

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
September 18, 2024 Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Korban Lee – West Jordan, Chair
Mr. Jared Gerber – Cottonwood Heights
Mr. Kevin Hicks – Riverton
Mr. Mike Barker – 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. Dom Burchett – UFA
Mr. John Evans – West Valley City

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Scott Harrington – Taylorsville, Vice Chair
Ms. Rosie Rivera – UPD
Ms. Gina Chamness – Holladay
Mr. Mike Morey – Alta
Open – Midvale

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Ivan Whitaker – VECC Executive Director
Mr. Tyson Montoya – VECC Deputy Director
Mr. Scott Young – VECC Legal Counsel
Mr. Robbie Russo – CHPD
Mr. Jeff Carr - SJPd
Mr. Terry Addison – SSLFD
Mr. Joey Mittleman – MFD
Mr. Derek Maxfield – WJFD
Mr. Craig Burnett – MPD
Mr. Brady Cottam – TVPD
Mr. Clint Smith – DFD
Mr. Ryan Carter – Riverton
Mr. Matt Evans – BFD
Mr. Dustin Dern – UFA
Mr. Chris Dawson – SJFD
Mr. Matt Evans – BFD
Mr. Troy Carr – HPD
Ms. Jodi Morris – VECC
Mr. Jonathan Bridges – VECC
Ms. Tammy Cornelison – VECC

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

Korban Lee:

Welcome everyone to the VECC Board of Trustees meeting for September 18, 2024. We're meeting primarily over Zoom. VECC Staff is in person at the VECC Center. Glad everyone's here. Let's start with the review and the consideration of the minutes from the August 21st board meeting. Does anyone have any changes they

would like to suggest, any edits or corrections from the minutes from last month? Seeing none, is there anyone that's willing to make a motion to approve the minutes from last month?

Josh Collins:

I'll make a motion to approve the minutes.

Doug Hill:

Doug from Murray, I'll second.

Korban Lee:

Great. We have a motion to approve the minutes from last week by Mr. Collins, a second from Mr. Hill. All in favor say aye.

Group:

Aye.

Korban Lee:

Anyone opposed? Ok. Great, we'll consider the minutes approved from the August meeting. Let's go on to the public comment portion of the meeting.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Josh Collins, to approve the minutes from the August 21st Board Meeting, seconded by Mr. Doug Hill; the motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Korban Lee:

This is an opportunity for anyone that would like to speak to the VECC Board of Trustees. First, is there anyone in person at VECC there, Ivan, with you and Tyson, that would like to speak?

Ivan Whitaker:

No, all clear here.

Korban Lee:

Is there anyone joining us online that would like to make a public comment? Okay, not hearing anyone, not seeing anyone unmute. We are going to close the public comment portion of the meeting and we're going to move on to agenda item number five, the operations board reports. We'll start with the police advisory board report from Chief Carr.

OPERATIONS BOARD REPORTS

Jeff Carr:

We met on September 12th up at Cottonwood Heights. Had a very, I think, a robust discussion on a couple of things and a good meeting. Ivan talked a little bit about the data review committee and looking for evidence-based data to come up with some dashboards and things. I think that would be very helpful for us. We also talked a little bit about case numbers and that maybe VECC was creating case numbers for things that didn't need to be creating them for. I think that kind of sent us down another track where we were also talking about

the whole budgeting process because the case numbers are still part of the funding formula, 50% of that. So, we had some discussion about that. But there was no appetite amongst the chiefs to bring anything forward to the trustees at this point. I think Ivan and his team are going to look at the case number issue or incident number issue. But on the other side of that coin is we want those incidents to be logged, and we can use those for reporting purposes as well. So, I don't know. It'll be interesting to see where that goes. And I think we'll be hearing some more from VECC on that.

We spent some time on the crash reporting update that is required by the State. So, with crash reports starting at the end of the year we have to submit those electronically. Versaterm is willing and ready to work on the update that is State mandated. The State has allocated about \$200,000 on a statewide basis for reimbursement for this project. But Ivan tells us our cost alone collectively is about \$150,000 for this project. He sent out notices to the chiefs to get an okay to move forward. We pretty much don't have a choice. It's state mandated. We are going to have to do that. And so we were asking all the chiefs to get back with Ivan with some kind of indication that we could move that forward. I think we will get some kind of reimbursement for that, but if there's only 200,000 for the whole state, we're certainly not going to get a dollar-for-dollar reimbursement off of what it's costing us, that's for sure.

We also talked about some of the other Versaterm requests that are more add-ons for people and how that could be costed appropriately and how much time that's taking for the VECC staff to do these optional projects. So, I think they're going to be bringing something to us on that. But they really wanted to just make sure that we're coordinating with the VECC staff to ensure that that gets done in a timely manner and that doesn't hold up VECC personnel that are working on other projects. Ivan indicated that he's also looking at a Tableau First Watch which are vendors that can be used to extract information from the Versaterm system and do dashboards and things that will help us so that was positive. There was an issue that came up, and I'm not sure I totally understand this yet, but when a call comes into VECC that is medical in nature, if it's not coded as a full arrest, or if it's just coded like a breathing problem, then it doesn't auto-generate something for the police side. So, they're not going to respond. I guess apparently there was a call or two where this became an issue, where it actually was a full arrest, but the police didn't know about it. They may have been closer than fire, that kind of thing. So, we're working through that now. And if somebody's got more information on that from the VECC side that needs more clarification than I can give, chime in. But the thought process was that we need to make sure that we don't miss something where a police officer may be close, but it's gone to the fire side, and it's a real critical call. So that's the gist of it. I'm sure there's some more technicalities that they'll be working through, but we talked about that.

The last thing that I was going to bring up was there was a proposal to change all of the canine officers in Salt Lake County on to a single numbering system. So, we had some discussion about that. There was a written proposal before us, but apparently it messes up Salt Lake City, who uses those K numbers for some of their like IBM numbers. There was actually a motion, which I can't remember the last motion we had in the ops board, but to just use our city identifier in front of the Kilo unit. And that's what everybody agreed on. So, we will be moving that forward. And I think that's probably it from our perspective for our report.

