approve the minutes from last month?

Rosie Rivera:

I'll make a motion to approve the minutes from January.

Korban Lee:

Thank you, Sheriff. Motion by Sheriff Rivera. Second by Chief Evans. All in favor say aye.

Group:

Aye.

Korban Lee:

Those online?

Group:

Aye.

Korban Lee:

Okay. Seeing no dissent, we'll consider the minutes approved from last month's meeting.

**Motion –**

**. . . by Ms. Rosie Rivera, to approve the minutes from the January 17<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting, seconded by Mr. John Evans; the motion carried unanimously.**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Korban Lee:

Agenda item number three is opening this meeting up to public comment. This is a public meeting. We have quite a few guests here. I'd like to turn time over to anyone in-person that would like to speak or comment to the board of trustees. Anyone here in-person that would like to comment? Is there anyone online that would like to comment? Please unmute your mic and share your comment with the board at this time. Seeing no public comment. We'll close the public comment portion of the meeting. Did we get any comments online submitted?

Clint Jensen:

No comments online.

**OPERATIONS BOARD REPORTS**

Korban Lee:

Okay. All right. Let's go on to the operation board reports. Chief Carr is here. Let's start with the police operations board. Chief?

Troy Carr:

Not a lot to report. We are changing when we're meeting and we've tagged it in front of the Valley Police Alliance meeting. We think that's a good move. We're all together anyway for the Valley Police Alliance, including Sandy in Salt Lake. So when we do meet as an operations board, if there's an issue that leads over to Salt Lake's Communication Center, we would be able to address it, at least with police chiefs that would be in the room. So we're doing that. This last meeting I was out of town. My understanding was that Elyse got tied up with something else. So I don't think there was any issues that came up that I'm aware of on the police side. So not much of a report. That's it for this one.

Elyse Haggerty:

Chief Russo was actually at VPA. I had a meeting with the fire department that went longer than planned.

Korban Lee:

Chief Russo, anything else to add?

Robbie Russo:

Because of the conflicts, we just bumped the meeting and we had no content, so thank you.

Korban Lee:

Okay. All right. Thank you. Chief Carr, thank you. Any questions for Chief Carr? Chief Evans, fire ops board.

Matt Evans:

We had a good meeting. We had a lot of discussion our last meeting about AVL. And I'm going to refer to Clint Smith, Chief Smith. He's going to talk a little bit about AVL. We had a good consensus. We're all in agreement. And Clint is going to talk about AVL for us for just a minute.

Clint Smith:

Yes. Thank you. Apologize for not being there in-person today to be able to deliver this, but we've had a lot of discussion really since the implementation of Versaterm and how AVL obviously applies to all the agencies in the Valley. And we certainly as agencies are all on the same page of wanting the closest unit to respond to those priority 1 calls. That have never been a question or a point of contention amongst the group. I think where we've had some of the discussion amongst the group is how do we utilize our units within our own jurisdictions efficiently and effectively on those calls that are not priority 1s without impacting our neighbors unduly for bringing those units across jurisdictional boundaries again when it's maybe not warranted or not needed because it's not a priority 1 call.

And that's been where we've I think had a lot of discussion. I'll give you an example. Traffic accidents for the most part, because of some limitations previously in the system, were all dispatched as priority 1s regardless of getting information from the caller that there was either no reported injuries or there may have been just someone with some neck or back pain and where in my jurisdiction our unit which was available wouldn't go but, one, because of AVL would show it just slightly closer would go. And we felt like that that obviously isn't necessarily the best utilization of our own resources. In Draper and again, I'll speak for us in particular, we have other challenges just based on locations of our stations. Having one up at the top of Suncrest in particular takes it a little bit out of the reach to where if we had a fire within our own jurisdiction because of how the

system was set up, we couldn't ever get that resource, our own resource, dispatched into our fire just because of distance and how the system was set up.

So we've been working and waiting on some things from Versaterm obviously to help try and remedy some of those. We had waited for some time for what is referred to as the if/then component, which is now something that is available to us, but we have not truly implemented the if/then which allows a little bit more of that customization on priority 2 calls within each of our own jurisdictions. It really allows us to utilize our own resources within our own jurisdiction prior to having to rely on outside resources and being a strain or a draw on those other resources in other jurisdictions.

We had had some, and I'll speak just for myself, some I guess confusion of over how that would work. We were trying to and had requested that we work with or try and get basically a programmer or engineer from Versaterm to attend a meeting with us to be able to help explain and really help us understand the capabilities of the system. We haven't been successful in doing that, but the members there at VECC who understand it and deal with this every single day in our last ops meeting I think was able to give us a much better understanding of how the full implementation of this if/then statement would do, because again, a lot of the settings within Versaterm are global settings. So it's very difficult to prioritize just in one jurisdiction how you want to do things without having these negative ripple effects of neighboring jurisdictions, which we certainly don't want to do.

After that, at the conclusion of that meeting and the updates and discussion from members of the VECC staff there who understand again, things much better than us I believe that all of the fire chiefs are in agreement that we really want to get to the trustees' approval to basically flip the switch and allow us to really turn on the if/then component as it relates to priority 2 calls. It's going to be then and only then that we really get a true understanding of if the system is performing the way that we hope that it will, we believe that it will and that will help alleviate some of those concerns from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and how we again best utilize our own resources within our own jurisdictional boundaries.

So again, I think we're in a good place as the chiefs. We all want to move forward with that and really want the trustees' support and understand that we are all on the same page in how this applies to us. And again, this will not affect priority 1s. We are all 100% in agreement that priority 1s needs to be closest unit all the time and we don't want to make any modifications to that. So I hope that kind of explains our good discussion. Again, I think it was a very good discussion with everybody in the room. And I'll answer any questions if you have them, but we would like the trustees' support to really kind of take that next step, implement this piece and see the capabilities of the system with this new programming component in place. And if I said anything wrong now, Elyse and Clint can correct me.

Matt Evans:

Thank you Clint. Okay. Any questions for us?

Mark Reid:

I have a comment. So years ago we had a traffic accident at Bangarter and Redwood. Our fire station was the closest, but it was on the, I think it was UFA at the time side, and it required three ambulances. And so an ambulance out of Riverton, an ambulance out of Herriman came, but the third victim sat there until the ambulance out of Kearns made its way all the way to that site. Is there something that would just say we can't have somebody sit there for 15 or 20 minutes when another ambulance is two minutes away even though it's not a priority 1?

Korban Lee:

Chiefs, any comments? How do you respond to something like that?

Clint Smith:

If I could, Mr. Chair. This is actually something that we did talk about in that meeting, recognizing that for the smaller municipalities, myself included, Bluffdale included, some of these things are much probably easier to

manage those resources, but UFA obviously is not in that same boat where they have such a large area and pretty much border all of us. And so there are a few of those nuances that again, once we turn the system on, and Elyse please correct me if I'm wrong here, but Lin has been very good to work through and work with UFA to help identify how they would like to again prioritize those, because again, we all agree that just because it's a UFA call and they agree too that they shouldn't be pulling an ambulance from Kearns or, say, from Magna into Riverton just because it's their resources first.

And again, some of these little nuances we will have to evaluate as they kind of present themselves once we turn the system on. But to Trustee Reid's comments there, that is not anything that any of us want to see that we are just simply waiting an exorbitant amount of time for a resource to come in just because it's within our jurisdiction or within a UFA jurisdiction. We still want those that are the most appropriate that surround that incident to be the ones that are called in. So I guess I can't say today that that might not present itself right off the get-go once we make this change in the system, but it's something that we want to be able to identify and put a fix in place for so that those types of situations do not occur.

Tim Tingey:

So I remember when we talked about this and it was going to be looked at and then brought back to the board. I thought it would be something more formal that would be presented to us, we would talk about the differing issues that could occur and then we can deliberate and make a decision rather than just having it on a ops report and then direction. I would like it a little bit more formal to understand all these potential scenarios before we finalize a decision.

Korban Lee:

That was my recollection as well that it was going to be studied by... I think David Dobbins was working with the ops board. David, am I getting that right?

David Dobbins:

Yeah. I think what we were wanting to do is make sure we're headed in the right direction and that we're ready to go to that next step or if there are concerns that haven't been voiced by any of the other members so far.

Korban Lee:

Can I ask? Chief Smith, Chief Evans, my understanding is this... Flipping the switch so that you use the if/thens on priority 2 and AVL on priority 1, that cannot be run in a test environment first? It has to be essentially tested out or beta tested in VECC as a whole? Am I understanding that correctly?

Matt Evans:

From what I understand, that's what it has to do. And we would know, we figure, in 30 days that we would have some good data from with just 30 days.

Clint Smith:

I would refer to Elyse there just to validate that that's the correct understanding.

Elyse Haggerty:

Yes. To do it in a development site, we would have to take apparatus out of their stations to go around the city to make sure it's pulling the correct recommends. And that's if it was something small that just one agency was doing, but as it's countywide.

Korban Lee:

It has to really be tested out?

Elyse Haggerty:

To get good statistics and accuracies.

Korban Lee:

In the whole. So we can't create a... I can't remember what IT guys call it.

Elyse Haggerty:

Development side.

Korban Lee:

Jonathan, what do they call it?

Jonathan Bridges:

Like a beta?

