

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

March 20, 2024 Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Korban Lee – West Jordan, Chair
Mr. Tim Tingey – Cottonwood Heights, Vice Chair
Mr. Craig Giles – Riverton
Mr. David Dobbins – Draper
Mr. Doug Hill - Murray
Mr. Dustin Lewis – South Jordan
Mr. Josh Collins – South Salt Lake
Mr. Nathan Cherveski – Herriman
Mr. Bruce Kartchner – Bluffdale
Mr. Scott Harrington – Taylorsville
Mr. Dom Burchett – UFA
Ms. Rosie Rivera – UPD
Mr. John Evans – West Valley City

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ms. Lisa Hartman – SLCo
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. Jeff Carr - SJPD
Mr. Troy Carr – HPD
Ms. Crystal Makin – South Salt Lake
Ms. Danielle Croyle – South Salt Lake
Mr. Clint Smith – DFD
Mr. Chris Dawson – SJFD
Mr. Joey Mittleman – MFD
Mr. Travis Bodtcher – MFD
Mr. Derek Maxfield – WJFD
Mr. Matt Evans – BFD
Mr. Craig Burnett – MPD
Mr. Dustin Dern – UFA
Mr. Brady Cottam – TVPD
Mr. Ryan Cram – SSLPD
Ms. Jodi Morris – VECC
Mr. Jonathan Bridges – VECC
Ms. Nicole Lopez – VECC
Ms. Lin Shaffer – VECC
Mr. Tony Bueno – VECC
Mr. Neal Bennett – VECC
Ms. Erin Downs – VECC

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

Korban Lee:

It's two o'clock. We have a quorum. Let's get started. Welcome everybody. Thank you to those of you that can be here in person. Welcome everyone that's here over Zoom and participating. We're happy you're with us. This is a public meeting. It is being recorded. We'll have a public comment period here in one sec. Before we go to agenda item three of the public comments, I'm looking for anyone that wants to note any needed changes, edits to the minutes or make a motion to approve the minutes from last month's meeting.

Dustin Lewis

If there's no changes, I'll make a motion we adopt the minutes.

Scott Harrington

Second.

Korban Lee:

Thank you. I have a motion from Dustin Lewis to approve the minutes. Second by Scott Harrington. All in favor say aye.

Group:

Aye.

Korban Lee:

Anyone opposed? Okay, we'll take that as the minutes are approved. Thank you. Thank you for taking a look at them.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Dustin Lewis, to approve the minutes from the February 21st Board Meeting, seconded by Mr. Scott Harrington; the motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Korban Lee:

Let's go on public comment portion of the meeting. Is there anyone here in person that wants to speak to the VECC board of trustees? Seeing no one in person. Is there anyone online that would like to speak up and make public comment to the VECC board of trustees today? Okay. I'm not seeing anyone unmute. Clint, was there any public comment received by the Center for the meeting today?

Clint Jensen:

No.

Korban Lee:

Okay. Let's close the public comment portion of the meeting. Let's go to the operation board reports. Chief Carr, let's turn the time over to you for the police department, police operations board report.

OPERATIONS BOARD REPORTS

Chief Carr:

We tried something new for our board meeting. We met before the Valley Police Alliance meeting. We probably need a little more time than what we had, but I think we'll continue to try that. There were four things that I thought I'd highlight. We talked about the towing program that was mentioned at the trustees and for us to look at that. There was some concerns about the cost of the Atura program, as I remember. West Jordan is also testing an alternate program that Rich Bell talked about a little bit, so we're going to have some more discussion about that. But apparently it's pretty pricey to implement it and if we did that, we probably have to be looking at some kind of corresponding cut from VECC to say, okay, we're seeing this much savings and time, but our people aren't having to do this so we can cut this many people so that we don't have to do the tow stuff. I don't know whether that's doable or not. I think more information is needed before we make any decisions, but just to give you an update on what we're doing there.

We also expressed some concern about the admin phone situation and the delay of notification to some of us. I expressed some personal concerns about that, but it seems to be solved.

Korban Lee:

Let's talk about the admin phone situation for a minute. Since you brought it up, it's not on our agenda, but I think it's on the mind of several trustees. Can you give us a rundown of what happened. Jonathan, will you brief us on what occurred.

Jonathan Bridges:

So in a nutshell, we basically had one of our older routers that's responsible for directing the admin or non-emergency lines to the Vesta system and the configuration on that device had become corrupted, and so as we started troubleshooting that, we then ran into a couple other issues. So it was actually sort of a cascading of problems. Some just due to the age and because of that device was a single device or was a single point of failure with that, which is one of the things we've been working on our new phone system to alleviate and that was actually one of the next steps for that system because we did finish porting our Lumen phone numbers to our new provider. And so one of the next steps was going to be moving that functionality from that single router to our new dual routers. We hadn't gotten there yet, and so it was a perfect example of why single points of failure can hurt you.

But anyways, the configuration on that device had become corrupted. When we started to look at repairing that configuration, we had to bring in several vendors. We had Motorola working with us on the Vesta side as well as our Cisco TAC team. And as we started working through it, that's where we found out it wasn't just a configuration file, there was a licensing component, there was a hardware component. So we actually literally were leapfrogging from one aspect, as soon as we thought we had one piece fixed, another portion of that issue then exposed itself. So that was why it resulted in such a long timeframe on getting it resolved. But in the end, we had to rebuild that configuration from scratch and Cisco TAC helped us do that so we could get that system back up and running.

Korban Lee:

The admin phone line was down or the non-emergency dispatch line was down for how long?

Jonathan Bridges:

Couple days.

Korban Lee:

I assumed like 48 hours or so. Is that right? Can you speak to, Chief Carr mentioned the notification. I wanted to ask about that as well. How were agencies notified that that line is down?

Jonathan Bridges:

So ultimately during the troubleshooting process and the delay on notification was my fault, nobody else's, it was me. As we were troubleshooting that morning and working through the issues with the vendors, each time we thought, oh, this is it. We've got this fixed. It was going to be a notification that, hey, we had this problem, now we're fixed. We're back up and running. And because we leapfrogged on those couple of different factors that were complicating getting it resolved, I had delayed in notifying the agencies.

Korban Lee:

You kept thinking I'll notify them, but I don't need to notify them because I'm going to turn this switch and it's fixed?