Korban Lee:

Thank you, Chief. Ivan, can anyone elaborate further on the issue about medical calls where we may need to dispatch police and fire?

Ivan Whitaker:

If we do it as a cardiac arrest, then it will get dual responses automatically through the CAD. That's set up the right way. But if we put in a different nature and find out later that it's an arrest, law enforcement can easily be delayed because it's a manual process of adding them to the call. So, the CAD will do it based upon the nature of arrest automatically but if we found out later an update from a call to arrest, it's not automatically adding them so it could miss them. So, we're looking at from a technical standpoint how to make sure that if the call is upgraded or changed that they can get added. So, does that make sense, Korban?

Korban Lee:

Yes. Are you changing the protocols at all, or the questions asked to try to determine when someone's having

trouble breathing, if it is an arrest or not, or you're happy with the protocols and just working on the speed at which you add law enforcement on the back end?

Ivan Whitaker:

Good question. What we are trying to make sure of is that the protocol has the functionality that when we upgrade, and it needs an additional response that that response is automatically added. Today I can't tell you that the protocol can actually do that because it's a protocol/Versaterm interface issue and we're getting to the bottom of it.

Korban Lee:

Okay. Thank you. Any questions Trustees, any questions for Chief Carr? Okay. Chief, thank you. Let's move to Chief Evans, the Fire Operations Advisory Board.

Matt Evans:

Good afternoon. To start off with, Leslie reported on a data committee that's been put together. They're going to be collecting information that came out of the users group. The first data that they're going to be looking at is the CPR/full arrest calls to get this data to analyze a little bit. It's made up of other people from all around. And it sounds like they had a really great meeting, the first meeting that they put together and things worked out good. So, they'll be collecting this data and analyzing it and then going from there and reporting back to the users group. The users group also has a works session scheduled for September 26th. The focus of this session will be the following: routing, mapping, and areas of concern for response. That came from the users group.

Elyse reported that there has been an updated electronic dispatch feed form sent out to the users group on September 5th. They haven't received any feedback yet back from that, but that looks like that'll be a pretty good thing that we can electronically fill out and talk to the dispatchers. There was discussion brought up about the P25 switchover and the need for testing coverage in large complexes and warehouses. It sounds like they're going to be doing some more testing on that. It sounds like the cutover period is being delayed a little bit because of some programming issues. They didn't really come up with a new potential timeline. They were just saying that possibly the holidays and those kinds of things will impact that switchover. But more is to come from UCA on that kind of information.

Jonathan reported from tech users that VECC had identified some issues with messages with some of the cell phone carriers with primarily being T-Mobile and Comcast. It was determined that it was a carrier issue and not VECC. This was provided as information to the group. Sounds like they're working on that.

Chief Dern from UFA reported that he was working with Central Dispatch down in Utah County to address their ability to dispatch appropriate agencies for locations of calls for auto aid calls. They work off a 100% stacked system. This will involve other border agencies as needed. So, Draper and Lehi will also, Draper and Bluffdale will be involved in those dispatches along with UFA.

Ivan also reported that they are creating an ISO template for agencies to utilize when they're going through ISO review for common needs data provided by VECC. Sounds like the second week of November, VECC will be holding a disaster response tabletop for all VECC personnel. And they will look in to build on this and for training for future and involve other agencies in the valley. Any questions?

Korban Lee:

Anyone have any questions for Chief Evans? Chief, the digital radio, the switchover being delayed into the holidays now or later, does it matter to VECC? I know it might matter to individual agencies and their timelines, but does it matter to VECC if that's delayed?

Matt Evans:

I don't know. I think Ivan could probably answer that a little better if that's going to be an issue with you guys, with VECC.

Korban Lee:

Jonathan, I see you unmuting, how does it affect you? Do you care if it's going slow or fast, what UCA's timeline is?

Jonathan Bridges:

Yeah, as far as the timeline goes, we're going to do whatever we can to help them accomplish the cutover as soon as possible. The only concern is that the current radio system that we have is old. Parts are hard to come by. If a radio goes down, it's just harder for us to maintain those so for us, it's more of the logistics of getting the new system in so that the older radio equipment doesn't fail on us. But as far as the actual timeline, as long as we don't have any of the old current radios break, we'll work with them when they're ready.

Korban Lee:

Ivan, I don't know if you're going to speak to this in the executive director report, but at our last trustees meeting, there was some inquiry about Eagle Mountain dispatching through VECC, having all of the UFA calls route through VECC, including those in Eagle Mountain. At the meeting, we talked about that would have further study and then come back. Has that been further studied, or is that in process? Ivan, can you speak to that or Chief Burchett?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yeah, it's still in discovery right now. There's been no further progress since the previous meeting. Again, it's just a concept right now.

Korban Lee:

Okay. Anyone else with questions for fire? Okay, Ivan, let's go to you. Agenda item six, awards and recognitions.

AWARDS & RECOGNITIONS

Ivan Whitaker:

I'm very excited about the members that we have up that we're showing for a couple of reasons. One, you'll see that the top squad for the month of August for answering times is C squad. The reason that we're excited about that is because C squad has really been trying since we put this initiative in place to be top and then they finally made it in the month of August. So, we're very excited to recognize them and award them for their efforts and you'll see the correlation in their efforts and in the numbers in a moment here. These individuals that you're seeing are not necessarily on C shift. So, while C shift will be recognized as the top squad you have these individuals Monica, Tiffany, Sam, Pyper, Nora, Chentelle, Telisa, and Juan. They all were the top performers in call taking across the dispatch center regardless of shift in the month of August. So, each of them will be recognized. They have been recognized and we're very excited at their performance. A couple of these individuals are actually new hires that are a few months out of training that have really stepped up to meet the demand. So, congratulations to those individuals.

We actually have a few employees of the month Jonathan, which is on the call now, one of the things that we wanted to do was formally recognize Jonathan. I know Jonathan is selfless in his approach and wouldn't take the credit, but the CAD-to-CAD interface has been huge. The transfer percentage was about 8% from agency to agency, far above the state mandate. And his work and effort, not just over the past few months, but over the years, has got us to a point with Central Square and Versaterm to where we're meeting the mark at the state level. And so, not only just the CAD to CAD, but he has numerous projects that are going on right now. Not only is he running a department, but he's also serving as project manager for many of these projects as well. And so, Jonathan, thank you for your support and everything that you've done thus far. You're a true rock star. Did you want to say anything, Jonathan?