Korban Lee:

A beta in a sandbox or whatever where they test it out over there before we... We can't do that with this?

Elyse Haggerty:

No. Unfortunately, no.

Korban Lee:

Okay.

Mark Reid:

I do think that having the priority 1s done by the closest is a huge improvement over what we had years ago. So I really want to trust the fire personnel to make the right decisions, but I just want to make sure that we don't have something that looks ridiculous show up in the news. So I'd like to talk about different scenarios.

Korban Lee:

Any other comments from other trustees?

Clint Jensen:

That's a big impact on UFA, I would think.

Dominic Burchett:

Yep. Mr. Chair. I'll comment on that real quick. Our team has been heavily involved in this and it is a little bit different for us. As Chief Smith mentioned, we border almost everybody. And so the if/then in this situation is something we have to work through and we have a meeting scheduled with Lin tomorrow to start working through some of that. So my understanding is that there is capacity there to allow that to happen so that we're not pulling a unit from Riverton to Magna for example. So after that meeting tomorrow, I'll have more information on how that will actually fall into place.

Korban Lee:

Any other trustees want to comment?

Doug Hill:

So this may be a question for Clint. So one of the issues that we are dealing with in Murray is that, and I might get some of these numbers wrong, but about 15% of our calls are going outside of our city where a much smaller number is coming into our city. Is this attempt to reprioritize going to do anything with that problem?

Clint Jensen:

No.

Clint Smith:

We believe that it will help, again, and Elyse can correct me if I'm wrong because again, we've heard those concerns from your city as well. Again, this should allow us to better utilize our resources within our own city first and allow other entities to do the same with our own resources. But again, knowing exactly how much it will affect that, it's very hard to predict until we actually put it into play to see again what that data really shows. But again, there is a belief that that will help in that regard.

Korban Lee:

From the two Clints, I started hearing two different opinions on this.

Clint Jensen:

So I would just say, Mr. Hill, that we don't know and it would only be an impact on your priority 2 calls, and I'm not sure the volume of that. So it's going to be a wait and see how that's going to impact you.

Elyse Haggerty:

It does have an impact on dispatch in the sense that right now they have to remember that on priority 1s, the command is different to make sure it pulls AVL and on priority 2s, they have to type something separate. So if they type the incorrect command, it's going to pull AVL even if it's priority 2, where the change would fix that and they would use the same command every time.

Clint Smith:

Mr. Chair, I was just going to say I apologize for not iterating that point. This does provide consistency for our dispatchers in how they pull these recommends and streamlines it so, again, they don't have to remember two different commands. And that is, again, something that we know we're putting a strain on our dispatchers right now the way we are currently doing it. And this would help standardize it and simplify it for our dispatchers.

Korban Lee:

Thank you, Chief. I guess short of anyone else's comments, I will say we've been discussing this issue for 18 months, 24 months. I am very grateful that the chiefs are over that time finding something that is at least closer to consensus, if not full consensus. I am very much in favor of something that simplifies the issues for our dispatchers. It makes me nervous to do anything short of true AVL in terms of liability for VECC and justification to the media why would we... I get that this is just on priority 2 calls, but the easiest defense in public safety is the closest unit, the fastest response. I don't have to explain anything more than that. However, if this is something that all the chiefs want to go to, I won't stand in the way of it but to say that at the moment our most important issue as board of trustees right now is finding the next executive director of VECC.

Timing wise, I would much prefer to let that director get hired and weigh in on this issue because I think there might be some unintended consequences or issues with VECC and I'd like to have that next executive director be part of this decision making. I like the idea of testing it out for 30 days or 90 days, but before there's any... maybe even before we flip the switch and test it out, I prefer to have this new executive director on board. So

my druthers would be wait on this decision. I did agree with Tim. I thought it was going to be a little bit more of a formal presentation coming back to us as trustees on this issue. But that would be my druthers is let's look at this but let's look at this when we have our executive director here to be part of that decision making.

David Dobbins:

We will follow that direction. We'll get the new director in place. But between now and then, I'd like to hear from anyone who has concerns that maybe you haven't voiced that clearly yet or maybe you're uncomfortable doing it in front of everyone. If you could reach out to me, I'd like to sit down with you and your chief along with my chief and talk about this to make sure that we've gone through all these details that you guys may have concerns about so that when the new director's in place we're ready to go.

Korban Lee:

Yeah. I think that's a good request. Sorry. I shared that as my single opinion. David, I don't mean to speak for the trustees. Sorry.

Tim Tingey:

I agree with that approach. And I think, David, it's great if that can be discussed. I would, and it can even be in the next meeting, I would love to have a more formal discussion talking about the issues and concerns, or if they've been resolved through these conversations with David and the chiefs, that's fine. But I think it would be good in the next meeting or two to have a formal discussion and just understand all of the elements as we move forward. And then, yes, I agree with you waiting for the new director to weigh in as well, but this will give us some time to work out some of those issues if there are any prior to even that director starting.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I would agree with that. The one thing I'd like to see in that presentation, just to understand the magnitude of what we're talking about, how often are we dispatching units on priority 2 out of the area, out of their primary areas. Is it going to make a big difference for Doug or is it really small?

Korban Lee:

The percent of calls, the quantity of calls.

Elyse Haggerty:

Can I also just say that there is a possibility that the impression is right now we are doing AVL on every single call and that is not the case. Currently, we are doing priority 1s as AVL and priority 2s are sort of dependent on the agency where if we did this for 30 days, we would have good statistical information to bring back and perhaps an understanding of AVL where if we continue to wait it isn't removing the liability because we are currently sending our-

Korban Lee:

We're carrying some of that liability at the moment.

Elyse Haggerty:

Already.

Korban Lee:

I would like a little... David, I think your request to say, "Hey. If there are concerns, what are all of them? Let's get them all on the table." I think understanding quantity, scope, the percent of calls, what are we talking about. Liability to me, what does this mean for liability? One of the concerns I've heard expressed and I share it, although I don't know if this is frequent, is what happens when priority 2 calls become priority 1 calls as part

of the process or as part of the timing? If we're asking to discuss this or address these concerns as it comes back and before we turn the switch on and try it for 30 days or 60 days or whatever, what other concerns do we want to be aware of so we're going into this eyes wide open?

Nathan Cherpeski:

Well, I had like to understand what might be unintended consequences of turning it on. We're pretty sure this is going to work? We're not going to have a problem? So again, I think we probably should do it because it sounds like we don't have consistent data or good data, but I guess I was under the impression we were going to hear, probably like you all, "Here's what we think we're going to do and here's how we're going to do it." I wouldn't be opposed to doing the 30 day test before the executive got here and just say, "Here's some data." They can decide, but I'd defer to the rest of the board.

David Dobbins:

Chair, if I could jump in again. It'll take us a little bit before the new directors in place. I'd like to come back to our next meeting with some of this information, as well as any concerns that some of you might have to reach out to me directly before we do the 30 day trial so we could discuss this and try to get a greater comfort level at the next meeting and then go from there.

Korban Lee:

Yeah. That's fine. I think that's good. So Chief Evans, Chief Smith, you've heard some of our questions, some of our concerns. Don't turn it on immediately, but please try to address some of those questions and concerns at our next meeting. Hopefully, in our next meeting we are, if not appointing a new executive director, very, very close to it, we can see a timeline. I don't want to kick this down the road six months, but I'm nervous about making a decision today and I feel like we're lacking a little bit of information.

Mark Reid:

One thing that Chief Evans and I do, we look at these individual situations where we go out of area and out of area comes in and we determine why they were a higher priority than us. And we have one station that's 14 seconds slower than an outward area. So it makes sense that if it was a type 2 call that we would go instead of the other one. So I think if the chiefs have enough data to help analyze that with David Dobbins, that most of those questions could be answered and be able to be addressed.

Korban Lee:

Is anyone opposed to having a report on this, a little bit more formal report on this at our next meeting?

David Dobbins:

Okay. I'll plan on doing that with my team.

Korban Lee:

Chief Smith, Chief Evans, it puts a little onus on you to address some of these concerns, be a little more prepared for or anticipate as much of the ambiguities as possible and try to address them, bring it back to the trustees and let's consider the test run after the next meeting.

Clint Smith:

Yeah. Will do. Mr. Chair, I just want to say, you asked another, I think, very pertinent question just a minute ago and that was what happens to a priority 2 call that becomes a priority 1. And that's another issue that we have been talking about. And if I could maybe, Elyse, I'll just have you talk about the two questions that have been proposed to be asked and when and how we at least hope that that will help identify that very early on so we don't find ourselves in that situation, hopefully frequently, to where, again, it is a priority two that changes to a priority one after we've already dispatched those units.

Elyse Haggerty:

So one of the benefits to APCO is we can ask questions in whatever order we would like.

Korban Lee:

We can adjust our protocol questions.

Elyse Haggerty:

Yeah, we don't have to be... It's not a strict if you don't follow this, we won't certify you, which gives you liability issues. So the chiefs have all discussed and deputy chiefs that they would like to see us asking the conscious and breathing question earlier in. Right now it's, "What's your address? What's your name? What's your phone number? Tell me what happened. Oh, you don't feel well? Okay, well are you with the patient now? How old are they? Are they male or female," versus, "Are they conscious and breathing or are they conscious and are they breathing normally?" A "no" for either of those would auto make it a priority one.