Jonathan Bridges:

Exactly. But that was an error on my part and in the future I will be more expeditious in sending notifications out if we have system problems like that. But yeah, each moment we thought we had it fixed and we're like, oh, we can tell them we're good. We're back up. It didn't happen. So there was a point in time in the day early afternoon where Clint and I agreed that okay, we need to notify the agencies, but it had gone on long enough that it was problematic for the agencies and so like I said, that was my fault and it won't happen again.

Jeff Carr:

Our information center just got a lot of calls and so Dustin was calling me saying what's going on? I didn't know anything about it at that point. It had been several hours. So that was my concern. I understand problems happen. Just let us know so that we don't get caught off guard.

Korban Lee:

I have a question I want to kind of throw out to the trustees, see how you guys feel about this. One of the issues I ran into is our police and our fire were notified, but the issue hit our customer service line. It came up in our city's social media and our PIO communication group didn't know. And when they talked to our police and fire, they didn't get all the information they were looking for or they got mixed signals a little bit. My question is when there's something like this, I think you're going to do better, but I think you have kind of dialed in how to notify the police departments and the fire departments and agencies. Do we need to or should we add to that list notifying a communications or PIO representative of each agency? Trustees, what do you guys think on that?

Scott Harrington:

I think it would be helpful.

Dustin Lewis:

Yeah, in that particular situation would've been very helpful. We would've been happy to have helped get the word out, alternate numbers when the calls came to us, routing those around. So yeah, I agree. Letting somebody know.

Korban Lee:

I'm looking for trustees, sheriff, Nathan, any other trustees? Sheriff, let's go to you. What do you think, then Nathan, we'll go to you next.

Sheriff Rosie Rivera:

I agree. I think that would be very helpful.

Korban Lee:

Thank you Sheriff. Nathan?

Nathan Cherpesci:

Just to echo that. I know it came to us, but I am often in meetings. I don't get to check my emails as often, so once I saw it I was able to forward it to my PIOs, but I don't know how long that gap was. So I think figuring out a better process would be good.

Korban Lee:

Does anyone have a different perspective? Okay, with that I have a ask Elyse or Clint, will you work with all the member agencies to reach out to us and ask us who is your PIO? So when we have a notification from VECC, it goes to the police agency, the fire agency, and the communications personnel for the city.

Clint Jensen:

Yep. Will do.

Korban Lee:

Okay, thank you. Sorry for that divergence Chief, let's go back to you. Thank you Jonathan.

Jeff Carr:

Another thing we talked about was CrimeTracer coming online. So we used to have Palantir and that went away and so we understand the State is paying for the integration costs, but there was a subscription cost that we were apparently paying to Palantir, which will now be replaced with the payment to CrimeTracer. So the way it was represented to us was it's kind of a wash as far as any costs go. The integration is being paid for by the State, which is really great. That's who should be paying for it and so I think-

Clint Jensen:

The Palantir costs, is it each agency?

Jeff Carr:

No, Palantir is kind of patchworked together. There were sometimes DEA paid for it one year, the State paid for it, the grants paid for it, the funding was kind of cobbled together and it was a mess. So this is I think a better product. We are actually able to get information across the nation, not just through Utah, so it's a better system. There's more information in it and I think for the cost it's going to be a wash for us.

Clint Jensen:

So who's going to pay that \$30,000?

Jeff Carr:

The integrations cost, is my understanding, is coming from the state.

Clint Jensen:

Yeah, that's the \$20,000 coming from SIAC or whoever, they're going to pay that, but there's that ongoing subscription cost that we haven't budgeted necessarily.

Jeff Carr:

Well, the way it was presented to us by Dwayne Anjewierden was that it was built into our costs, each of us individually in the assessments and that this would be replacing that.

Clint Jensen:

That's why we pushed this to the ops board because this will be something that will pass through to each of the police agencies because we are not paying anything to Palantir. So that's why we wanted the chiefs to say yes, I'll pick up my proportionate share of that cost. Probably somewhere between what, two to five, 6,000 bucks a year for that subscription because we have not budgeted anything.

Jeff Carr:

Elyse, am I misrepresenting that?

Elyse Haggerty:

Captain Anjewierden, remember he said our cost for UPD at least is going to be about 6,000 of it because they're one of the larger agencies. Salt Lake is also going to be chipping in.

Clint Jensen:

Salt Lake will pay their share.

Elyse Haggerty:

35%

Clint Jensen:

Right.

Jeff Carr:

I thought I heard him say that we were paying for the Palantir on a subscription basis and that it was coming, I don't want to misrepresent it.

Elyse Haggerty:

I did not know that that was being paid through a grant or I just understood it-

Clint Jensen:

Probably some other resource had been paying for that, but we have not paid it through the VECC budget.

Jeff Carr:

Well then we have something to work on then because it was our understanding and any of the chiefs that were here, please jump in because it was our understanding and I think he used the words, it's a wash. And so that's why I don't think we had any discussion about it is because we were under the understanding that was being paid for, or Palantir was being paid as a subscription.

Clint Jensen:

Not by us, and if it's a wash, it's a wash to VVEC because we would just pass it along. We would get the bill from Versaterm, we would then pass that along to each of you like we do your RMS.

Jeff Carr:

Okay, well let me do some follow up with Dwayne and find out what he was talking about and where that was coming from. We're probably going to have to come back on that.

Clint Jensen:

We had asked the State to pay the whole thing and they said no.

Jeff Carr:

And in fact I said that in the meeting that I thought that the entire thing was paid for by the State and that's when Dwayne said, no, it's-

Brady Cottam:

Yeah, I thought the same thing that Chief Carr was mentioning. I thought Dwayne mentioned that it was already essentially in our package that we were being billed from VECC and that essentially the money was close to being the same amount, whatever it was, but if what Clint's saying is true that that's never been a part of our VECC package of billing, then I don't know where it was. Because I was almost positive that he said what you said, Jeff, that it was in, but maybe it wasn't VECC. Maybe it was another package that it's being, but I don't know what other entity or what other series of billing that we would receive that we all chip in essentially. That was my understanding too is all I wanted to say.

Korban Lee:

Thank you Chief.

Jeff Carr:

I can prepare something after I talk with Dwayne so that the board knows exactly what we're talking about here.

Korban Lee:

We have on our agenda today, we have adoption of the tentative budget with a tentative plan to adopt a final budget at our April meeting. If this is going to be something that is added as a pass through into the permanent budget, it would be helpful if we could figure this out in time to roll it into the final adopted budget. That means we probably have to figure this out, A, figure it out and B, get the chiefs to kind of make a joint recommendation to the trustees here in the next couple of weeks.