Jonathan Bridges:

Thank you. The opportunity to work on these projects is great. I know there have been some significant pain points along the way with some of them, but like you said, though, it's not just me. It's like everybody on the team back here has just given their hearts to this organization and everybody's working really hard. And I couldn't be more proud of the team that I'm on and of our organization and for the forward thinking that we're going through. And I'm excited for the future of where we're going. Thank you for the accolade. I appreciate it, but it really is deserving of the larger team. So, thank you.

Ivan Whitaker:

And then we have Meghan. Meghan has really stepped up to help train our dispatchers or communications officers and so just she's been dynamic not only are her people clearing and soloing but they're actually thriving when they actually complete their training and so she just was a no-brainer in selecting her for employee of the month and then we have one more and that is Heidi Bell. Again, she's one of those trainers that have really stepped up and have allowed us to do some neat things with our training program. We've acknowledged these three individuals. They received an award and just we're so proud of their efforts in the month of August.

Korban Lee:

Thank you, Ivan. Meghan, Heidi, Jonathan, thank you for your hard work and your dedication at VECC. Thank you for setting a great example and serving very diligently. Ivan keep going. Let's go to the tow services presentation.

TOW SERVICE PRESENTATION

Ivan Whitaker:

So, this was brought to me when I first arrived, but I wanted to kind of pause on it to get some more information through discovery and I think we're there now as far as what we want to propose for our tow services. We're talking about what we want to do for tow services as a part of VECC, as a part of the consortium, and for our public safety agencies. We want to start with the gaps of what we're experiencing right now. Right now, VECC is processing about 66,000 tows. The average in the amount of time to process those tows are about seven minutes. So the quickest we can get those processed is about three minutes, but we've seen upward of 11 to 12 minutes in the processing of those tows. And if you think of it, it's just like processing a call, whether it's a non-emergency call, but it's still a call that's added to our system that requires personnel hours. We're also seeing that because of the way we're doing business right now, the field officers, they're spending about 15 to 20 more minutes than what they should be based upon modern processes or technology. So, we want to put that time back in the system and so we want to present this today. Why now? We're at a point where the consortium as a valley, we're all united on the same CAD. We're through the Versaterm interfacing that we set out to do some years ago. We also know that this provides a technical solution and a process that will help us in the future. We know that we continue to rise across the nation, about 3% in call volume and we want to make sure that we have contingency plans or plans in place to be able to deal with that call volume. Also, liability concerns of wrecker rotations. I've heard quite a few stories about some issues and challenges with those vendors and then we've already gone through a two-year vetting process, so this is not something where we've been chasing the shiny bubble this is something that we've really taken our time to look at and it started with Scott, the previous director, which I believe did a great job with this.

And so we've looked at a few potential vendors. We've done our due diligence. There's one other vendor in the valley, but the size of that particular vendor, the number of individuals that they have on staff and kind of their portfolio, we don't think that it's a good fit based upon our call volume. And so we've really taking a look at Autura which has risen to the top as far as vendors that could potentially serve our needs with that. Autura has their own dispatch center, it's called ARIES dispatch and again those non-emergency calls that we're taking because of tows that would actually go to their dispatch center and so that's one of the reasons that they're

unique is other vendors really don't have their own dispatch center that could manage those calls during the day at night and also act as customer service if there's issues and challenges and we'll talk about that in a moment.

We also want to drive down as I mentioned the response times of the tow trucks and some of the ways that we're doing things right now. We've had an elongated process before we can even get to notifying the vendor and so we want to make sure that we can drive that down and put officers available back in service quickly. And then real-time tow data and so that's another thing that we're missing right now to where if we want to see our frequency or the distribution of the data and how we're faring, we want to be able to see that, but also we want the officers to be able to see in real time the processing time, when they will arrive, where they are. They'll be able to see all of that at their fingertips. I just mentioned the robust analytics. There's also an integration available, and so we checked the other vendors, and there's no integration available to be able to have case numbers for those particular calls in our CAD system. And also, Autura has had a partnership with UHP and that partnership seems to be flourishing. UHP has some great things to say about Autura. These are some of the statistics that we have at our fingertips because that partnership was in place. And so, before Autura, it's about 45 minutes per tow that the officer could expect as far as the response time of a tow and that has been dropped to 20 minutes. Thinking of the time that it would take to get that officer back in service, that's a huge amount of time per call. So, the average response time or request time is about 1 minute that they know that that request is going through, it's taking us much longer to get that request through. They're getting ready to roll this out stateside and you'll see that they're managing a rotation about 50 plus wreckers right now. So through UHP, Autura has the experience needed for us to feel comfortable that we can pull this off.

One of the things that we wanted to show is a couple of examples of how a call, a tow could be processed. So, they could come up with the radio of the officer and access the ARIES dispatcher or they can enter it in their MDC smartphone or tablet based upon that agency's wishes of how they wanted to move forward. So, there's a variety of ways to do this but essentially, they can put out their phone and request a tow very simply. The interface will allow that data to be able to transfer into the app and so again they wouldn't have to type in address information or case information. That would seamlessly dump over and so that's one of the reasons we're excited about Autura is because of that interfacing. And then it's intelligent and so they'll know exactly where that tow is there are no time frames to where I think that they're lacking with that right now. So, you'll see kind of the new process at the top. I won't go through each of those line items, but the new process puts us at about 13 minutes. That is from the time the request happens to the time the tow actually arrives. You'll see the manual process below which puts us at about 45 minutes and so if we contract with the Autura of course one of the things in going into the annual contract that we can do is make sure that we meet those time parameters that we're talking about today.

I just wanted to put up a lot of what we have with Autura that we wouldn't necessarily have with anyone else and that's if you start with the administrative assistance. If the officers in the field had issues with logins, they need advice management, any of that administrative assistant, Autura will handle all of that. And so all of those things that you see is all the things as far as the administrative assistance that Autura would provide the technical assistance and also ARIES dispatch support to where their dispatch center could provide real time support if there's an issue or a challenge. So I won't go through all of those. I can actually share this power point for anyone that wants to see it. But there's just a lot that come with their partnership.

