

**SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER**

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING**

***June 18, 2025 Meeting Minutes***

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Scott Harrington – Taylorsville, Chair  
Mr. Kevin Hicks – Riverton, Vice Chair  
Mr. Korban Lee – West Jordan  
Mr. Mike Barker – Draper  
Mr. Doug Hill – Murray  
Mr. Dustin Lewis – South Jordan  
Mr. Josh Collins – South Salt Lake  
Mr. Nathan Cherpeski – Herriman  
Mr. Bruce Kartchner – Bluffdale  
Mr. Dom Burchett – UFA  
Mr. John Evans – West Valley City  
Mr. Dwayne Anjewierden – UPD

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Mr. Jared Gerber – Cottonwood Heights  
Ms. Rosie Rivera – SLCo  
Ms. Gina Chamness – Holladay  
Mr. Mike Morey – Alta  
Open – Midvale

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Ivan Whitaker – VECC Executive Director  
Mr. Tyson Montoya – VECC Chief Financial Officer  
Ms. Elyse Haggerty – VECC Chief of Operations  
Mr. Scott Young – VECC Legal Counsel  
Ms. Rachel Nipper – VECC  
Ms. Jodi Morris – VECC  
Mr. Jonathan Bridges – VECC  
Mr. Brice Rawlings – VECC  
Ms. Nicole Lopez – VECC  
Ms. Ambir Widdison – VECC  
Ms. Tammy Cornelison – VECC  
Ms. Chelsea Ridge – VECC  
Mr. Neal Bennett – VECC  
Mr. Clint Smith – DFD  
Mr. Shane Taylor – RPD  
Mr. Derek Maxfield – WJFD  
Mr. Terry Addison – SSLFD  
Mr. Matt Evans – BFD  
Mr. Troy Carr – HPD  
Ms. Danielle Croyle – SSLPD  
Mr. Craig Burnett – MPD

The meeting was called to order by Scott Harrington at 2:02 p.m.

Scott Harrington:

Let's go ahead and get started. We have a quorum now. Welcome to the June 18th, 2025 Salt Lake Valley Emergency Communications Board Meeting. Review and consideration of the approval of the May 21st Board Meeting minutes. Does anybody have any questions or changes to the minutes? I see none.

Dom Burchett:

This is Chief Burchett with UFA. I'll make a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Kevin Hicks:

I'll second.

Scott Harrington:

All in favor?

Group:

Aye.

Scott Harrington:

All right. That's better. Any opposed?

**Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. Dom Burchett, to approve the minutes from the May 21, 2025 Board Meeting, seconded by Mr. Kevin Hicks; the motion carried unanimously.**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Scott Harrington:

Second, public comments. Anybody online want to make public comments? There's nobody here that wants to make public comments. Okay. Seeing none, we'll move on.

**OPERATIONS BOARD REPORTS**

Scott Harrington:

Operations Board Reports. Police Operations Board. Chief Taylor here?

Ivan Whitaker:

I didn't see him online.

Scott Harrington:

All right. Maybe he hasn't gotten on yet.

Ivan Whitaker:

There was no board meeting this month.

Scott Harrington:

All right. There was no operations board meeting this month so we'll move to the fire operations board. Was there a fire operations board meeting? Chief Smith? It's going to be a quick meeting. Strike two. All right. Maybe there was no fire operations board meeting. All right, we'll move on then. Awards and recognition, Ivan.

**AWARDS AND RECOGNITION**

Ivan Whitaker:

All right, so this will be quick. We do have an employee of the quarter, Mark McDermott. Would you like to say a few words, Ambir?

Ambir Widdison:

Mark McDermott was selected by his peers as an employee of the quarter based on his positivity and his ability to uplift the entire floor. Every day he walks in, he says hello. Every day he leaves, he says he'll be back with bells and whistles on. He is extraordinary at translating Spanish calls, and he is always offering assistance to his employees and that was stated in the nominations that we received.

Ivan Whitaker:

Great. We did want to, and again, I won't go through all the list of names on here, but this is awesome for several reasons. These individuals had exemplary performance in their call taking. The reason I think that this is great is because we now have a QA program in place where we can know these types of things. Some of the AI that we're doing and the hands-on QA, we can sift out and give some recognition and these individuals actually got recognition. About 12% of our calls that are coming through are exemplary. This means that they're doing above the call. Proficient is a good job. Exemplary is they went above the call. So that was great.