Jeff Carr:

I think we could do something like that if we can do it through email and things like that. But if I remember right, so you're talking UPD represents 25% of VECC roughly, right?

Clint Jensen:

Yeah.

Jeff Carr:

26% and their part of that was \$5-6,000. So the city's paying a portion of that. Is that 50%?

Clint Jensen:

35% of the total would be paid for by Salt Lake City.

Jeff Carr:

Okay, so my guess is the subscription costs for this is fairly low per agency.

Clint Jensen:

Yeah, probably two to three, \$4,000 bucks.

Jeff Carr:

Yeah. I'm not even sure if it'd be that for some agencies, but nonetheless, I'll do some follow up.

Korban Lee:

One of the questions I have too, the RMS is a pass through?

Clint Jensen:

Yes.

Korban Lee:

And the proportionate costs each agency pays, is that based on their proportionate assessment to VECC for the law enforcement side or is that based on some other metric?

Clint Jensen:

RMS?

Korban Lee:

Yeah, on RMS.

Clint Jensen:

Versaterm bills that based on sworn officers.

Korban Lee:

Based on sworn officers. My point is not only do we need to know are you all on board with it, but what's the apportionment methodology?

Jeff Carr:

Okay, we will get on that. Speaking of being billed by a number of officers, I brought something up to the board for consideration. I know we've been down this road before and I don't want to open Pandora's box, but there was a reason for it. Draper indicated that they had had quite an increase based upon their calls. So I was talking to the Draper chief and he was saying, Hey, yeah, I'm concerned about this because every time I check out on something I'm getting billed by VECC. And so I tried to bring him up to speed on the history of where we came from. Before we were billing just on calls, on the CAD portion, just on calls, and then we went to a hybrid where it was half paid by the number of officers and the number of calls. So I said, was there any interest with the chiefs in examining the cost analysis of just going to the number of sworn officers and the reason being is I think it's a bad practice to be concerned about or have agencies be concerned about, well if somebody makes a traffic stop, that's \$5.

Because what happened in the past is we had agencies, and I'm talking long history here, in the past we had agencies that were telling their people, well, don't check out if you don't have to. Well, that's an officer safety issue and we have a lot of other subscriptions that we have, including the Versaterm that we're billed strictly by the number of sworn officers that we have. So I think I'm going to have the board at least examine that and use VECC to help me understand that. When we did this before, some of you may remember, I think we even actually looked at all three methods like if it was all by calls, a hybrid, if it was all by people, as I recall, the amount was almost negligible. I would like to see us move that direction, but I'm going to at least let the board talk about it before we would make a recommendation if we don't have the support of the Chiefs then we won't make a recommendation, but just know that that might be looked at with the board of ops this next time.

Korban Lee:

My comment to that would be it'd need to go back through the trustees finance committee. The assessment formula was hotly debated for a year last time we went through this and we did go through multiple different iterations of the formula and the pros and cons of each.

Jeff Carr:

And I suspect why you guys came to that is a bit of a compromise. It gives everybody a little something and I understand. I just think it's not wise to be looking at our bills and trying to decide, well, how can I figure out my folks don't check out with dispatch, I don't get charged. I just don't think that's a good officer safety practice, but I understand all things. When we looked at it before I remember it's like, well show me how much it costs and then we can talk and it's like, well, let's talk about the methodology first. So I understand that. Those are the big things. Elyse, do we have anything else that you remembered, those are the ones I highlighted anyway to talk about.

Elyse Haggerty:

We have come to a consensus with Salt Lake City and Sandy police call types. We've cut the list down significantly and we have finally got them to agree to put timers. Currently, there were calls like a stabbing just occurred, didn't have a code for check timer, which is insane, right? So now all priority one and priority two calls will be a four-minute timer. All of our agencies are allowed to suspend, so is Sandy. Salt Lake's concern is their officers can't suspend their code four checks, but that's a policy problem within their police department, not with the dispatch centers. So what's safest for the whole is those four-minute timers.

Jeff Carr:

I think we're going through some growing pains with realizing that the system used to be Salt Lake and the county and now it's everybody's and everybody's got a seat at the table. We're trying to figure out policy decisions and we're working through those things.

Elyse Haggerty:

The only other thing is I added it to the meeting notes which will go out to the entire ops board. If anyone is interested, I have started getting some statistics on the admin calls that we are now tracking. So if you'd like, I can send that out.

Korban Lee:

You just have three weeks or so of that? Three or four weeks of data?

Elyse Haggerty:

About six weeks now. And there are definitely contenders that are much higher than other agencies, so if you're interested, please feel free to reach out to me. I can give you the number just so you have a basic idea already.

Nathan Cherpesci:

I just suggest we send that out to the trustees and we don't need to ask for it. Let's just all see it so it's not dribbled in and out. I would just ask that it just be sent to all of us.

Korban Lee:

I agree. I was going to go a step further and say if you want to put it on the agenda for next month's report, by next month you'll have nine, 10 weeks of data. Will you put that on the agenda for next month's meeting?

Jeff Carr:

That's all I have.

Korban Lee:

Thank you Chief. Very good. Let's go to the fire ops, Chief Evans.

Matt Evans:

As chiefs, we want to start off and welcome Ivan as our new director, so we appreciate that and we're looking forward to working with you as chiefs. Fire training's been going on with VECC. Each department has been inviting VECC to come out and do some training with us on Hot Tuesdays and it sounds like they're having fun at it and it's going to be a good thing for them to see how we work. So that's been going on. iSpy has been rolled out to a lot of the departments. I think all the chiefs have it. It'll be a neat addition. Guys can track that on their phones, they can see where their calls are. It's got a mapping thing and everybody in the valley will have that iSpy and VECC has provided that for us.

Korban Lee:

Chief, you said it's starting to roll out, they kind of run out one agency at a time or how does it work?

Matt Evans:

No, it rolled out to all the Chiefs, now it's up to the chiefs when they want to put it out to each one of their staff and we put it out to all of our VCs right now to try it and it seems to be working good. It's been being used down in Utah County for quite a while. Let's see, priority one and priority two agreements. We do have a presentation ready to go. You should have all received an email just recently here from Trustee Dobson. There's going to be a meeting on the 26th at one o'clock, either Zoom or at Draper City. Clint and Trustee Dobson are going to probably present that presentation and we'll have discussion on it. I think we'll just have discussion on it and then we'll probably bring it back, but we are looking forward to moving on and getting this going because I think it's only going to be better for the dispatchers and each city. So that discussion, and that's about it.