Korban Lee:

Did anyone have any concerns? Trustees, any concerns, comments, questions on that? Chief Evans, what are your thoughts on this topic?

John Evans:

I don't think you're going to know until you try it. I mean I think that's really where you're at. I don't think you can a hundred percent answer every what if. I mean you can't do it today. They're doing the same thing today almost as you're going to do with trying it. So I mean get more information, that's fine, but I don't think you can answer some of the questions until you actually try it. And then from what I understand, correct me if I'm wrong, if this doesn't work, you go back.

Korban Lee:

Thank you, Chief. Dustin, Josh, Scott Harrington, I just want to make sure you guys have a chance to weigh in on this.

Josh Collins:

I don't have anything to add to the conversation. I follow and I agree with what's been said so far, especially your point, Korban, that our highest priority is just making sure that we have the closest and fastest unit respond. Safety is the biggest priority, but I agree that we should have something more formal at the next meeting. Thank you.

Dustin Lewis:

I have similar feelings as Josh. I've had a couple conversations with Chief Dawson about this. I am pretty comfortable with the direction things are moving and I would support a more formal discussion at the next meeting as well.

Scott Harrington:

I'm of the same sediment. I think a more formal presentation's warranted. And once we have a little better data, we'll be able to make the best decision.

Korban Lee:

Okay. Any last comments before we move on? All right, Chief Evans, what else do you got?

Matt Evans:

That's all I have. That was our biggest discussion. So one of the concerns that I think we have is waiting to put this director in and then have to wait another six months, roll this down until they get up to par. I mean we know how to do that but-

Korban Lee:

Okay, the more homework you can do between now and the next trustees meeting, I think the more comfortable you'll get from the trustees running the test earlier in the tenure of our new executive director. Okay, let's go on to the operations report, agenda item number five. Elyse, let's turn the time over to you.

## **OPERATIONS REPORT**

Elyse Haggerty:

So we hit our 15 second, 90% of the time. We still did not hit the 95%. In December we did hit the 95% but we did not this past January, which led me to try something new and we are reevaluating the way we're answering calls. The big problem at VECC with Intrado back in the day was it wasn't dropping calls correctly. Today I did watch when two 9-1-1s were holding and there were available staff. So we are going to contact Motorola and see if we can have the times written down on a piece of paper in my office because I watched it. And we're all, myself included, taking a more active role in watching if people are on break far too often or if they are taking 10 additional minutes after they finish a call to follow up and type everything in. So additional training. The stats probably will look not as awesome as I would like them to next month, but we're trying something different because right now it's just we're not hitting that number.

Korban Lee:

I was so proud we hit it last month.

Elyse Haggerty:

I know, me too. And for me it's very difficult. I never saw these kinds of numbers but I understand why it's happening. We take so many calls and it really is in Salt Lake, a car accident you only had the people passing by. On freeways, which VECC has far more freeway addresses, those accidents just slam our Center so you get 10, 15, 20 calls. Well we only have 10 call takers at best. Calls are going to hold, whether you're on admin. So we're also really working with people to put the admin calls on hold and pick up the 9-1-1. I definitely feel like we need to try something new. So we're going to try something new and I can give you updates again next month.

Korban Lee:

Been hovering right there. The numbers are far, far, far better than where we were a couple years ago.

Elyse Haggerty:

Yes. Oh, absolutely. And making the 90% within 15 seconds, we have not dropped below that although I felt dangerously close to it this month. It is something that we talk about. The watch commanders, the supervisors and are monitoring every day. We're pulling stats, we're giving the floor the statistical information. We have a lot of people who are very concerned about the admin calls because even I myself have taken calls on admin that should be 9-1-1s. So those holding for eight minutes, it's a big struggle for a call taker who just wants to help and they get this call that finally processes through and you're like, you should have definitely called 9 1 1 on that. You've been waiting eight minutes and that's pretty unacceptable. So we've also implemented quality assurance again, which has been the goal since I took over as a deputy.

We are getting really positive responses from that and we're correcting things that we all assumed was going on like don't stay in follow up for 10 minutes typing out the things you should have typed when you were on the phone call with the person, wrap it up while you're on the phone, hang up and then get ready for the next. So through quality assurance this month, I've had several people approach me and even when it's not fantastic feedback because they aren't doing it the right way, they appreciate that they're getting feedback. But that all came with the changes of moving training supervisors, changing the way we were doing the squads. We have watch commanders working 10 hour shifts so now they're overlapping each other so that we can get more consistent. A lot of changes in a very short amount of time but we are aware and it's concerning to us as well.

Korban Lee:

Any questions for Elyse about the performance measures?

Troy Carr:

On 9-1-1 calls that are either hangups or open lines that aren't essentially 9-1-1 calls, how many of those do we get a day on average?

Elyse Haggerty:

A lot.

Troy Carr:

We averaged about between 15 and 20 in South Jordan for a while. So I'm curious to know and obviously those are included in your statistics. They're not really 9-1-1 calls. They're butt dials or whatever they are, right?

Elyse Haggerty:

Yeah. That might be something that I could run reports on for next month's meeting if you are interested in because that is a huge drain on the system.

Troy Carr:

Well how does NENA look at those?

Elyse Haggerty:

That's why you get 5% of your calls can be longer than 20 seconds. It's supposed to include that kind of.

Korban Lee:

Good question. Other questions for Elyse? Call volume a little bit less in January than in December, looks like slightly less than average.

Elyse Haggerty:

The PSAP transfer rate, Clint will give you the good news about CAD-to-CAD that is still not the news I would like. But once we can turn it on and the most recent discussion was it doesn't matter if they're getting the unit information or they just need the call so we can stop transferring calls because that is required before June 30th and we're still not there. I'm sorry, that's for the transfer rates so transfer rates have gone down even again. Once we get rid of that, the total count 62,000 for last month. Not only do admin calls outnumber the 9-1-1s, they take significantly longer because to the caller, it's a conversation that they're having with what they believe is the police department. To be rushing them is they are frustrated by that. Well I just want to know, I want to understand who I need to go to pay for the GRAMA requests and what information I need to bring and the dispatcher's like I get it but that's not our department so let me transfer you. So then they're looking at phone numbers. Where on a 9-1-1, they're pretty cut and dry. What's the emergency? You write it down

unless you have to stay on the line to give CPR instructions. Most calls should be less than two minutes but our admin calls are upwards of five to seven.

Korban Lee:

Any questions? Elyse, thank you for your work in this area. Thank you for being so attentive to these performance measures and giving them to us every month. I find them very helpful to look at and monitor our progress over time. Thank you. Thank you for trying different things and tweaking on the edges to try and keep those numbers high and get them right over the edge, over the top. Very good. We will be talking in future meetings about the admin calls as well and make sure us as agencies are doing our part to help reduce the admin calls going to VECC so that the VECC staff can focus on the 9-1-1.

Elyse Haggerty:

We have implemented the documenting all admin calls.

Korban Lee:

And we're anxious for a report on that, having all the CAD files on the admin calls. I assume that's a few months out as we gather data?

Elyse Haggerty:

We would see a difference even this first month. So next month I should be able to give you something.

Korban Lee:

Anxious to see statistics and percentages on those admin calls in the future. I'm a little worried. West Jordan's a big culprit of the admin calls.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Will your data have time of day as well?

Elyse Haggerty:

It can.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I'm just curious if these are coming in during our normal office hours then that's something we really should be trying to... If it's coming in at midnight, that's a different kind of thing.

Elyse Haggerty:

Yes, day shift is significantly busier.

Korban Lee:

Any other questions for Elyse? Okay, let's keep going. Clint?

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT**

Clint Jensen:

I'll report on a couple of items. So Elyse and I continue to work on the relationship with SLC911 and we have a standing meeting with the executive director. And last time she brought out Mr. Bently and we had a very honest and open discussion about some things, some of the challenges between us and them particularly

relating to the CAD. We think we're making some headway but stay tuned. I think this is going to be a work in process as the wheels of SLC911 are not the most responsive and they're a slow churn. But I think that we at least have a dialogue with them, we at least have an open discussion. I know that Elyse and Lisa Kehoe, the director, are hoping to get together even just kind of outside of a meeting, maybe go have lunch or something together where they can maybe get a little deeper into the discussion about some of the challenges we're facing.

The next item on the list is CAD-to-CAD and the good news is January 31st came and went and bad news is we still do not have a CAD-to-CAD solution. That was our initial deadline. I know UHP's putting a ton of heat on their consultant. I think we've gone through I don't know how many different project managers on different sides of this project. Jonathan had a meeting yesterday, I believe, with the project manager on our side. And now he's newer to the project and so getting him caught up and he's taking on the project for someone who didn't complete it or whatever, it's a little bit of a challenge. So the goal is to still have this thing up and running soon, but I know we promised January 31st last month and here we are.

Korban Lee:

Before we go on, anyone, I want to pause here about the SLV911 CAD issues or CAD-to-CAD issues with UHP. Any questions? Jonathan, Clint, I'm a little concerned we're going to be held accountable for compliance with SB130 come June and yet it feels like this issue is out of our hands and with UHP.