I wanted to make sure that we spelled this out. I heard that there were some kind of some perceptions about this was a solution for dispatch and really wasn't a solution for the field. And I wanted to make sure that I brought that to light today to where this is indeed a solution for both dispatch and the law enforcement to where we're looking at decreasing what we're calling uncommitted time to where law enforcement would be more available for high priority calls. That real time data that they'll be able to see. So, while they're standing on the side of the road, they'll actually be able to see how quickly the resources will get there, direct communication with tow services, and so on. So, we wanted to make sure that you all knew that this is indeed a solution for VECC but also the field as well.

In order for me to get warm and fuzzy around this because I saw the initial quote and immediately told Tyson that we couldn't pitch that but once we started to wrap our head around what this would do for us from an FTE perspective I started to get warm to it because again looking at what it would put back in our system to

our system one of the things that we need to focus on and pivot is we need to focus on our management of non-emergency calls. We have to get those processing times a lot better on the non-emergency side, and anything that we can do technical without adding FTEs, I think we need to be looking at it. So, if you look at the law enforcement side, we're looking at across the valley, adding about 16,500 hours back into the system, which is equivalent across the valley, right? This is not going to be one agency, but across the valley of about eight FTEs. And so again, hoping that, and we'll be looking at this data we're requiring Autura to provide us with this data as well but we're hoping that this sticks and then on our side, we're looking at about 7700 hours and that's equivalent to about 3.7 FTEs and you'll see the cost of FTEs. If we try to do an FTE equivalent, it's about 300,000. Now, that 300,000 number is important and I'll show you because that's what we use in our negotiation of the price point.

We have a vetted implementation timeline. That timeline is about 60 days. I have another document that shows all the different tasks that are a part of the implementation plan. If anyone wants to see that implementation plan, I do have that available. Autura is also registered through the state as well, and so there's ways that we can actually move this forward and sole source this as well. So, this is what their first proposal was and through some negotiating and looking at again, the savings that we would have from an FTE perspective, we got them down to about 280K. I wouldn't propose 280K to you unless we had a plan on how we would fund this and so we'll talk about that plan.

So, there's legislation that allows VECC to bill tow vendors up to the cost of the software. Glad that that legislation is in place and so that billing model would allow VECC to work with the vendors not only partner with the tow vendors but actually charge those that want to participate a subscription fee. Autura would help with that as well and so were looking at recovering the majority of that of 280K. We think that we can get to roughly 100% but we've also left something in the model to where if even if we didn't recover, there's a risk of about 20% with this that we wanted to bake in but we think that we can get the majority of this covered and we think that that process would also clean up some of what we may be seeing from a liability perspective with some of the tow vendors that are being used. VECC would bill the vendors once a year. And the reason that we would do it that way is because that allows us to be accurate so we can see the actuals and bill accordingly. And then VECC has already coordinated a 60-day implementation to where this just couldn't be anything that resulted in a multi-year project. It just couldn't be. So again, we're making sure that they can adhere to that 60-day implementation. So these are some of the large systems that they're in. This is what some of this made me warm and fuzzy to be able to do this proposal to where you're seeing the number of tows we were a lot more than any of those but at least they have the infrastructure in place to be able to handle a call a high volume.

Korban Lee:

Any questions for Ivan?

Doug Hill:

I'm just trying to understand how this would affect Murray City's procurement process that we are currently using for selection of towing companies. Would we still use our procurement? Would you be able to use the people that we want you to use or would the company Autura be able to use the companies that we want you to use or would that be taken completely out of Murray's hand and now put in the hands of Autura?

Ivan Whitaker:

No, it would be based upon the companies that you want us to use and so during the implementation process that is one of the things that we would have to meet with you to make sure that you're comfortable with those tow vendors that are in the process. So Autura would just come in and use the existing vendors that are in place.

Tyson Montoya:

The only way that they would be pulled out of the rotation, Doug, is if they didn't pay. They're vetted, they're in your system, it's likely if they're paying you, they're likely going to pay on behalf of you. So that would be the only situation where they would be pulled out of a rotation.

Doug Hill:
Thank you.

Korban Lee:
Good question, Doug. Other questions?

Brady Cottam:
So can you just explain, because I know that some of the other companies that we've, the one that West Jordan is using, I believe right now, or they've done a trial and error with, they were obviously a lot cheaper, and I can't remember their name off the top of my head, but they had a similar, I mean, I've never heard it presented this way to where essentially we're billing the tow companies, which is nice, obviously, in the fact that we don't have to maybe cough up the \$300,000, but do you know, are we going to get calls in regards to tow prices going up? When you mentioned that there's some legislation to help us with that, how does that work with the way we bill the tow companies and the way that the tow companies are going to basically counter this. Does that make sense?

Ivan Whitaker:
It does. So the vendor that you're talking about right now is called TowPro. And the challenge with TowPro is they just don't have a history of large agencies like us, as far as VECC and our volume. So that's one of the challenges. Also, they don't have the means to have an interface. And so, again, while it may work very well for an agency without that type of call volume it was challenging for us to get to where we thought we were comfortable with the volume. From the billing perspective, I think that we need to iron this out to make sure that from a cost perspective of what you're doing now is not impacted. Autura is willing to do that. The bigger piece is trying to work with those vendors that you already have in place and then meeting with them to again we don't think that this is going to be a huge cost for each of the vendors because there's about a hundred vendors in the valley that we're working across right now. So we're trying to work out the numbers as to what it would look like as we approach those different vendors. I probably didn't answer your question but we're still in the stage of trying to figure out what that monetary increase would be for those tow vendors.

Brady Cottam:
Have you had any conversation with any of the tow companies about this?

Ivan Whitaker:
No, we wanted to go here first so there are no rumors out there.

Korban Lee:
Thanks, Chief.

Jeff Carr:
Do we have any idea what the integration costs would be for the Versaterm piece of this?