Next month at the user meeting there will be a joint police and fire and they are going to be talking about the SWAT standbys and that kind of stuff to see what each department is doing and how they're going to be doing the standbys because it sounds like right now that every department does it a little bit different and so I don't know if they're going to try and make it standard, but we'll talk about that next at the joint meeting there. So that's all we have for us. Any questions?

Korban Lee:

Thank you. Does anyone have any questions for Chief Evans? Anyone online? David Dobbins, any further comment on the upcoming meeting?

David Dobbins:

Yeah, just let me know if you're interested. Several of you have already responded and we'll try to get everyone in the same room to have that discussion and get a final recommendation to the board.

Korban Lee:

Good. Thank you for setting that up. Okay, thanks Chief.

Chief Evans:

Thanks.

OPERATIONS REPORT

Korban Lee:

Let's go to the agenda item five, operations report. Elyse, let's turn the time over to you.

Elyse Haggerty:

Great. So Clint just very kindly pointed out to me that I already put the admin calls on this printout, but this is about three weeks ago is when I pulled the report, so I'll just continue on adding that. We didn't hit either of our numbers and I checked today for this month and there's a strong possibility we're not going to meet them again. I've given you all the numbers. It's not that we took significantly more calls. Part of it could be that we're tracking the admin and so they're taking an extra minute or two. However, our practices, if you're on an admin call, you tell them I have to put you on hold for a 911. That has been a bit of a struggle for some of our employees and so we're working through that. Our supervisors and commanders are watching.

Korban Lee:

You struggle because the employees are reluctant to put someone on hold to answer 911?

Elyse Haggerty:

Everyone has differing opinions about it. That they're going to get in trouble for bad customer service because the person already has waited seven minutes to get their admin call picked up and now they're being placed on hold. We're explaining that as it is right now, the 911s have to be answered, the admin calls, we don't want them to wait, but if there's a 911. Yesterday I had up in my office and was watching and I'm sure you've all read the news, there was a mass casualty incident in Salt Lake City, so they were all calling us and several times I looked up and eight people were on 911 calls and two, three, four holding. I don't know how to fix it other than more call takers. It's frustrating for them. People are starting to become very overwhelmed with the non-stop. They're taking call after call, hundreds of calls a day.

So I'm really, really excited that Ivan will be here next month to help me share this news because it is a huge disappointment and our people are doing everything they can. So we took 17,000 last month. I checked again, I can't remember what the total number of calls so far this month, but it's similar and the admin lines going down really slammed us because people were then just calling 911, which we wanted to get those calls. We were trying to take care of it. Salt Lake City and Central and Weber all pitched in to help us. Salt Lake City especially. I'm glad that we've kind of worked on that relationship because they were handling anytime we were getting a call from someone that spoke a different language, we were conferencing them in with Salt Lake City and because we have a consortium CAD, they were able to put the calls in for us. So still it was a beautiful example of how the system should work and how we want it to work. We just don't want the phones to break again.

Korban Lee:

The admin calls going down, is that reflected in these numbers or will that be reflected in next month's numbers?

Elyse Haggerty:

The overall number of calls will drop significantly with two days of, no, it's hundreds and hundreds of calls.

Korban Lee:

Right, but we'll see that next month.

Elyse Haggerty:

I put the admin on here so I'll just continue to do that for you all. As you can see, it's still so close. We're talking about it every week in our commander meetings. We're talking about it on the floor with all of our staff. Every supervisor is working with their team of employees, they're meeting with them, going over how to put them on hold, going over ideas on how to make that more comfortable. It's not something we just have our fingers crossed that it gets better. We really are actively working to accomplish this goal. The transfer rate is again 6.8, which is above the 2% that we are allowed by UCA, but once we get rid of those DPS calls, it's below 1%. So we'll be hitting our target every month. We've just got to get rid of the highway patrol calls, which there was

successful testing this week. So the information got pushed to highway patrol. So we were able to push a call to Highway Patrol and Highway Patrol was able to push the call back. They're getting all of the detail. They're getting enough for us to now move forward next week and start doing the CAD-to-CAD.

Clint Jensen:

Testing was successful.

Elyse Haggerty:

I know. Don't get excited.

Korban Lee:

Is it really happening next week?

Elyse Haggerty:

I really feel like they're terrified of us because we all have crazy eyes when we talk with them. It's just this is so important and it has been, 2019 was our first meeting to address the CAD-to-CAD and I'm not sure where Salt Lake City is on this, but Jonathan has been doing all the work to get it to work. So do we know if they're-

Jonathan Bridges:

Just real quick, going back, I'll touch on the Salt Lake thing. So the end-to-end testing as Elyse said was working yesterday. We had successful testing, which was a little bit of a relief. There's one fine-tuning detail that still needs to be worked out and Erin and I sent the information to Versaterm this morning on that. So their engineer is going to work with Central Square to get that last little piece worked out. But as Elyse said, the portion that we have to have the core functionality is ready to go. I have asked them to target Tuesday when we have our next full team meeting together for that to be our go live.

So that's our target right now, is Tuesday. That way if there is anything that happens that we're not planning on or is unforeseen, we'll have all of the teams together because that's when we do our normal weekly work session. So Salt Lake City, same CAD. The way we're building the process, anybody who takes the call will be able to transfer a call to UHP.

Korban Lee:

Anybody in VECC or Salt Lake City can transfer to UHP?

Jonathan Bridges:

Yeah, so from that perspective, they haven't had to be involved in the building process, but when it comes to using it, they'll be able to do the same thing we do.

Korban Lee:

Will you send all the trustees an email? We've been talking about this for five years. When you flip the switch on Tuesday, will you send the trustees an email saying we did it, we've met this statutory deadline, we've made the switch.

Elyse Haggerty:

And hopefully next month in my report that number will be lower to see us on the right track, at least. Abandoned, still below the 11%, the total count. So while we only took 17,911 9-1-1 calls, we still have the additional almost 42,000 admin calls, which is what is keeping us very, very busy. I think that's all I have. Any questions?

Jeff Carr:

When we call them admin calls, obviously some of those are more like switchboard stuff that we're trying to reduce, but there's also people, we encourage people to call into that number that need a police officer or whatever, but it's not emergency, right? So is there a way for us to tell the difference between those two general categories?

Elyse Haggerty:

We might have better data once we've had the year of documenting all the admin calls, the true admin. The I need to talk to South Jordan records. Okay, hold on one second. We'll transfer you. But we do encourage people, that's not really not a 911 emergency, please call us on our non-emergency number and plenty of them are those as well.