Jonathan Bridges:

So that was actually the crux of my conversation with the new engineer on our side on the first term side and that is actually why I had that meeting with him was being newer, he was not aware of the deadlines coming up. He wasn't aware of the political financial impact if we don't meet that deadline. So he assured me yesterday later after conversations internally with Versaterm that this is his number one priority and he is confident that based on not having to bring in other functionality but the basic call transfer process, he believes he can get this wrapped up on our side very quickly. And Captain Trotta also is aware on the UHP side. As Clint said, he's putting a lot of pressure on the Motorola team to finish. They have one piece functionality that's not there that some of these other processes are reliant on and we conveyed to them we don't care about that. Those are future pieces. We care about the base call. Once he understood that, he then came back later in the day and told me, he said, we are going to do everything we can to get this going as soon as possible. So we have expressed that concern to them now repeatedly.

Korban Lee:

Is Captain Trotta and Colonel Rapich and others at UHP, are they feeling this sense of urgency? Are they applying this sense of urgency to their vendors?

Jonathan Bridges:

He actually had a separate meeting with them what, three or four weeks ago and we went through this same conversation with them because they want other functionality in the system that we don't care about. And we did come to an agreement that those other pieces, that other functionality would come later after we go live so that we can be our deadlines. They are aware of that. They were in agreement with that. So from that meeting, I felt like they understood the comparative nature of this. Elyse?

Elyse Haggerty:

They just are not being held accountable like we will be. To them, they're a secondary PSAP. They don't have to follow those expectations. So while we're...

Jonathan Bridges:

I don't think they necessarily understood that until that meeting.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Who were we reporting to on that? I know Scott used to go out to make presentations.

Korban Lee:

Yeah, I mean who does monitor it, UCA, right? We used to report to the legislative and the legislative auditors on this issue too and they're still frankly observing, watching this. My fear is they use it as a reason to pull back some of our 9-1-1 funding, our state controlled funding.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I'm just wondering if we need... Because right now it seems like we've talked about this for two years.

Korban Lee:

Three.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Three years. It is always going to come, our side's always done, we're waiting. If the state patrol or state UHPD is just not ready then maybe we need to tell the others we are ready and we're waiting for them. We can't do anything. Maybe somebody else needs to put this through.

Korban Lee:

I think come next month if this still isn't resolved or immediately within reach, I think we might need to do that because we have not been telling our story because frankly, we were content to kind of wait and let UHP come along when the deadline was a year and a half away. But the deadline's here, I mean it's coming up awfully fast.

Clint Jensen:

Let's do that.

Korban Lee:

Will you visit with our lobbyists, Spatafores. Can you visit with Dave and Ashley too on this issue, Clint?

Clint Jensen:

Yes.

Korban Lee:

Any other questions on those topics? All right Clint, keep going.

Clint Jensen:

All right, the next couple of items, just a quick report. We've talked about this, reporting of those administrative numbers, that's in process. The port request is in, we're just waiting for CenturyLink to work it out and make it happen. The radio project continues to move forward. We've had a lot of back and forth with UCA on this as we are making sure that we have everything we need and they have everything they need as we look at later this year for that full implementation. I think in May is, I think, we turn it on and start test-driving it side by side with Motorola. And then next November here we go.

The towing contracts, we keep having a software vendor that could track these tows. They, I believe, are now going to be at the next police users meeting on March 7th. There's a lot of information that they're providing and we felt like this was better to run this through that operations board rather than coming directly to this board with that, let the chiefs take a crack at it. There is some financial impact of that. This, despite what was

we were led to believe a couple of years ago when this whole conversation started, the towing solutions have changed their business model. So there is now an impact to the Center if we were to go down this path. So if somebody's going to pay for either additional staff that we would need to chase down tens of thousands of tows every year and collecting our revenue off of that. So there's several moving parts of this. I just think that it sounds better coming from the police ops board if this is something they really want to pursue and find it helpful. I think the last call we had, we had a West Jordan deputy chief on and that was kind of the consensus we came to is that this needs to go up to the ops board.

Korban Lee:

Chief Carr, will you make sure you guys are following up on that?

Clint Jensen:

The UPD organization continues on. We've had several meetings with the sheriff's office as they are looking at their various options. Sheriff Rivera, I'm happy to hear from you if there's anything new other than my short paragraph there.

Rosie Rivera:

Really there isn't anything new. We're still waiting on the townships to decide what they're going to do and we've asked them to give us a decision by March. But we've asked for an entire year for that decision, so I'm not quite sure when they're going to make their decision.

Clint Jensen:

All of that has some sort of impact on who's going where, the townships, whether cities are staying with UPD or whatever.

Rosie Rivera:

It just depends on the FTEs for which agency.

Clint Jensen:

Yes. Anyway, we've done our best in the budgeting to anticipate what we know today and that is sheriffs basically by themselves, everybody else with UPD. And if that model changes, we can adjust.

Korban Lee:

Sheriff, remind me, this all happened last year, I think, in the legislature. What are the deadlines. What are the effective dates right now?

Rosie Rivera:

It's January of 2025, but the UPD board chose July of 2024. And they're coming right up on their deadline of July of 2024. But yeah, they haven't talked about any extension.

Clint Jensen:

Moving along the TeleStaff UKG project, we've had two complete payrolls now with them. On the scheduling side, that seems to be working very well. The interface to payroll is still a work in process. We are working through some of the bugs on that. But at the end of the day, this is going to be a good implementation for us.

Legislative update, I include in the packet what we get from Spatafore's and so you can take a look at that. I think the biggest impact for the Center will be the procurement rules of the state. If that law changes, calls us a government entity as far as procurement's concerned, then we fall into the state procurement rules versus our own procurement rules. And if you want to opt out, then it takes an effort through the state auditor's office to have them review your procurement. And I would just say if we get adopted into this, it's probably not a

terrible day, but we would just go under whatever the state procurement rules are. And we're in a good spot if that's what we're doing.

Korban Lee:

Our procurement rules are pretty similar. I thought they were fairly similar to the states anyways. If we fall under the state, is it a big impact?

Clint Jensen:

I think our procurement, they're so dated that they are, they're insufficient compared to the state and this would be an impact. But again, the level of purchasing that we do is not huge and we would still do getting bids when appropriate. We just set those dollar limits and within a certain dollar amount you can get competitive bids or you have to go to RFP or whatever. We'd still have those type of things outlined. And then you just fall under, well if you're going to get architect and engineering, you go here and if you do this something else. But we just don't have that, a lot of this is through the state contract. We just don't have the same thing.

Tim Tingey:

If this is a pass, we probably wouldn't try to opt out would we?

Clint Jensen:

I don't think so because I think any state auditor is going to say it needs to be equivalent to or stronger than the state rules. And I don't know if we'd want to write 30, 40 pages of procurement rules to try to make that happen. And we were going to do that as part of an administrative policy manual update to include procurement. But if this happens, we can just point to that. And most of the special districts are already under this. That's pretty common that they just point to the procurement rules of the state, especially a lot of smaller ones. Bigger ones, they can do their own thing.

And then the CAD update. So I received a letter from the U of U police chief saying that they're no longer interested in going to Versaterm, being part of that CAD system. So they are staying with Spillman, just being a better business decision for them right now. And so no skin off our budget, it's just a pass through as we are the contract holder with Versaterm so it's part of the consortium. Everything flows through us. So that's just revenue we don't get and expense we don't have. So no fiscal impact to us.

Korban Lee:

Chief Carr, do we care operationally?

Troy Carr:

You want to talk long history? We tried to get everybody on one system 25 years ago. To me, that's always the right thing to do. The sheriff can chime in, but I always think it's good to share information. I think it would be good for them and good for everybody else to all be on one system. But I understand the cost involved is probably what's driving the decision.

Rosie Rivera:

Cost versus lives. There you go.

Clint Jensen:

I wouldn't doubt that they come back. I think they've got a presidential debate. They've got a lot of things going on that they kind of threw out. They threw the whole laundry basket at us of all the things that's going on up there. And so I think maybe a year from now they come back around and we start a conversation. But we'll see.

Rosie Rivera:

Well, and hopefully they're talking to the police chiefs and the sheriff because there is an impact if there's a critical incident, massive. We've had them before where a hundred of our officers are headed up there and you might want to be on the same system as everybody else.

Clint Jensen:

Any questions on any of those items I reported on?

Korban Lee:

Listen, can we pause and just catch the folks that are online? Chief Burchett, Dustin, Josh, Scott, David, any questions from any of you?

Dom Burchett:

Nope, I'm all good. Thanks.

Scott Harrington:

None for me.

Korban Lee:

Okay, keep going. Keep going, Clint.

## **FINANCE REPORT**

Clint Jensen:

Okay, so continuing along, I'll jump right into the financial report. Really nothing out of the ordinary to report as far as our ongoing revenue and expenditures. I think we've talked about some of these outliers with interest income coming in a lot stronger than we anticipated.

Mark Reid:

I have one question. So over the last couple of years, the inflation has really hit us hard and we're paying a lot more for our personnel than we ever have before. And I assume like us most of your expenses are to personnel. Does the franchise tax E 9-1-1 have an inflation factor to it or is it the same as it was or how do we look to see if we can get that raised because we've had such an increase in our expenses?