Ivan Whitaker:
Not yet. So that's something that we know that we can implement this without the integration. The reason that we can move forward without the integration is because Autura has a website and that website for us if as individuals call in and need that information of where my tow is or whatever the case may be, we can refer them to the website. That's pretty simple. From the officer side, they can put it in until we actually get to the point of an interface being available and us being able to negotiate it. That's the thing that TowPro didn't have.

Robbie Russo:
I think we have the same concern as Mr. Hill. We choose our tow companies and we have them sign a contract with us. We do the backgrounds on them. We monitor them regularly to ensure they're drivers meet our standards and have valid insurance and no background issues, and we monitor their cleanup times and

response times and so forth. I'm not sure, how does this system replace that, and does it infringe upon that? We're pretty comfortable with the system that we have. They're unique to us, and we have unique challenges with mountain areas and things like that. But more importantly, it's the relationship that we have with the tow companies and our citizens. I'd be afraid to compromise that with people that I don't know or don't have an opportunity to pick or vet.

Ivan Whitaker:

And so those contracts would still be in play. Autura would work on your behalf to manage and take that work off of you. You'd still be very much involved in the process but the heavy lifting would come from Autura if you move forward with it. And so one of the things that Autura expressed is that they're very concerned about relationships and keeping those relationships that you have in place. I just want to make sure that I paint the clear picture. They would act as the call center removing that workload from VECC. That's the bigger piece, is they would be, not only would you have the technology, but that would be freeing us up in addition to your officers having that immediate access through the technology. So that is the difference.

Robbie Russo:

But that cost is passed on to either the victim of the crash or the person being towed. That's ultimately, correct?

Ivan Whitaker:

That would be up to the tow vendor. So, yeah.

Doug Hill:

When somebody calls VECC now, who is typically that person that's calling VECC? And how does that get handled on your side? Is it handled through a phone tree or is it handled by a dispatcher?

Ivan Whitaker:

It's usually the officer that's making the tow request.

Doug Hill:

Is there a special number that they would call to make that request? How are you guys handling them?

Ivan Whitaker:

So they call VECC and one of our emergency dispatchers, our call takers are actually handling that, arranging with the tow vendors. And that's what we're trying to get off of us right now. We want to try to move to strictly non-emergency 911 calls versus tows. And so, again, we're handling that entire process, that 45-minute process that you saw. The beginning of that, the majority of that is us arranging it with the tow vendor.

Doug Hill:

So under this new system, the officer would call Autura. They would have a list. In Murray's case of vendors that Murray City has approved and then they would use that list to contact a tow company?

Ivan Whitaker:

Well yes, it could work a couple of ways. They could request it via the radio, they could request it on their phone or any type of smart device and basically - I'm at this location, I need a tow. It's very quick. So much different than inundating the phone lines with that call and then us taking that next step. Autura would handle that entire management up front process.

Doug Hill:

And so if I heard correctly, the officer could make that request via some other way than a phone call.

Ivan Whitaker:
Exactly.

Korban Lee:

You can set my city to only call out certain tow trucks based on what tow truck vendors are on the rotation list in my individual city. Is that what you're saying?

Ivan Whitaker:

Exactly. And that's where I think I'm hearing some concern about relationships with tow vendors, but those relationships will still be in play. It's just you get access to the technology and also it takes that call, that physical up front, heavy lifting off of us.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I hear there's some concerns about the cost being passed on. How many tows a year are we handling now? Simply divide 280 by that, that's going to be about the average cost, right? Does anybody know what that number is? What amount are we talking about?

Korban Lee:

You're talking about \$4 a tow. 70,000 tows, \$280,000.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yep. It's not a lot of money.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Four bucks to get to save that much in the dispatch time and our officers time seems something to at least explore.

Doug Hill:

And Autura bills that? VECC doesn't do the billing, that's done by Autura?

Tyson Montoya:

No, we would pay it.

Doug Hill:

So when you say we would pay it, meaning VECC would pay the \$280,000 a year?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yeah, and then we would bill the tow vendors.

Doug Hill:

So is that adding additional work to your staff to have to track billing and collect on billing?

Ivan Whitaker:

It is, but the way it will work is Autura will provide us with the distribution annually. They have a report that they'll provide to us and then we'll bill annually based off of that distribution. So one of the things that we didn't want to do is do this monthly because that would be a heavy workload on us.

Korban Lee:

So Ivan, how does it work? So if a tow vendor doesn't pay their bill to VECC, do they then just, they're not listed on our Autura?

Ivan Whitaker:
Correct.

Korban Lee:

UHP is already using this. In this valley if Salt Lake City does this or doesn't do this, do we care? Is it more efficient if Salt Lake City's using Autura with their dispatcher also or can we get that 280 down if we jointly go in on this or is it pretty independent and it doesn't matter?

Ivan Whitaker:

I've met with Salt Lake City on this. I've talked to Lisa about this. They're interested but I don't think that that would move the 280 number. I mean we can try to go that route, but we've really beat them down to this.

Mark Reid:

I'm not a fan of annual billing. I think when you send someone an annual bill it takes the ones that are skating along with just barely making it and it puts them under. So I would support quarterly, but I think annually is a little tough for especially a tow vendor.

Tyson Montoya:

Mark, that's a concern that I had as well. Semi-annually or quarterly are options. The Autura interface is really pretty straightforward in terms of showing the number of tows, who it was. So from an administrative standpoint it does add a little bit to both myself and Jodi in terms of getting the overall billing situated but I'm not too concerned. Doing it annually is a concern. Doing it semi-annually or quarterly would be my preference as well. This is the initial discussion. Ivan and I have spoken about it. The monthly piece of it was a little bit too heavy of a lift right now, but you make a great point. And so, you know, this is why we wanted to bring this up is to get your input on this.

Ryan Carter:

Earlier in your presentation, I recall you providing examples of some other cities that you're looking at as kind of a way to kind of show as an example for what the direction VECC is going in. My question to you is, in those other cities that you've identified, is their model an apples-to-apples model with the way in which we handle things here? Because, you know, VECC being an interlocal entity with several member cities participating in it, each of these cities have their own relationship with these tow companies directly. Is that true for these other cities as well? I mean, I don't want to overstate the situation here, but this really, in my mind, Mr. Hill kind of had similar questions earlier in the conversation. This really kind of creates a question as to whether or not we should be looking at an altogether different model for doing this service. In other words, perhaps VECC would be willing to just take on the entire service and everything gets run through VECC and they have their own direct relationship with them entirely. What's your reaction to that initially? Thanks.