Korban Lee:

Trustees, any other questions for Elyse? Elyse, you do have on the table administration calls. These numbers we're seeing, is that for, it looks like-

Elyse Haggerty:

It's for two and a half weeks I want to say.

Korban Lee:

Okay, that's for two and a half weeks. I was saying that's not jiving with the 40,000 number.

Elyse Haggerty:

No, and it won't. Because Chief is right. Our admin calls are calls that go to 840-4000. They range from a lot of times our elderly callers don't want to call 911, but they have woke up and their spouse is deceased next to them. I've taken those calls on non-emergency numbers. I feel like it's very generational. A lot of elderly people are looking up the 10 digit number and calling us even when it is probably emergent. But those come in on non-emergency lines, which is why it's so important to us that we're answering those in a timely fashion because you do occasionally get emergencies on the non-emergency line, someone trying to help you, and just call 911. And then we have, I need an officer to come out here and talk to my neighbor because they're mowing a strip of my lawn and I don't like the way it looks and I have a neighbor dispute. That's not something we're just transferring off. We have to take the information and document it and send an officer.

Korban Lee:

Elyse, what I'm trying to understand is the admin calls listed here, the sum of all those calls is, I don't know, around a thousand or so for two weeks worth of data. But we have 41,653 total non-emergency calls that came into VECC. So in two weeks there were 20,000 calls that came into VECC non-emergency. There's about a thousand listed here. I'm just trying to understand the other 10 to 19,000, what are those?

Elyse Haggerty:

Those are very specifically, I need to talk to records department. I want to talk to the fire station and say thank you. I want to talk to the Chief. Those types of questions where normally we would just transfer them and no one would ever even know we handled that call. So now we're documenting those as an admin call. They get cleared out immediately. Officers are not responding on any of them, at the other 40,000 truly are possible emergencies or non-emergent need police assistance or need fire assistance. So there are calls that not only are we handling them, but our responders are being dispatched on them.

Tim Tingey:

So the data, when we get the data, say we get two or three months, are we going to get the 40,000 so we have an understanding or will it just be honed in on probably if you have four weeks, 2,500 calls.

Elyse Haggerty:

So that number will never match the admin number because 99% of our non-emergency calls are calls for service. That 1% are the ones that we've just been handling this whole time and documenting in no way.

Korban Lee:

So the 99% that are non-emergency of the 41-42,000, they're listed here as non-emergency, but they're still calls for service so they're still going into the CAD system.

Elyse Haggerty:

Yep.

Korban Lee:

Okay, now I think I'm following you.

Jeff Carr:

That's why I questioned the term admin because they're really not registering type calls. Those are.

Elyse Haggerty:

Yes.

Jeff Carr:

But we still have a large number of calls coming into the Center where they need services, it's just not 911 services. It might be I got my bicycle stolen.

Korban Lee:

Yeah, right. Dead animal on the side of the road. So of the non-emergency calls though, most of those, the vast majority of those were already going into CAD and hence when member agencies are assessed based on call volume, that was already factored in previous.

Elyse Haggerty:

Yes.

Korban Lee:

Gotcha. Okay, now I think I'm following better.

Nathan Cherpesci:

Korban, so I'm clear the call volume we're using to assess our fee includes these non-emergency calls that are not administration?

Elyse Haggerty:

Sorry, will you repeat that? It includes which calls?

Nathan Cherpesci:

So the 41,000 a month of non-emergency calls, you've got some that are administrative, but then these other ones you just said they're part of our allocation, they're going into that. I just want to understand that.

Elyse Haggerty:

Yes, they're already a part of your assessment.

Korban Lee:

In member agencies, our assessment portion assessed based on call volume, that's not just 911 calls, that's 911 calls and attributable calls for service. And prior, it was a lot of calls for service that were non-emergent but attributable and now we're putting in even these more administrative calls into a CAD record to be able to attribute them to different agencies.

Clint Jensen:

To pick up the rest of them.

Tim Tingey:

But hypothetically, if you got rid of these, say this problem got solved, it's not going to significantly change anything related to the challenges that we're having with call and answer times and things such as that. Correct?

Elyse Haggerty:

No, it's too small of a number. However, it is the first pull of the information and people are not remembering every time because this is a whole new practice to actually generate a call. So things as simple as can you transfer me to the records department? They're so used to just click the button, okay, I'll transfer you. Hold on, thanks, bye. They don't even process. That's a learned habit and so it'll be interesting to see in another month how much the numbers go up. But currently at this one, now, West Valley is at 487 admin calls. Those are just simply hold on for records, hold on for the desk officer, hold on for streets. We get calls of, I need to talk to the streets department. Okay, which city? Look it up, send it over. I think the numbers are going to get bigger. I can't imagine it's going to be huge, but when we're handling these types of calls and all of our record calls, all the tows and city hooks and PPIs, all of those things contribute to someone being on the phone not answering 911.

Korban Lee:

Other questions? Dustin, you good? I want to make sure we're getting all the trustees online. I'm seeing some head nods or some head shaking. Any other questions? All right, let's keep going, Elyse.

Elyse Haggerty:

I'm done.

Korban Lee:

All right. Thank you. Clint, let's go to you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Clint Jensen:

I think most of my stuff in the executive director report we touched on. CAD-to-CAD, telephone system issues. The rest of that, not a lot happening. We still continue to work with Salt Lake 911. They have made some

changes I think will be beneficial to us when it comes to the CAD. They've had some personnel reassignments, so that's a good thing and I think we helped move that along. So that's been good. The rest of these I think we've talked about, so nothing additional on that. I did include a copy of the legislative report from the Spatafores. These are the bills that mostly impact 911 or PSAPs. The biggest for us at the moment is going to be the procurement code amendments that will basically put inter-local agencies like us under the state procurement code.

And so we will just fall in line with that rather than trying to create our own procurement code. And I think since a couple of years ago we've been following that anyway for the most part. Our defaults always been state contracts always great, but we always like to keep them on us and double check and make sure that we're still getting good value for that. So I don't see that being a huge impact on us, but it prevents us from having to go through and create our own procurement code. We just refer to the state. Any questions on that part of it, legislative report or anything in my executive summary?

Korban Lee:

Anyone online? Any questions of Clint thus far? Are there any questions about his executive director report? Thank you.