Clint Jensen:

So it functions like a sales tax, right? There's a rate set, 71 cents, I think, per line. So the growth that we get is based on the growth in our communities. So as we have more people with telephone lines living in our area so we have seen a general trend of that increasing over the past few years. We are not playing with the rate, we still just have the rates fixed, but the growth is being picked up in our budgets.

Korban Lee:

But the rate is fixed as a 71 cents. It's not fixed as a percent of phone bills.

Clint Jensen:

Correct.

Elyse Haggerty:

I believe that that's actually up from at least when I started, and it seems like it's going to continue to go up. So it's something that they do review.

Mark Reid:

Just based on growth though, right?

Elyse Haggerty:

No, like the cost.

Clint Jensen:

They have changed that 71 cents. It hasn't always been 71, but I think that's come from the legislature.

Elyse Haggerty:

Yes.

Mark Reid:

Yeah. But over the last three years, inflation's been about 20% overall. And so maybe that's something our new director and the Spatafores could look at. Just a thought.

Clint Jensen:

Other questions on revenue? Expenditure, we're right in line where we expect to be on payroll at 58%. And we are a little bit ahead on the admin and ops, but the big ticket item there is going to be our software expense as we in January make our Versaterm payment. So that's reflected in there. So overall, it's what we'd expect it to be this time of year. Questions on revenue or expenses? Cash situation, we're in really good shape for this time of year as we've collected most of our assessments from all of you. And then we have the check report and I'd be happy to answer any questions on that.

Korban Lee:

Any questions for Clint? Clint you do a good job walking us through this every month. Thank you. Not seeing any questions. Let's keep going.

Clint Jensen:

Let's go to the budget. So included in the packet, or at least a separate document, the activities of the finance committee. So we met a couple of weeks ago, reviewed the draft budget. This memo summarizes the big ticket items that are impactful to the budget. For example, we anticipate an increase in our 911 sales tax revenue of 350. We anticipate more interest income. Hopefully we can keep that interest above 5%. And then here are the big ticket items. Personnel - Wages of 3% COLA, plus some merit for the non-operations staff. Some personnel, a sick leave buyback program. Now this is something that we hope to put in there as a placeholder. I don't have detail of that. I think it's something we need to come back and present to the board later. We've tried using beating people up with the stick and say, you've used too much sick leave, maybe the carrot would be better. And sick leave, you've heard us talk about it before. It impacts a lot of what we do. It impacts the overtime budget. It impacts the call answer times. It impacts every day goings-on here at the Center. So I'm asking for an amount of 75,000 that we could set aside to come up with some sort of an incentive for the buyback of sick leave. We would not spend that until we came back to the board with some sort of a program that you would all approve.

Rosie Rivera:

So can I ask a couple of questions on that then? Is the intent to have the employees not use their sick leave, but what if they're sick? So are you going to get employees that are sick coming to work, getting everybody else sick? I've seen where that happens sometimes. You push them to come to work and then now you have five more people sick. Or is there an issue of specific people? Like you said, the stick thing didn't work, but have you thought of that because that could happen where they're sick and they want this incentive, so now you're really in trouble.

Clint Jensen:

I don't know the answer to that and I think that that's all part of our review to make sure that if this works, and maybe it's a balancing act of not so lucrative that you're going to come in when you're sick, but lucrative enough that if you just wake up one morning and you just feel down in the dumps and I don't want to go to work, you'll still get up and go to work because there is some incentive. So finding that balance, that's going to be an interesting exercise for us. And if we can't find that balance, then the 75,000 wouldn't be spent. But I think that we need to come back to you all and say, this is the way we've seen this. I've worked for entities that have provided this. It seems to be a good incentive for those who.. we usually do it around Christmas time so that it gets people's attention, that they can have a little bit of money for Christmas or whatever. But we will do a lot more investigation on this before we spend that money.

The next part of that is just a general increase in our medical insurance. And as we increase wages, the 401A and the URS increases. The payroll processing as part of our professional fees. The lobbying expenses have gone up a little bit, and some network security consulting fees. That's just some inflationary increases for some of those. Software costs increase, Versaterm's a standing 5%. We've put a lot of technology into the Center and Scott was very good at getting prepaid maintenance contracts on those, but those are all due up. They've been three years. And so now we're seeing an increase in those maintenance contracts. And then just everything else, we've got some facilities and utilities and other things. Our language line continues to go up. I think when I first started here, it was about 8,000 a month, now it's over 12. And so we just see just general increases in that and that's a great benefit for our folks here and also some of your folks in the field that use that.

So the overall impact to assessments, \$331,000 or so. And this is what it looks like, the big picture of revenues. You see the budget for 2024 compared to 2025 with the percent change of about a 3% increase overall to the assessments. And then some increases, we're anticipating way more in interest revenue and same with the franchise taxes. If you look at the assessments to each individual entity, you're seeing quite a range. Those negative ones, I wouldn't count the Unified Police necessarily negative just because part of that's going to the Sheriff now. But you see a range there. For example, Taylorsville is a little bit of a decrease whereas Draper going up about 18%. Their call volume increased by 10,000 calls last year. So this is part of that revenue model, picking up those additional calls. On the fire department side, Bluffdale and South Jordan are the two bigger numbers in there. Bluffdale, you have another 20 or 30 calls. It has a big impact. So you see the overall picture of how that's going to impact the individual entities. On the expense side, we've tried to keep everything in check. Again, you see some of these that jump up a little bit, but that's just they're small dollars. You'll see a reduction in software. That software is going down and that will even change some more because we're probably going to take the U of U out of the picture and not have that budget line in there. So that'll impact our pass through revenue and it'll impact our software expenses. After all is said and done. It's a break even budget with debt service and lease expenses. So that's the hope.

You can see what I'm projecting to be the fund balance as of June 30th. We ended last year at about 1.4 million. I think the projections will even come in stronger than that. You see this 412,000 is what I'm projecting will be the surplus for 2024. And then we'll have another discussion admitted on what we might be able to do with that surplus in the current fiscal year. One of the things that we had included in this budget for fiscal '25 was some capital needs, particularly the roof of this facility. And every time it rains, we get out the garbage cans and put them everywhere to catch the leaking. And so we've had some assessments on the roof, but we can have that discussion in a minute when we talked about a budget amendment. So at the end of the day also, here's the assessment model with call volumes in there, uniformed or sworn officers. You can see the red

ones there. We're still waiting for final numbers for the Sheriff and for Unified Police, but they've given me those numbers for now. I suspect if the townships go, then we'll bump up the Sheriff and reduce UPD in a like manner and that probably won't have a huge effect on the overall assessment model.

I'd be happy to answer any questions. I know you guys like to get this early, you can start putting things in your budgets to anticipate what it'll look like. The finance committee and I... Tim, you can speak for the finance committee, but felt like around a 3% overall increase to the assessments was pretty good considering where we've been in the past few years. Any questions? I'd be happy to answer them.

Doug Hill:

How much did the lobbyists go up and what are we paying them?

Clint Jensen:

We're currently paying them 2000 a month. It went up like 10%. So I think I want to say it went from 17 or 1800 up to 2000 a month.

Doug Hill:

All right. And then last year, as I recall, we adopted the budget fairly early on, I want to say in April or May. And I felt like we were a little premature in adopting a budget. I wonder what your thoughts are if we were to wait and not adopt the final budget until June, what your thoughts are on that?

Clint Jensen:

So for the Center, it doesn't matter if you adopt it in April or May. I think for you all trying to do your budgets, I think you'd like to have this locked down before you're doing and finalizing your budgets. But I'll defer to the board. We can adopt this as late as the June board meeting, and that's okay with us. But it's just for your benefit that you're getting these numbers earlier.

Tim Tingey:

Yeah. I would say, Doug, what's your rationale on that? I think the past conversations have been, we want to get this nailed down so we know what the numbers are. So what's the concern with doing it earlier rather than June?

Doug Hill:

Well, I'm not as concerned this year as I was last year, but when we're trying to project cost of living increases and we're ahead of the city process, I hate to be voting on cost of living increases before I know what our city is inclined to do. Because I personally am not one who's going to support giving somebody else a cost of living greater than what we're giving our cities unless there's some extenuating circumstances. So when we're adopting a budget in April, typically our cities aren't... We don't really know what that cost of living. And I saw that last year, a lot of cities last year and the year before even were given bigger cost of living adjustments, and then a lot of them backed down from what we originally thought cities were going to do. So I think VECC ended up being a beneficiary of bigger cost of living adjustments than what most cities ended up adopting as part of their budget. So that's my concern. I do like these numbers for our assessment. That's really all I care about for our budget is what is the assessment and the impact on our budgets. And so what we have today is very helpful and we can plug those numbers in. At least I get a general idea where Murray's going to be, are we going to be slightly up, slightly down, significantly up or significantly down. And so that's my rationale on wanting to wait, not on the tentative budget, but on adopting a final budget.

And then just my last comment, is I also tend to agree with Sheriff Rivera on the sick leave incentive. So what I heard you say, Clint, was that we're not making any decisions right now on what that policy will be. You just want some money to look at some different things, which I'm comfortable with. But personally, I'm very skeptical that you can adopt a sick leave incentive program that's going to change people's sick leave usage. It ends up, and I can say it's the way it worked in Murray, we've played with it several times that I've been here

seeing very little impact on sick leave usage. It ends up just being money that goes into the employee's pockets. And that's why I'm skeptical that there's a... I'd love to hear if there is a program out there that changes sick leave usage. But my experience has been as typically it's just putting money in employee's pockets.