Korban Lee:

Ryan, that's a good question. Ivan, in your presentation you showed Austin, Las Vegas, San Diego, UHP, but are all those entities kind of single entity points of control for towing and tow rotations? Is there another agency similar to VECC where there's a dispatch agency serving multiple jurisdictions that's using this software?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yeah, I mean I can investigate that deeply. I paused during the question because I'm trying to if the model coming back to VECC, I'm just I want to make sure I understand the benefit of something like that versus getting it off of our plate and actually having more available time for processing other calls. But yes, I can go and do some investigation to make sure I take a deeper dive into their models as far as across jurisdictions or municipalities and how they're faring.

Ryan Carter:

Thanks for that. It just seems to me that we've just got a lot of moving parts and it may not be in VECC's

interest to do what it is I'm suggesting. I recognize that. But we should think through these issues because it does complicate our own RFP process to some extent. And West Jordan is an example of a city just came through kind of a difficult chapter in its history in its relationship with tow companies. So this is a sensitive issue, at least for me.

Korban Lee:

I'd be happy to hand off tow rotation issues to VECC. I'm kind of joking, but in seriousness, are we as cities, I'm looking at you trustees, are we as cities holding on to the tow rotation rather than have VECC doing a valley wide tow rotation because we like our individual requirements. For example, in West Jordan, one of the requirements was you had to have a tow yard within five miles of the boundary of West Jordan so that someone wasn't getting in an accident in West Jordan and having to go up to North Ogden to retrieve their car. Are there other, like, why do we have a dozen different co-rotation lists among a dozen different communities? Is it for things like that? Chief Russo, you talked about having special circumstances in Cottonwood Heights, being up near the mountain. Elaborate, I guess, trustees. Respond to that. Why are we managing all the different tow rotation lists individually at the city jurisdictional level?

Josh Collins:

I can speak for my city. I don't think we have a special interest in doing that. We do that because it's kind of what has happened. If we were offered a different approach, we certainly are not holding onto it with any sort of special interest. If someone else wants to take over that, we're not going to be crying about that.

Ryan Carter:

Yeah, we just recently updated our list because we realized that we were having problems with the way in which the list was being altered over time without our purchasing department knowing about it. There's lots of administrative headaches that can come concomitant with managing this whole thing. And this just seems to add to the list because right now I'm just going to remain concerned that the service that we provided had a fee with it. And if they basically tied together VECC's fee with the relationship that we had already set with them, you know, basically I feel like we just all need to approach our own tow companies and try to figure out whether or not any of us individually has any exposure that could possibly be triggered because of this issue.

Doug Hill:

First thing that comes across my mind is, are we violating our own procurement ordinances by shuffling this off to VECC, right? Do we still have some responsibility if we're giving that to somebody else and we're making the ones making the request? And I don't have an answer to that. That would have to be examined. But I'd like to ask Chief Burnett, who's our police chief in Murray. It seems like in the mayor's office, anyway, the calls that I deal with are typically from Murray businesses, Murray Tow companies, and they're the ones that are upset when they're not called in favor of somebody outside of Murray. And I'm kind of curious, how does our procurement chief in Murray work, and do we care whether it's city, we have our hands on it or whether we give it to VECC?

Craig Burnett:

Well, I think a lot of it just depends on what we're required to do and what we're allowed to do. As it is now, in order for them to be on our list, we have to vet them out and they have to be... The scary thing about this is they have one lot where seven of them all hang a shingle and then they claim that they have a lot in Murray, but we still have things that they have to do before we can get them on the list. We don't carry a huge list so we kind of have a lottery, and that's usually where we have some issues. So if there's some way that we can do this, and it's not going to cause us a problem with our processes, we're good with looking at something that doesn't draw a lot of work from us.

Tyson Montoya:

Maybe on an annual basis we would circle back and just get the list because essentially what Autura is doing is taking all of your current tow vendors and putting them into an app where they can then be selected if they

fall in your jurisdiction. So each year we would reach out. We would have to have a process internally here where we would meet with you individually, get the list of tow vendors, make sure that they have paid, and then continue to have them in Autura as a software program where they can then be picked from. But those are all great questions and concerns.

Ivan Whitaker:

So I guess my question, Korban, would the board need from me to further conversations or steps?

Korban Lee:

Trustees, does anyone have any concerns with Ivan and Tyson continuing to explore and look into this, spending staff time looking into this? Are you okay with further study?

Ryan Carter:

I think further study is great. I feel like kind of the ball is in my court to help move this along so I can just figure out where we're at in our relationship and what kind of possible ramifications this could have.

Doug Hill:

Yeah, I would like to just maybe take a month and investigate it and just have this put on the agenda for our next meeting and I'd have more information then.

Korban Lee:

Everyone okay with further study and revisiting this some more at our next trustees meeting?

Group:

Yes.

Ryan Carter:

Keep in mind that this means that we'll be talking to our tow companies. I mean, this is going to let the cat out of the proverbial bag, right?

Korban Lee:

Ivan, are you okay with it getting out there that it's being publicly debated and discussed.

Ivan Whitaker:

Absolutely.

Korban Lee:

OK, as trustees, let's go back to our jurisdictions and discuss it with our procurement managers, our agents, our law enforcement agencies, our partners, our stakeholders. Ivan, if you'll keep looking into it, we'll discuss this some more next month. Put it on the agenda for next month.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I just want to be really clear, Autura, is a dispatch, right? They're not a tow company.

Ivan Whitaker:

Correct.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I just want to make sure the tow companies know we're not replacing them. It's just a different way they would be dispatched.