FINANCE REPORT

Clint Jensen:

Okay, so this is what I really like to talk about is the financial piece. And so this report, just so you're aware, I updated it to include the amendments that were made last board meeting. So little grayed numbers are adjusted, budget amounts that you guys approved last meeting. You can still see the numbers are still coming in strong. Just a reminder on the franchise taxes, there is a two-month lag on that. This month we collected almost 750,000, so this continues to be a strong number that's coming in. So once we get to the end of the year, that all catches up, I suspect we're going to be even slightly higher than this budgeted number. So that's a good number. Interest income continues to be strong.

Then on the expense side, we had adjustments to the office supply budget for the chairs. This general administrative budget was adjusted for the mental health grant and we have started that program this month. So things are moving forward with that. And the equipment/facilities budget was increased by 400,000. We have received bids on the roof, looked like that's going to come in between 325 and 350 by the time we do the lightning suppression, that needs to be replaced and re-certified, but that's going to be a good thing for us. All of the other line items are kind of as expected. We're 67% of the budget and we're about 65% spent on year to date. Next page is cash summary and then I've got a check register in there and I'd be happy to answer any questions on those items.

Korban Lee:

Any questions about the budget? Any part of the financial report? Trustees online, any questions?

Rosie Rivera:

So as you know with the split with UPD and the sheriff's office, we're still not sure which jurisdictions are going with either or, and the numbers could change. So I see the way the budget is presented today, but that could change. Is that going to be reflected on the next monthly meeting or how is that going to work?

Clint Jensen:

Yeah, so Sheriff, what I would do, so right now I budgeted based on what we know and today I hope that the board will adopt a tentative budget and it is just that. It is tentative, it provides opportunity that the board can adjust as we take a 30-day period to review and make it publicly available and all of that. If something happens

in the next 30 days and we come back and adopt a final budget, then we would hopefully have answers from UPD and the Sheriff on what entities are going where and we can adjust accordingly. That would just basically be the difference between UPD and your office as to who would share in those costs. If it goes beyond that, it doesn't mean we can't come back and amend the budget after it's adopted, but that's kind of the steps to making any changes.

Rosie Rivera:

Okay. I just wanted to make you aware though, that the Sheriff's office is planning on staying with VECC, but the Sheriff's office law enforcement Bureau has seeked out a bid from Salt Lake City as well for those units. So just wanted to make you aware of that.

Clint Jensen:

Okay, so that would have an impact on the overall budget then. That's what this next 30 days, hopefully we can resolve most of that before we adopt a budget. If we even get into April and we don't know and the board wants to push it to May, as long as we have a budget adopted by June 30th, that's the law, but we'd certainly like to have it done before then.

Rosie Rivera:

Okay. And we're trying not to hold everybody up, but with the townships not making decisions very quickly, it's impacted our decision making and everybody else's. So I just want to apologize for that, but we're doing our very best to speed that along.

Clint Jensen:

Okay.

Korban Lee:

Any other questions? Okay, Clint, let's go on to the next agenda item.

Clint Jensen:

Tim, do you want to kick us off on this?

Tim Tingey:

Yeah, we discussed this last time and talked about the finance committee recommendations and we also discussed in the last meeting moving forward with the tentative budget at this meeting with consideration in April of the budget or finalization of the budget. Why don't you go into the specifics?

Clint Jensen:

Yeah, so last month we talked about some of the big ticket items. I will just highlight those again and you can see all the detail for the budget packet is there. I'd be happy to take a deep dive if somebody has a question. Big ticket items are this, and again, this doesn't look like big changes for example on the franchise fees because I've included the amended budget amount here. So even though it says it's a 0% increase, it's really a \$350,000 increase from what we had budgeted for fiscal 24, and that's the same holds true for the interest. We had only budgeted 50,000 here. We're budgeting 125 in fiscal 25. So overall on the revenue side we'll see a pretty healthy increase on the franchise taxes of 350,000 and then across the board a 3% increase in the assessments for the law enforcement and fire and as well as the contracted services with Salt Lake County.

You can see the assessments, how those are impacting individual agencies. Again, we'll see what happens between UPD and the sheriff and how this impacts them. Taylorsville for example, is having a decrease in their assessment and Draper is our high when it comes to their increase of 18.3%. They had about a 10,000 call volume increase for last year and so that kicked into this and made that number go up significantly. On the

expense side, and I'll just buzz through these then we can take deeper dives if we want to. The expenses for wages are increasing 3.7% in total. The bulk of that being cost of living of 3%. There are some step increases for some of our staff who continue to improve their skills and they qualify for step increases.

And then I've asked for some money to be set aside as we develop a program for a potential sick leave buyout. That's a \$75,000 amount that we will not spend until a program has been put into place. So if we can come up with a program that we all agree to, then that money would be available for that type of program. Payroll benefits, they're going up a little over 4%. Our health insurance, I think we've been about 8%. That's showing 8.6. On an annual basis we've had some, it's slowing down. We've had double-digit ones, so that's coming down a little bit. And then just some of the smaller ones. Workers' comp kind of bounces around a little bit, but overall 4.1% on the benefits. And then the rest of the expenses are actually going down. This is probably a little bit misleading because the software expenses going down and because of the UTA and University of Utah opting out of the CAD project, those expenses were picked up here. The revenue for that was picked up in pass-through revenues, so that kind of distorts the number a little bit.

You can see some of the amounts here. We're just refining some of these numbers. The equipment maintenance, it just bounces around, just depends on what kind of equipment we're buying. And then just smaller amount of increases and decreases here. This one, it shows that \$400,000 for the roof, so we are not re-budgeting that this year. So overall we're looking at a pretty solid budget that can then satisfy our debt service and our lease expense with no additional money is being budgeted to add to fund balance. At the moment, I'm projecting at the end of the fiscal year 24, which will be this June that we would have 1.8 million in our fund balance. That is in line with, maybe slightly above what we have been asked to do by the board of having 10% of our personnel costs, which 10% of personnel costs is about 1.6 million. So that's the 30,000-foot view and if you'd like to take a deeper dive, we can do it.

Tim Tingey:

If I may, Clint did you mention the RMS cloud or support?

Clint Jensen:

Glad you mentioned that. So this is something that's always been a little bit of a trouble spot for some. If you look in the body of the document here, we have the RMS for each of the entities. This is not included in the assessment. So if you're budgeting, budget for the assessment and budget separately, this amount for the RMS. And we usually bill you separately because we'll bill you your assessments twice a year. We'll bill you your RMS once a year. So make sure you pick up those numbers in your annual budgets.