Clint Jensen:

Yeah. I appreciate that. I think that before we do anything, this needs a lot deeper look, and so we will do that. Any other questions, comments on the draft of budget?

Scott Harrington:

I would rather see us have the budget adopted in April for my budget purposes, so that I know going into it, what my rate's going to be and not have to deal with changes.

Korban Lee:

Scott, you're not seeing it, but there's a couple of heads nodding around the table as well. I think I would agree with you also. First to do a city budget in May and June, I would prefer to have VECC's budget locked down by April. But Doug, your point about COLA is well taken.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I think one of the challenges that every city's using COLA a little differently as well. And so there's not a uniform one across, and I don't know if that's a policy where you just pick a date certain it's this... If we're using CPI reason that month and it's always that month and then we would know what it was or if we want to do it. But we've talked not in these meetings, but in other meetings, city managers, and we all use different dates and different definitions of that. So I don't know how we come to anything that's uniform.

Mark Reid:

We don't.

Clint Jensen:

Hopefully, there's not the dramatic shift. There was last year a pretty dramatic shift in the spring, but hopefully this year we see that a little more stable and we can move forward. But I think what I'm hearing is that in March, we would then present a tentative budget. I think we have another finance committee scheduled later this month or early next month.

Tim Tingey:

Next month. Yeah.

Clint Jensen:

And we will then present the whole package that you'll have everything to look at and hopefully we can adopt a tentative budget in March. And then at that point you'll set the public hearing for the adoption of the final budget. That can be April or May, whatever you choose.

Korban Lee:

Does anyone have any concerns with this? Doug, aside noting his concerns. Anyone else have concerns with this schedule that Clint's just laid out adopting a tentative budget in the March meeting, public hearing for final adoption in the April meeting, assuming there's no big changes to the budget? Scott Young, are you still online with us?

Scott Young:

I am. Yes.

Korban Lee:

Scott, Clint, remind me, do we need a public... I have it in my head, we need a public hearing to adopt the tentative budget and a public hearing to adopt the final budget. Is that correct or no?

Clint Jensen:

You can adopt the tentative budget as this body and then you set the meeting time for the public hearing.

Scott Young:

That's my understanding as well.

Korban Lee:

All right. Tim, you're the chair of the finance committee. Anything else from your end?

Tim Tingey:

No. We're going to talk a little bit about the roof. We talked about that in the finance committee. That's going to be discussed here in just a few minutes. I don't know if we want to just go into that. But that was the only thing we wanted to discuss. What we had talked about originally, it was proposed in the budget for this upcoming year. But as we talked as a committee, we thought it would be better to consider that as a budget amendment now, not have it impact the rates and things for the cities and get this addressed, especially if there's water that is leaking into the building.

Korban Lee:

Okay. So let's pivot off of the FY 25 budget and talk about this issue of the budget amendment.

Mark Reid:

Do we have an estimate?

Clint Jensen:

Yes we do. So the idea here is when we proposed the draft budget to the finance committee, there were a couple of big ticket items that we were hoping to do. I'll start with the little one first, and that's the chairs in this room. We're quite entertained when people come in and try to adjust, and then there's musical chairs. But we'd like to spend a little bit of money to get some better quality chairs in here, make it a little more of a boardroom that's comfortable for people to be in. So there's a \$20,000 option in this budget amendment to replace the chairs in here. We've got some bids anywhere from \$600-\$800 for some pretty good chairs, that we could get 20-22 chairs or so in this room.

The second piece of this was a rehab to the roof. The numbers we originally had on the roof rehab was in the \$150,000 range. That was from when we did the overall remodel. That was a number that our architects gave to us. And as we've gone out and looked at options, we had a state contract vendor come in because it's easy just to go to them, and they came back with a quote anywhere from \$400,000 to \$750,000. The \$750,000 option was basically strip it down, replace it, put it all back, and it was a 40-year roof. We've asked them to look at other options that are maybe less aggressive. There is some damage to some of the board up there, but not a lot. We would just maybe look to replace some of that. So they came back with a not to exceed of \$400,000. Now what they will do is then get their contractors, the three or four that they deal with to come bid on that. But they gave us a not to exceed of 400,000 to replace the current membrane up there and fix it so that we would have a 20 to 30 year roof.

So that's the two options that we were given. I don't think the \$750,000 option is one that we can afford. \$400,000 one, I think we can. And as presented in the budget, we saw that I'm projecting and very conservatively projecting that we would have a 400 plus thousand dollar surplus in fiscal '24. So instead of laying these big capital items on you as part of your assessments, we would just use available funds to do some of these big ticket items. So we'd probably look at this every year, depending on if we're having a good year as far as maybe tax revenues or something else that might allow us to... the next thing might be a boiler or an air conditioning unit or maybe a new generator or whatever. We need to be looking at all of that stuff that will need to be replaced in the next 10 years or so. So with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Korban Lee:

Any questions among the trustees?

Rosie Rivera:

My question would be on the roof. It's not warrantied or anything. You just said that they're guaranteeing a 40 year for 750. What happened when this building was built? Was there a guarantee on our roof?

Clint Jensen:

Yeah. Good question. We're probably outside of that warranty because we've been here 22, 23 years. So I think that warranty has run its course. I'm trying to think who even put that roof on there. I think it was Leighton. They're the ones that keep coming out and putting caulk on it and patching it up and doing everything they can to keep it from leaking. So I couldn't answer that definitively, that was a few years ago.

Mark Reid:

I think at that dollar amount, I would probably look to go out to bid to see what other companies would come in.

Clint Jensen:

And we are doing that as we speak. We're not just going with that one vendor. We are looking at other vendors. We're going to get two or three bids to see what other solutions are there. We kind of default to the State contract because it's easy. They've gone through the background work, but we still want to get a couple other bids to make sure that we're not in a bad space.

Korban Lee:

Clint, can I restate to see if I'm understanding what you're proposing. What you're proposing is rather than put a new roof and new chairs into the FY 25 budget using our one-time excess revenues in the FY 24 budget, doing a budget amendment and using that money to do the chairs and the roof, you'll get bids. But if a budget amendment of 400,000 for the roof and 20,000 for the chairs, we'll at least assure that you know you have at least a 400,000 option on the roof. So if the bids come back at 500...

Clint Jensen:

We're out. We're not going to do it, unless we come back and ask for more, which I don't know that we could. But yes, you are correct. So on the revenue side, we're increasing franchise taxes by 350. We're increasing interest income by 70. And then the miscellaneous is 40,000. So we would've needed to adjust the budget anyway. We got the grant that was not counted for in our original budget. So mental health grant of 40,000 came in from the Department of Public Safety. And then on the expense side, you'll see the 20,000 for the chairs, the 40,000 for the mental health services that we're going to procure and the \$400,000 for a roof.

Korban Lee:

Does anyone have any questions about this proposed budget amendment? Tim?

Tim Tingey:

Not as much of a question but just a statement. So I'm supportive of this, especially with the roof. One of the things though that I think would be important for the future is rather than just coming with when there's under expend or whatever and saying, okay, we've got this needed, it'd be great to see what the future priority needs are from capital or other issues and what you have coming down the pipe. Just so we can think about it, plan for it, understand it a little bit more rather than just year by year, say we want to do this, we want to do that, and prioritize it of course.

Clint Jensen:

I've got a list and that will be as part of our budget. You'll see those items popping up in there.

Korban Lee:

Does anyone have any concerns about this proposed budget amendment? I want to catch the trustees that are online. Any concerns? Scott, Dustin, Josh, Chief, any concerns from any of you about this proposed budget amendment? David. Who am I forgetting? David. Lisa.

Dominic Burchett:

Mr. Chair, I'll go. I was going to say exactly what Tim said, because a roof to me isn't something that sneaks up on you and just there's got to be a plan in place. And he mentioned the boiler and a couple other things. And so I'd really like to see what those priorities are moving forward. But I did some rough math with the numbers you gave with a 20 year a 30 year and a 40-year roof. And the 20-year roof seems to make the most sense at 400,000 as the cap. And I'm also curious what the mental health resources are that you're putting in place with that grant money, just out of curiosity.

Clint Jensen:

So we're reaching out to the Partridge group and also to Blomquist Hale and we're asking them to do an annual assessment for each of our operations staff. And so couple of reasons, just to have a check in with a mental health person that they can talk to. We hope that this opens the door with utilization of our EAP by our staff as they maybe take on a tough call or they get in a situation in their family or whatever it might be. So we want to go through each of our operations staff and have them throughout this year have an assessment. This isn't necessarily a fit for duty or anything like that. This is just a check-in to see how they're doing.

Dominic Burchett:

And then is that same program budgeted for next year in the preliminary budget?

Clint Jensen:

It is not. We are just doing it this one time with this grant money. We hope that over time we can continue this, but that was not built into the next year's budget. Maybe with any luck we get grant money. I know there was some conversation at the legislature for that. And maybe if that grant money continues, we can continue that program without hitting you all at once with a \$40,000 hit, we can just grow into it.