Korban Lee:

In terms of cost recovery, remind me, Ivan, and this predates you, so you may need to go back and research it with some help from Scott Young. State law changed a year or two ago about towing, the dispatching of tow companies. And I thought it created some opportunities for VECC to pass on the costs of dispatching tow companies to the tow companies. So A, does that allow us to pass on the cost of a software like Autura? Or B, does it allow us to pass on direct costs for VECC? In other words, if we didn't use the software, but we kept using VECC, can VECC just start passing on a charge to these tow agencies to dispatch the tow agencies? In other words, can we do some cost recovery on this issue regardless?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yeah, and the answer is, the legislation allows us to expense up to the cost of the software. The way it's written, it does not allow us to recover directly from the vendors to where we had incoming revenue. So, we couldn't just say, okay, we assume responsibility and then we would charge them directly.

Tyson Montoya:

So are you asking if it's going to replace the four FTEs, would we be able to bill a tow company for those four FTEs taking those 66,000 calls in some fashion? And I think there is, and Scott, correct me if I'm wrong, I remember seeing kind of a breakout of administrative costs. I don't know if it was specific to a center like us, or if it was specific to the call of the tow company. In other words, I don't know if VECC has X agreements with tow organizations and we don't, right? We just have it with the municipalities or the agencies. So, Scott, do you know if VECC can bill for those FTEs right now?

Scott Young:

I don't know the answer to that offhand. I'm looking right now at the recent statute regarding tow rotations and there are provisions for reimbursement of costs but I would need to look at that more carefully. I don't know if it applies to VECC and what if it does, how much we could recoup.

Korban Lee:

Okay, that's something to consider for next month as well. If you want to do some study on that.

Scott Young:

I'm happy to look at that.

Korban Lee:

Lastly, I've never seen software get implemented as quickly as the salesman say it can get implemented. If it takes us four times 60 days, if it takes us 240 days to implement, is that still the course we want to do? I just want to say, assume that so you're pleasantly surprised when it gets implemented quickly.

Any other questions about tow services? Seeing none, let's go to the operations report.

OPERATIONS REPORT

Ivan Whitaker:

So in looking at the PSAP answering times we are good there. Well above the national mandate and so we are at 98% for 90% of the calls answered in 15 seconds and we are also at 98% at the 20 second mark and so we have met those marks four months consecutively. Those numbers that you are seeing the 98% are amongst some of the best in the nation. So we are still treading in the right direction there. The state mandate is the 3rd chart and no more than 2% of calls can be transferred from PSAP to PSAP and for August we are at 1.1% so a little bit up from the previous month but we had some issues with the CAD to CAD interface for a couple of days but Jonathon hopped in and made some efforts to resolve that and we were back where we were supposed to be. The last chart is the abandoned call rate. Abandoned calls are calls that when individuals call

in they go unanswered. The mandate is 10%. We are at 5%. We set that mark of where we want to be because traditionally 5% is what we call pocket dials. So we met it right at the mark and we are very happy about that as well.

The next chart, for the month of August we are about 77,000 calls. We are trending right now to have about 840,000 calls for the entire year which puts up between what we did in 2022 and 2023. Korban, you wanted some breakouts better than this and you wanted to include the emergency and non-emergency calls in that breakout percentage. We are working on that. That is CAD data, but we are working on that as quickly as we can.

Korban Lee:

Any questions about the performance measures, the call volumes or the breakouts in the administrative calls? Ivan, we have had a few months of really good performance measures. Thank you. Is there anything that is standing out to you as concerning? It's been all good news the last 2 or 3 months.

Ivan Whitaker:

Still non-emergency calls. Non-emergency calls, we are in the 70-80% range. Our non-emergency calls should trend just as our 911 calls and so our next big project is working on what we can do. Which is why I presented the tow proposal today. We have to focus on those non-emergency calls because 7% of our non-emergency calls are actually emergency calls so we have to be answering at the same clip.

Korban Lee:

Thank you. Good reporting. Any other questions or comments about the performance measures? Let's go on to the Executive Director report.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Ivan Whitaker:

If you look at our current vacancies, still as we were before. We have some new hires that are in the pipeline right now. One communications officer, one watch commander and 2 part timers. Currently for the last 12 months our turnover is 13%, which is great. We've only lost 1 employee in the last 4 months, and I put that out in the email. That person was in training. The national average in dispatch centers across the country is about 30-50%. That was a study that came out by NENA, so we are treading in the right direction with that. The only concern that we do have is that since we put out the attendance policy, we have had an increase in FML. We expected that and in that expectation the thing that I told everyone is at least we are able to document for the board exactly what those numbers are and who they are versus having a bunch of call outs without a good policy in place. We're doing well in that area.

We had a meeting with our insurance vendor, Gallagher, which is responsible for working on our behalf. Our insurance premium and this is very surprising to me, but our medical premium is not going up next fiscal and so that will be a 0% increase. The only thing in all of our insurance that is going up right now is our Dental and that will be a 5% increase for a total cost of \$5,681. We are very pleased where we are. A lot of that is how our employees are utilizing the insurance plans and what Gallagher is doing in negotiations, but we are well funded in those plans.

Doug Hill:

How are you able to get those kinds of quotes so early in the fiscal year. In Murray we don't get those kinds of numbers until April.

Tyson Montoya:

It is just based on when our policy is up. Taking a step back with Gallagher we did have an increase with them but they spread it out over the course of a few years and so we are on the last year of that original contract increase so that's why we don't see that medical. Next year we would expect to see an increase, but we have

a couple of other vendors that we are currently talking with. This is just when they come out with our premiums for us for the fiscal year.

Korban Lee:

Does the health insurance plan year marry up with VECCs fiscal year?

Tyson Montoya:

No, they are not. They overlap in different times.

Korban Lee:

What does the health insurance plan year reset?

Tyson Montoya:

December is when that starts.

Korban Lee:

That is why you are getting notification on your increase now because you are coming into the end of the plan year at the end of this calendar year.

Doug Hill:

So when we put the budget together in the spring, we'll put an increase in but that is really only going to be good for 6 months.

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, you are right.