Korban Lee:

Did the RMS pass through change at all?

Clint Jensen:

So it's just we inflated with the Versaterm contract, which they've typically been 5% a year. So in our Versaterm, when all Versaterm goes up 5%, it includes these items here. So there was a small increase in that.

Tim Tingey:

And remind me, the formula for this.

Clint Jensen:

It's based on the sworn officer count.

Doug Hill:

Can you tell me what page that's on in the budget document?

Clint Jensen:

Yep. Page 15.

Korban Lee:

Can we put a note in the budget document that this assessment is divided based on officer count, not based on the assessment formula that governs all the other costs.

Clint Jensen:

Yes. I can do that. Other questions? Any other things you'd like to look at or discuss?

Craig Giles:

This is Craig with Riverton City. I have a question on the employee compensation or the raises. I was looking at, we've looked like we've gone from a 40% turnover down to an 18. Do you guys feel good about what the increase you're proposing is for the employees and even closing that gap more?

Clint Jensen:

Well, that's a good question. We feel okay. I know it's always been a struggle to keep up with some of our neighboring agencies. I know Salt Lake City's probably a dollar or two more.

Elyse Haggerty:

Three.

Clint Jensen:

Or three. What's interesting is Salt Lake City employees still like to come work for us, so I think we have a good balance. I know in years past we would have mid-year adjustments to kind of help that along. I know Scott when he was here, we would approach the board with that. That's a good question. We haven't really considered that as part of this budget.

Dominic Burchett:

I have a couple of questions. The first one is something that Elyse said when she was giving her report on meeting the standard for answering time. She said that the employees are doing everything they can and the only way to meet it is to add more call takers. So was that part of the discussion? Are we in a spot where we need to add more call takers to meet the standard? Seeing the numbers over the last couple of months trending in the wrong direction is concerning to me. And I just wondered if adding more call takers is a solution or if that was part of the conversation. So that's question number one. And then number two is on overtime, do you feel like there is enough room there? Looking at this year you're a little past the 67% on that and then with the 3% COLA, is that reflected in what you have budgeted for overtime for next year and you feel good about that space?

Clint Jensen:

I'll address the overtime one first because I think what we've done with bringing UKG online is helping us to control the overtime better than we've ever been able to. So it used to be that some people might just show up and they want to work overtime and somehow they find a way to work them in. Now we work that through the software and there's a lot more control. Elyse is actually going out and deleting people who think they can come in and just take overtime. So I think that the overtime will be okay. We're inflating that a little bit just because of the inflationary pressures on wages. So I feel pretty good about overtime. When it comes to new staff, that's always a hot potato. When we started the budget process and we were bumping up right along those 95%, 90%, we felt like if we could just get fully staffed, we might get there and we always seem to be

down four or five employees as we currently are. And just when we get close to being fully staffed, then four or five people leave. So that's part of it.

Part of it being the training takes a while for people to get competent and able to turn them loose. So that plays into it. Then we put a little money in there for this sick leave buyback. If we can encourage people not to wake up in the morning and they just have a down day, if they're really sick, we're not wanting them to come in. But if they just feel like they need a day off, maybe they would think again if there was some option for them. So don't know if that's answering your question. Elyse can certainly, she would love to have probably a whole bunch more people, but we felt comfortable going into this budget without asking for more when we just asked for four last year and got them.

Elyse Haggerty:

Agreed. I will always take more people. But Clint is right, we've been down about four to five all the last eight months. We're currently preparing to hire another lateral group, which those people tend to train really quickly. It's just getting us fully staffed and it went down, the retention rate went down significantly. And really I think we've only had two people leave recent in the last six months for personal reasons. They had opportunities in their life to move on. We are much better at not prolonging the inevitable with new hires and we're kind of pushing them out before they become a larger issue. So a lot of our turnover has been from termination versus people leaving because they're miserable. There are always going to be some people.

Clint Jensen:

I think that's a good point on the 18% turnover that a lot of that's happening in the first six months rather than it's not a tenured employee that's been here for five or 10 years that's leaving unless they have a life event that they're moving to wherever or doing something different in their life. We had a couple that had babies and decided not to come back and that's expected.

Tim Tingey:

This may be subjective, so obviously you say that our competitor is paying a few dollars more, but we're having some come from our competitor to apply and work here, correct?

Elyse Haggerty:

We have two currently that both took anywhere from a \$2-\$3 pay cut to come work here.

Tim Tingey:

Do we have any idea what they're looking at as far as increases? They being our competitor?

Elyse Haggerty:

Yes, it's all public. So yesterday, because we have someone else that has applied and requested to move over here, 15 plus years of experience. I reviewed their contract. And it is very public that they pay their topped out employees after eight years of dispatching, they're making \$38-40 something cents. We have people who have been here for 20 plus years and are still making \$33.

Clint Jensen:

35 is our top. So three dollars-

Elyse Haggerty:

But they have to know how to do everything. They have to be able to dispatch police, fire, and take calls.

Tim Tingey:

So with a 3% COLA.

Clint Jensen:

That's another dollar on top of that.

Tim Tingey:

Okay. And then I guess they're probably proposing COLA as well. Okay.

Clint Jensen:

I think the other thing too, some of these that are coming over or talking about our benefits package. We are exempt from Social Security, so there is a contribution to a 401-A on their behalf. In lieu of that, the benefits for the health insurance and dental and some of the things that we're providing are superior and less costly. So I think there's the trade-off, if you really dig deep, it starts to balance.

Korban Lee:

The total comp value may be a lot closer.

Clint Jensen:

Maybe closer.

Korban Lee:

This is just the salary comparison?

Clint Jensen:

Correct.

Tim Tingey:

And based on that, probably, we're not losing a lot. We're gaining some to our competitor.

Clint Jensen:

Yes.

Elyse Haggerty:

We have not lost one to our competitor in the last two and a half years.

Tim Tingey:

Good to know.

Korban Lee:

Good questions. Anyone else have any questions?

Dominic Burchett:

The on-call pay, Clint, you've got 30,000 in there. In sub-account 41-30, does that need to be increased with the COLA as well or do you just kind of make it work between those line items to, currently you're like 52% on that line, so maybe there's enough room. Is that what you're thinking?

Clint Jensen:

There is enough room in that. So we're okay on that. I just left it alone.

Dominic Burchett:

Okay. My second question then is on, you mentioned, and we spoke about the behavioral health grant you received from the State. Is that program, what you're doing with that money, going to sustain you through this next year's budget? Or is there any necessary program that needs to be implemented on VECC's end with that, does that make sense?