Dominic Burchett:

Okay. And then on the legislative side, there's a House Bill 378 that addresses some of these issues. That might be something that you want to have the Spatafores track for you to see what impacts that might have on the Center.

Clint Jensen:

I will. Thank you.

Korban Lee:

Any other comments or questions about the proposed amendment to the FY '24 budget?

Lisa Hartman:

I was just going to say I'm supportive of making the changes and agree with Tim and the chief about just seeing the full list, which it sounds like, Clint, you've already got that included for the budget for next year. I think it would be nice just to see all the capital improvements that are on the horizon, and I think maybe the Board of Trustees may decide that they want to move up other items over another, so I think it's just nice to have that full picture, when we're making decisions about under expend to spend on these projects, to look at them holistically.

Clint Jensen:

Yeah, and we will do that. I know that when we did the remodel, all of these things were to be included in that remodel. We all know the story about how those costs really took off, and so we minimized that remodel to take care of the floor and operations side. So here we are coming back and asking for these things. We do have a list, and we'll continue to make sure you guys are aware of what those things are.

Korban Lee:

Doug, Josh, Dustin, David, Scott. Just want to make sure I'm giving everyone a chance to chime in. David, I see you unmuting.

David Dobbins:

Yeah, but I just want to say I'm good.

Dustin Lewis:

I would just echo. It's good to go out and get bids. We often find much more competitive pricing than what the state contract offers, especially from contractors who are bitter they didn't get the state contract, and will often sharpen their pencil to get a much lower bid, than even the state contract, even for things like the chairs.

Korban Lee:

Hear, hear. I'll echo that. Okay. Then this is a public hearing, or at least it's agendized as a public hearing. Let's open this public hearing up for any public comment, on this topic. Is there anyone here, from the public, that would like to speak to this issue? Anyone online that would like to speak to this proposed budget amendment? Okay. Seeing none, I'm closing the public hearing, and looking for a motion to approve resolution 2024-01, proposing an amendment to the fiscal year 2024 budget, as per what's been included in the packet. Chief Evans, I see a motion to approve the resolution.

Tim Tingey:

I'll second it.

Korban Lee:

The second from Mr. Tingey. Whereas this a public hearing, and a vote of the budget. Let's take a roll call vote.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Lee, West Jordan?

Korban Lee:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Tingey, Cottonwood Heights?

Tim Tingey:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Dobbins, Draper?

David Dobbins:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Hill, Murray?

Doug Hill:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Lewis, South Jordan?

Dustin Lewis:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Collins, South Salt Lake?

Mr. Collins:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Cherpeski, Herriman?

Nathan Cherpeski:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Reid, Bluffdale?

Mr. Reid:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Deputy Mayor Hartman, Salt Lake County?

Lisa Hartman:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Harrington, Taylorsville?

Scott Harrington:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Chief Burchett, UFA?

Dominic Burchett:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Sheriff Rivera, UPD?

Rosie Rivera:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Chief Evans, West Valley?

John Evans:

Yes.

Korban Lee:

All right. Thank you. We'll consider that approved unanimously, and move on. Please go take care of the roof of this building.

Clint Jensen:

Yeah, for sure.

Korban Lee:

Okay. Anything else for Clint, regarding finances for VECC?

**Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. John Evans, to approve resolution 2024-01, proposing an amendment to the fiscal year 2024 budget, seconded by Mr. Tim Tingey; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SEARCH PROCESS**

Korban Lee:

Okay, I'm going to move on to agenda item number eight, report on the executive director search process. I'm going to start by turning the time over to Colin. Colin Baenziger's here, our executive search consultant, Scott Krim is also here in person, with Baenziger & Associates. Colin, let me turn the time over to you, for a second.

Colin Baenziger:

Okay. I'm going to share this time with Scott, put him on the spot. I'm not sure how many applicants we had, but we've narrowed the field down to I believe seven. We have four that we think are particularly strong, and we have three others that you may want to consider. Our recommendation is that you select at least four to interview, and possibly five, simply because people do drop out. Now I understand we're actually going to make the selection of the people we interview in closed session, but we do also need to have some direction on how we want to conduct the interviews. They're supposed to be, I guess next Thursday and Friday. I will be present for those, as will be Scott.

The bottom line is do we want to have the whole committee interview each candidate, I mean the whole Trustee Board, interview them? Do we want to have perhaps Korban as the Chairman, and possibly a couple of others, do one-on-one interviews, and then maybe split the Board in two? Because you've got a lot of members, and it might be hard for everybody to ask their questions, if we just did one Board interview review. Then of course we have the operating committees of both police and fire, and I think they should have an opportunity to talk to the candidate.

We do recommend a reception where you can see how the candidates interact with you, and in a public setting. They will be representing you as possibly rotary, at County Commission meetings, at other governmental affairs, so you want to see how they interact socially. But then the bottom line is really the chemistry, and how do they work with you, as Board members. We find the one-on-one interviews tend to be the best test of that. Unfortunately with 13 members, or I'm not sure, I think it's 13, but I could be wrong, plus the operating committee, that's pretty difficult to do. I guess what we're putting out there, right at the moment, is how do you want to conduct the interviews for the executive director?

Korban Lee:

Any trustees, anyone want to chime in on preferences? Anything they'd like to see in the interviews next week?

Doug Hill:

Well, I'll just say that I'm comfortable with a smaller group doing the interviews. It would be nice maybe to meet the final candidate, but frankly I'm comfortable with the small group, the Chair, Vice Chair, all Board chairs doing those interviews.

Rosie Rivera:

We had a small group last time. It was a small group that selected the previous one. That worked really well with trying to schedule schedules, because if you have all of us, it's going to be a huge challenge. I'm comfortable with any of the trustees, and I would say the two chairs of the Board, ops Board, and the other, as well, if they can. I mean, it's kind of short notice.

Korban Lee:

Nathan, any preferences, comments, discussion on how we proceed with interviews next week?

Nathan Cherpeski:

I think a small group makes sense. There's too many of us to try and wrangle, I think try and get everybody in there.

Korban Lee:

I will say I'm uncomfortable being in too small of a group making this decision. This is an executive director that will report to all of us, as trustees, and we're a pretty big group. I would like as much consensus as possible. I will say too, in getting feedback from the trustees over the past week, there is wide divergence among the trustees in the rating of the applicants, thus far. Now in an interview process, often that mellows out, and you

tend to find a lot more consensus of opinions. But in reading the packets that Scott, and Colin, and their team have prepared, as trustees, we're all over the map, in terms of who we like, and what resumes we like, and what backgrounds we like.

Rosie Rivera:

They selected the top four, didn't they, but didn't tell us who their selection was? Isn't that what he just said?

Korban Lee:

Scott and Colin provided a top seven. In their opinion, four stood out. They haven't told us which four.

Rosie Rivera:

Different than some of our four, because there's people on there that some of the trustees know.

Korban Lee:

Yes, certainly. A couple of comments from me, I guess, in terms of what I've heard back from trustees, as we've tried to pull, and send out email, and gather feedback on this. Of the responses I've got, unanimously the trustees want to include Clint in the interview process, and on the interview panel. Clint, as you know, initially we were leaving you out thinking you might be a candidate for the role. As that's changed, unanimously, we want you involved, so sorry you're not off the hook. Also, vast majority of trustees want to invite the ops chair, Chief Carr, Chief Evans our two ops chairs to be part of that interview process. Most trustees prefer to invite the ops chairs to be part of that process.

As I've spoken with Clint and Scott earlier this week, I've spoken with Colin as well, and just to try to move the discussion along, what I'd like to propose is a luncheon tour and Q&A session with our top candidates that we want to invite to interview on Thursday the 29th, a week from tomorrow. I think we're probably settling into inviting the top four, maybe the top five candidates, to interview. What I propose is on Thursday have a lunch, a tour of the Center, where the candidates, some of these candidates are from out of state, some are local, many of them are not familiar with the building and the Center, so a tour of the Center. Then a Q&A time, or some interaction time with Clint, with Elyse, with a handful of trustees who can make it on Thursday the 29th, just to field questions from all four or five candidates. Then on Friday morning, March 1st, do interviews with small groups.

As many trustees as can be part of those interviews, that would be great. I'm very sensitive about the scheduling. I think we're going to do these interviews on March 1st. That's when we told the candidates. That's what we've outlined it with Colin, from day one, on this process. So as many trustees as can make it, to be part of the interview panel, great. If there's 12 of us here, we may split into teams of three, and have each applicant interview with trustees three at a time, or two at a time, or something like that. I'm going to throw that out for discussion. Let's talk about pros and cons, tweaks, like to see it differently. What do you think?

Tim Tingey:

I'm comfortable with that, where you do the interviews on Friday, we have interactions with them on the 29th. I guess the only thing is I don't know if I'm overly comfortable with breaking into smaller groups. I'd probably just say have the interviews with who is going to be in the interview room, and have everyone do it all at once.

Korban Lee:

Even if it's a bigger board, come in interview with the whole, all the trustees, even if it's six or seven trustees that can make it, you interview with seven trustees at once, because then all seven trustees hear the same response, from the same candidates?

Tim Tingey:

Yeah, that's what I'm more comfortable with.

Korban Lee:

Right, a little less personal, little less direct, but a trade-off in the consistency of response.