Ivan Whitaker:

We are trying to do a better job of tracking if some of the things we are doing with a process prospective is leading to the intended outcomes in respect to overtime, sick and vacation leave. We started that up in July and you'll see a comparison in overtime, sick and vacation July and August of 23 versus what we are doing in 2024. We put some markers by it. Green means good, red doesn't necessarily mean bad, just we need to investigate what is happening. So you'll see July 2024 a huge decrease in overtime and sick. There was an increase in the amount of vacation that we are giving and maybe there is a positive relationship with that. If more people are coming to work then we can give more vacation time. In August we saw an increase from the previous year in overtime. Some of that could account to some of the vacation that was given but then you'll see in the plus for sick and vacation. Again, nothing that is really standing out right now that is a trend that we can point to but we are going to track this over time to see what we can do. We want to drive down the overtime cost. One of the things that we found with overtime already is that at the dispatch point those are our higher paid employees and so we need to focus on cross training, and we need to focus on part-timers in that particular section because that position is actually driving the overtime expense and that's not what we want because those are the higher dollar employees. We are looking at all of that, haven't implemented anything differently. Just trying to track trends to get better.

Chief Burchett:

Is that hours?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes, that's hours.

State Mandated Crash Report, we have already talked about that in the police chiefs report. Just wanted to open up if anyone had any questions about the crash report mandate?

AVL Pilot Program, we are meeting on the 26th to go through any issues or challenges with the response recommendations, AVL. My team some of them are at the Versaterm conference right now and they are

actually meeting with Versaterm about this as well. There is a couple of configuration pieces that we know that Versaterm is working on and so we are getting a status on that as well. I'm interested to see what comes out of the meeting on the 26th.

The rest of the items are old business. We are just going to scroll through to see if you have questions or need an update.

Korban Lee:

You all received the packet. Anyone have any questions from any of the old discussion items from Ivan's report? Thank you, Ivan. Let's go to the financial report.

FINANCE REPORT

Tyson Montoya:

Currently through August we should be at 16% of budgetary estimate. You will see here our Actual vs Budget column and then this is the percent of actual to budget. Currently we are at 34% of total revenue. As I mentioned in our last meeting and as you know we bill half of our assessments in June and July and then the other half in December and so that's why these numbers are significantly higher than the 16% but over the course of the year these will flatten out and we should be right on budgetary estimate. Our pass-through revenue is something that is significantly over budget. One of the things we are going to need to discuss is doing a budget revision in a couple of months and the reason is because of the software expense. We were just way under what we thought the pass-through expenses would be. Next year we will be able to hon in this figure a little closer to budget. Having said that, we are just over 7 million. Keep in mind we are 2 months behind in franchise tax. Do you have any questions on revenue?

Doug Hill:

When you say we'll have to make adjustments, are we talking about did expenses come in higher than anticipated and will adjustments come in the form of additional costs to member agencies to pick that up or just an accounting adjustment.

Tyson Montoya:

It's just an accounting adjustment. We had additional Versaterm pass-through costs that we did not account for in the original fiscal year 25 budget. We are seeing those now. We are paying those and then we are getting paid for those and then those are showing up in revenue and they are also showing up at the expense line at the bottom that I will talk about. The net effect washes out. There will not be any additional cost to any agencies that we serve. It's just a budgetary item we need to adjust and make sure it is in line with our budgetary estimate.

Korban Lee:

When you say there is no additional cost to agencies served your saying in the VECC assessment there is no additional costs. It's not going to increase the assessment levels to member agencies but the entities that are incurring the pass-through will pay for those pass-throughs, right?

Tyson Montoya:

Correct, like IPro and some of these new softwares that some of the agencies are bringing on that's going to be reflective in this number. There will be no additional assessment for 25 outside of the budgetary estimate provided.

Doug Hill:

The assessment is one thing but then many of us are paying for the RMS in addition to the assessment. So, there is an assessment and then an additional assessment for the RMS. Are you saying the assessment for the RMS is going to go up?

Tyson Montoya:

No, that will not. Any further questions on revenue?

On expense, on personnel you can see that we are right at 16%. We do have a couple of outliers. Our overtime that we have briefly talked about and then the incentive on call. We are closely watching that to make sure those don't get too far out of whack. We are taking measures in terms of bringing on and recruiting more part-time employees as Ivan mention to bring this overtime figure down. So, we are closely watching this on a pay period basis and then I'm sending that out to the executive team so they can look at that and make adjustment as needed. But overall, we are right on target at that 2.68 million figure on total personnel expense.

Everything else under Admin & Operations we have the software that we talked about already. We are going to have the second half of the big Versaterm payment that we pay for the RMS and the CAD system. That will be reflective in the December-January time frame. Our facility maintenance is a little bit high year-to-date but we're expecting this to flatten out. And then we have Professional service that's legal, IT, Caselle team. That is a little bit high, and we expect that to flatten out over the course of the fiscal year as well. This property and liability is a one time so we aren't going to see that go up. We pre-pay that in advance in July for the year. Everything else is pretty close to our budgetary estimate. You can see our total expenses at 24% and our revenues at 34% so we are plus 2 million. As we get through the fiscal year, we will see this number slowly go down to zero. We budget really close to what our revenues are. Do you have any questions on what I've discussed this far through either the personnel or operations/administrative expense?

The next section is our Fund Balance. You can see our Wells Fargo and PTIF amount. You can see the beginning balance and ending through the end of August. You can see what our cash position is. We have all the outstanding checks for the month of August. If you have any questions on any of these please let me know.

Korban Lee:

There are employee names in that list of check payments, are those for travel or travel reimbursements rather than miscellaneous reimbursements?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, they are. We've had several staff take conference or work-related trips. We are implementing a new policy where we use the PCard and that PCard acts as a method of payment for the hotel and airfare rather than having to reimburse employees like this just for checks and balances and to keep a good eye on our expenditures. These are just reimbursements for travel-related expenses.

Korban Lee:

Thank you. Any other questions? That is it for the agenda.

NO CLOSED SESSION/MOTION TO ADJOURN

Korban Lee:

No need for a closed session that I'm aware of today. Does any Trustees have anything else they want to bring up?

Doug Hill:

No, but I'll move adjournment.

Korban Lee:

We have a motion to adjourn from Doug. Is there a second?

Dustin Lewis:

I'll second .

Korban Lee:

Motion to adjourn from Mr. Hill of Murray. Second from Mr. Lewis at South Jordan. All in favor say Aye.

Group:

Aye.

Korban Lee:

Anyone opposed? Thank you. We stand adjourned. We'll see you all next month.

Motion –

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

The meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.