Clint Jensen:

Yeah, so we hope that since we're starting it this month in March, that that money would last us until next March and that would give us an opportunity to get through all of our operations staff with a counselor that they could meet with, spend some time with. So that's where that expense is going. That should get us into next March and at that point then we would start having conversations on the fiscal '26 budget and we might continue that program if grant money is not available.

Dominic Burchett:

Did you get an opportunity to look at House Bill 378 and what implications that may have on you?

Clint Jensen:

I have not yet.

Dominic Burchett:

Okay. Those are all my questions. Thank you.

Korban Lee:

Good questions, Chief. Thank you. Anyone else online have any questions for Clint or for Tim or the finance committee? Okay, let's move on in the agenda. I want to thank Clint and thank Tim for chairing the finance committee. Thank you to the finance committee members for taking the extra meetings to consider and help with the preparation of the budget. Next item on the agenda, I'm looking for a motion to approve the resolution, 2024-02, adopting the tentative budget.

Clint Jensen:

This also establishes the place and time for the public hearing for the budget.

Korban Lee:

Yes.

Tim Tingey:

I'll make a motion to approve resolution 2024-02 regarding the tentative budget, which sets the public hearing on April 24th, 2024 at 2:00 P.M.

Korban Lee:

Who was that second? Sorry I missed that.

Bruce Kartchner:

Bruce Kartchner.

Korban Lee:

Thank you, Bruce. Okay. I have a motion by Mr. Tingey from Cottonwood Heights, a second by Mr. Kartchner from Bluffdale approving Resolution 2024-02, adopting the tentative budget and setting the public hearing for the next board meeting on April 24th, 2024 at 2:00 P.M. Let's 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. Giles, Riverton?

Craig Giles:

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?

Josh Collins:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Cherpesci, Herriman?

Nathan Cherpesci:

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.

Jodi Morris:

It's unanimous, Mr. Chair.

Clint Jensen:

Jodi, we have Bruce sitting in for Mark Reid if you wanted his vote as well.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Kartchner, Bluffdale?

Bruce Kartchner:

Yes.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Tim Tingey, to approve resolution 2024-02, adopting the tentative budget and setting the public hearing for the next board meeting, seconded by Mr. Bruce Kartchner; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SEARCH

Korban Lee:

Okay. Thank you. Let's go on. Agenda item eight. Report on executive director search. At the end of February, start of March, we did two days of receptions, tours, and interviews with five candidates to become the next executive director for VECC. Colin Benziger and Associates assisted with that search, presented us with candidates. As you know, we narrowed it down to five candidates at our last board meeting. We completed the interviews on Friday, March 1st. The interview was a three-step process with members of VECC and trustees doing different types of interviews. At the end of that interview process, the trustees determined Ivan Whitaker to be the top candidate through the interview process and through the vetting done by Benziger and Associates.

Subsequently, Tim, myself, and Clint met with Ivan and offered him the job, discussed terms of employment and worked with Scott Young to draft a contract for Ivan, which has been negotiated and agreed to and has been shared with the trustees. So with that introduction, now Ivan is here. I would like to solicit a motion from the trustees to approve the employment agreement for Ivan Whitaker and appoint him as the next executive director for VECC.

Tim Tingey:

I'll make that motion. Motion to approve the employment agreement for Ivan Whitaker.

Nathan Cherpesci:

Second.

Korban Lee:

Thank you. I have a motion by Mr. Tingey from Cottonwood Heights. Second by Mr. Cherpesci from Herriman. Jodi, will you give us a roll-call vote on this.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Lee, West Jordan?

Korban Lee:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Tingey, Cottonwood Heights?

Tim Tingey:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Giles, Riverton?

Craig Giles:

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?

Josh Collins:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Cherpesci, Herriman?

Nathan Cherpesci:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Kartchner, Bluffdale?

Bruce Kartchner:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Mr. Harrington, Taylorsville?

Mr. Harrington:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Chief Burchett, UFA?

Dominic Burchett:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Sheriff Rivera, UPD?

Rosie Rivera:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

Chief Evans, West Valley City?

John Evans:

Yes.

Jodi Morris:

That's unanimous Mr. Chair.

Korban Lee:

Thank you Jodi. All right. Ivan condolences and congratulations. It's official. Now quit sitting on the sidelines. Come sit up at the table and you're going to be front and center next meeting. For everyone's information, everyone who's on the call, Ivan's first day will be April 15th. We'll have our next trustees meeting the following week. Following our trustees meeting today, we invite everyone who can and would like to come meet Ivan. Spend a few minutes with him getting to know him here in the boardroom at VECC. Ivan, welcome. Congratulations. We are very excited you're here.

Ivan Whitaker:

I'm excited to be here, thank you.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Tim Tingey, to approve the employment agreement for Ivan Whitaker, seconded by Mr. Nathan Cherpesci; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

NO CLOSED SESSION/MOTION TO ADJOURN

Korban Lee:

The next item on the agenda is a possible closed session. I don't believe there's a need for a closed session. Scott, I'm looking at you. No. So I'm going to move on to agenda item number 11, discussion and consideration appointing the next board chair and vice chair. I asked that this item be tabled for one month. I've met with Tim on this item and asked that we pick up the appointment of a new board chair and vice chair next month. Is that okay with the trustees? Is everyone okay tabling item 11 until next month?

Tim Tingey:

Yes.

Korban Lee:

I'm not seeing anyone oppose. Nathan, you unmuted. Are you going to speak against that?

Nathan Cherpesci:

No. I think you're doing a great job and we could just continue having you do it.

Korban Lee:

I know, I know. Okay. Our next board meeting will be April 24th. Just an item of note that is not our traditional third Wednesday of the month. That is the fourth Wednesday of the month due to a city manager conference that will occupy the attention of most of the trustees on the third Wednesday of the month. So April 24th is our next board meeting. It is scheduled. You're always welcome here in person. It is scheduled to be one of our Zoom meetings. With that, I'm looking for a motion to adjourn our meeting today.

Dustin Lewis:

So moved.

Korban Lee:

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Lewis from South Jordan.

Scott Harrington:

Second.

Korban Lee:

Second by Mr. Harrington from Taylorsville. All in favor say aye.

Group:

Aye.

Korban Lee:

Stand adjourned. Thank you everybody.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Dustin Lewis, to adjourn the meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. Scott Harrington; the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.