Nathan Cherpeski:

You could have the, if you wanted to let ops have more than just their chairs, you could do a separate group with them, kind of round table it, where they rotate through. But I'm good with it.

Korban Lee:

Interview with maybe the ops chairs and Clint, and then a separate interview with the trustees?

Nathan Cherpeski:

Yeah, you can do it that way. I've done it that way, because then at the end, you get back with them, you get their feedback, you take your feedback, and all come together.

Korban Lee:

Any other thoughts, proposals?

Dominic Burchett:

Is there any type of presentation involved in this? Because that could be another opportunity to get more of the staff, and/or fire and police ops boards involved, with this position, being probably pretty heavy on the public speaking side, as Colin mentioned. That a presentation of some sorts could be valuable, and give us another opportunity to get more people involved, and keep the interview group to five to seven, or a smaller number.

Korban Lee:

Chief, we can do whatever we want. We haven't told the candidates anything, except to reserve, hold the dates for the 29th and the 1st.

Dominic Burchett:

Okay, I really like the luncheon and the Q&A, and giving especially staff an opportunity to meet some of the candidates, and then provide feedback. Then on Friday, I would suggest an interview portion, and a presentation portion. Then at the end of Friday, we all get together and discuss, however many people can be involved in that.

Korban Lee:

Thank you Chief. Thank you Nathan. Other comments? Any other thoughts? Doug, Lisa, Josh, David,

Colin Baenziger:

I was going to say, I think that's all fine. I do think that as the chairman, and probably the vice chairman, that you ought to interview them personally, one-on-one. I just think it's a different dynamic than making a presentation or interviewing with a group. But that's my opinion. It's your decision, and it would be in addition to the other interviews, of course. I'm not suggesting we shouldn't have panel interviews for the people that can make it.

Korban Lee:

Thank you. Good feedback. Scott, did I see you unmute for a sec?

Scott Harrington:

I think that it's fine, us doing it in a bigger group interview setting, and if you and the Vice Chair want to interview him separately, I'm fine with that. But I think it works better in a bigger group, so that way for consistency.

Korban Lee:

Thank you Scott. Doug, David, Lisa, any preferences?

Colin Baenziger:

I will say again, I'll emphasize the one-on-ones, because I remember seeing a search of another firm did years ago and the candidate wowed everybody in the panel interview. They didn't do one-on-one interviews, and the guy bombed out in about 18 months. He could not relate to people individually. I think both are great. I think both are needed, both the panels, and the one-on-ones, but I would not skip the one-on-ones.

Korban Lee:

I'm going to formulate a few thoughts, maybe a proposal. I'd like to discuss the candidates in closed session and pin down the number of candidates we want to interview, in closed session. As part of the conversation about the candidates we want to interview then, I think just refine given the look at, "Okay, we have four candidates we want to interview, or five we want to interview." Then at that point say, "Okay, and here will be the process." But I'm leaning towards recommending lunch, tour, Q&A on Thursday, all pretty informal. Friday presentation to the trustees as a whole, or as many trustees as can be there. Interview with Tim and myself in a small group setting. Then an interview with the balance of the trustees I guess, or a bigger group, and a bigger group setting maybe. We try to get some one-on-one or two-on-one interaction, as well as some bigger group interaction, and some of that consistency.

Tim Tingey:

Would you include the ops?

Korban Lee:

Oh, and an interview with the ops, yes. Because I think one of the critical parts of this job is how well do you relate with police chiefs, fire chiefs. Yeah, maybe a separate interview with the ops chief. That's a lot of interviews for the candidates. Upwards of a presentation, and what three interviews that day. We'll put them through the ringer. Let's discuss the candidates, and just make a final decision, on something like that.

Rosie Rivera:

Good idea.

Korban Lee:

I just want to check my notes and see. I think there was one other aspect we may want to cover before we...

Doug Hill:

I would not be available on Thursday, but I would be available on Friday to sit in on any interviews. I'm comfortable with being part of that larger group interview panel, if that's what is decided, and anything else you decide I'm fine with as well, so just want you to know that.

Korban Lee:

Thank you Doug. All trustees up for debate and discussion, but I guess what I'm proposing is Thursday from a trustee's perspective, Thursday is optional. Friday for interviews... if you can be there to help interview on

Friday, please make yourself available, as a trustee, to help interview on Friday, if you can. Okay, let's go on the agenda. Colin, anything else about process, before we go into closed session, and talk candidates?

Colin Baenziger:

I don't think so. I mean we can work out the details after the meeting, but I think you've got general direction. I think that's sufficient, at this point.

Tim Tingey:

One thing, that in your proposal, originally we had talked about having some interaction with the VECC staff as well.

Korban Lee:

Yeah, that's what I'm thinking on Thursday, some of that informal or some of the less formal lunch, some interaction with some of the VECC staff, the tour, the Q&A. At least that's what was going through my mind, with everything.

Tim Tingey:

Yep. That's good.

Colin Baenziger:

Yeah, I think they should be involved. If nothing else, it's a big decision, and there are probably some concerns, and just meeting the people, will put a lot of that to rest.

Korban Lee:

Yeah. Sheriff, are you okay with this direction?

Rosie Rivera:

I'm okay, except I'm not available Thursday or Friday.

Korban Lee:

Is under Sheriff Archuleta?

Rosie Rivera:

She will be, yeah.

Korban Lee:

Okay. With that, the next item on the agenda is to go into a closed session. I'd like to entertain a motion to go into closed session for the discussion of character, professional competence, physical or mental health of an individual. Okay. Chief Evans' motion to go into closed session.

Tim Tingey:

Second.

Korban Lee:

Second by Mr. Tingey. We need to do a roll call vote.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Lee, West Jordan?

Korban Lee:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Tingey, Cottonwood Heights?

Tim Tingey:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Lewis, South Jordan?

Dustin Lewis:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Harrington, Taylorsville.

Scott Harrington:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Chief Burchett, UFA?

Dominic Burchett:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Sheriff Rivera, UPD?

Rosie Rivera:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Chief Evans, West Valley?

John Evans:

Yep.

**Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. John Evans, to go into closed session for the discussion of character, professional competence, physical or mental health of an individual, the motion was seconded by Mr. Tim Tingey; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

**CLOSED SESSION 4:01 p.m. to 4:33 p.m.****RE-OPEN PUBLIC MEETING/MOTION TO ADJOURN**

Korban Lee:

Okay. We are back in open meeting. As trustees we've selected five candidates to invite to interview on the 29th and the first. Let's talk about the process we want to go through on February 29th and March 1st. What's been proposed is that February 29th, that's a week from tomorrow, we invite the five candidates for an informal lunch to meet with any trustees that are available and Clint and any VECC employees Clint would like to invite to that informal lunch. We offer the candidates a tour of the VECC facility right after lunch. And we have an informal Q&A with all five candidates here, able to ask whatever questions they like of Clint, of-

Clint Jensen:

Probably Elyse for operations.

Korban Lee:

Elyse, myself, any other trustees that can make it. If you can make it on the 29th, please don't leave me by myself as a trustee, but really where we want to focus the trustees attendance is on Friday, March 1st. On Friday, March 1st we'd like to invite the five candidates in for formal interviews starting the morning of March 1st with a combination of a presentation, a small group interview with the chair and vice chair, and a larger group interview with the balance of the trustees, and an interview with the ops chair, Chief Evans, Chief Carr, maybe Clint in the ops chair interview.

Clint Jensen:

Yeah, that'd be fine.

Korban Lee:

Details to be worked out by Colin and Scott and Clint. The scheduling details to be worked out by Colin, Scott, Clint. Any questions, comments on what's proposed?

John Evans:

Could you do the presentation in the large group at the same time? I guess I mean to try to save time. I mean, if you've got whoever's here from, if they're doing a presentation, then they could almost just go in and start an interview too. I mean, I guess to try to not make it go until eight o'clock at night or something.

Korban Lee:

Yeah. Scott, I see you nodding your head.

Scott Harrington:

That makes sense. While they're already in here presenting and you just go and ask some questions right after.

Tim Tingey:

I agree with that. The other thing I would say is let's start early on Friday morning.

Korban Lee:

I agree. I mean, I'm assuming like an 8:00 AM start and try and wrap up these five interviews by noon or one or two.

Tim Tingey:

Yes. Earlier the better.

Korban Lee:

Whatever trustees can make it will be flexible, but I hope a handful, at least a handful of trustees can make it on Friday. Whoever's available.

Dustin Lewis:

I can be there all day on Friday Korban, especially if we start at eight and we're done by one.

Korban Lee:

Thank you.

Scott Harrington:

Korban I will not be able to be there.

Korban Lee:

Okay. Chief can be there. Tim can be there. I'll be there.

Rosie Rivera:

I think the Undersheriff can be there. Yeah, I can do the morning, but I have a luncheon downtown at noon.

Korban Lee:

Okay. Any comments, everyone okay with this proceeding with the interview process in this manner? Okay. With that, I'll look for a motion to adjourn this meeting.

John Evans:

Second.

Korban Lee:

A motion by Mr. Tingey, second by Chief Evans. All in favor say aye.

Group:

Aye.

Korban Lee:

Thank you everyone. It's a marathon meeting today. Thank you for sticking through it all. See you Thursday or Friday if possible.

**Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. Tim Tingey, to adjourn the meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. John Evans; the motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.