Scott Harrington:

What's the criteria between exemplary and proficient?

Ivan Whitaker:

Exemplary would be they had no deviations whatsoever, so it's one hundred percent, where you could have a few deviations and still get proficient.

Scott Harrington:

Okay. That's great news.

Ivan Whitaker:

I did want to take a moment and talk a little bit about the recent West Valley shooting over the weekend. These individuals: Rosa, Shelby, Matt, Melissa, Britnee, Andrea, Brooke, Elaine, Jaycee, and Carolyn; They were all involved in this incident and did an outstanding job. We got some feedback from field responders on the work that they did. This was a big deal. Anytime you have an eight-month-old that was part of a homicide situation, it's going to be tough. We've had critical incident stress debriefing over the past few days as well. We had some people that just kind of rocked them pretty hard, so just wanted to acknowledge those individuals that took that call.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you.

Ivan Whitaker:

I also want to acknowledge Jonathan Bridges and his team. Also, Bryce, you should be on there as well, for the work that you and your team did. During the protests we were requested to split up consoles for Salt Lake City 911. We had nine consoles ready just in case they needed to relocate. There was a lot involved in that involvement with UCA and they did a phenomenal job, the readiness. We had a text group texting them, letting Salt Lake City know that we were ready to go. They just did a phenomenal job on the readiness. Great teamwork all involved.

Scott Harrington:

Yes, that's a great thing to do and it's great for us to do in case we need it as well.

Ivan Whitaker:

Exactly. The last one, we'll talk a little bit, we're kind of ahead of the month with this one, but I know how this is going to turn out. June 1, 2024 through June 18th, which is today, we are right on target for our answering time. We have to close out the month, but we're trending the right way. It has to be a lot to happen to knock us off that bar. We have to have 90% of the calls answered within 15 seconds and we have to have 95% of the calls answered within 20 seconds. That puts us in line if we do that for a year for the bonus of the carrot monies.

I don't know if those carrot monies would be \$50 or \$200,000, but we qualify based upon that. On the 30th we'll be reaching out to UCA, seeing if any paperwork needs to be done. I've already reached out to them, and they said we're good to go, but it's just a phenomenal feat to do that. A lot of hard work from all the people in this room to make that happen, the commanders and the people on the floor. They really went at it.

Scott Harrington:

Yes, for sure. Especially that trend where it was at before. That's great news.

Ivan Whitaker:

What we're going to do, whether it's end of July or August, we're going to do something special, whether it's a barbecue or something to where we show our appreciation of our folks and that's it.

### **PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR MAY**

Scott Harrington:

Let's go over all the performance.

Elyse Haggerty:

June is our last month of the 12-month cycle that's required for the carrot money. In June we did meet our numbers by hitting 94.7% in 15 seconds and 96.04% in 20 seconds, so it's over the 95%. Someone asked recently what the difference between the number in the average 95% of 911 calls in 20 seconds or less and the total call count. The reason those two 911 numbers are different, we don't include abandoned calls in our answer time, so the abandoned calls are removed.

Tyson Montoya:

That someone was me.

Elyse Haggerty:

Yes.

Scott Harrington:

Nice work, Tyson.

Elyse Haggerty:

We were on 0.87% for transfer rates, which is just an amazing number compared to even a year ago. 5.92% for abandoned, which is great. 72,942 total calls. We've got our list of admin calls and we're still 4.54%. That

number of responses goes up every month pretty significantly. I looked just before the meeting and as of the 15th of June we are on track to continue to take more and more calls. It is summer. June's going to be busy, and July is always the worst. We'll see those numbers jumping.

Tyson Montoya:

You see them expecting to be 73,000 for next month?

Elyse Haggerty:

For June? This current month? Yes.

Elyse Haggerty:

We're on track to least hit that same number.

Tyson Montoya:

The gap between the non-emergency between April and May, is that just...

Elyse Haggerty:

It's because kids are getting out of school and they're causing mayhem.

Scott Harrington:

Yes, they are. Okay. Anything else on the performance report? On to UCA radio project, Ambir?

### **UCA RADIO PROJECT STATUS UPDATE**

Ambir Widdison:

We had some significant issues in the last month with multi-agency ops that we ran where we identified that some of the tac channels were still programmed secure in some of the field responders radios. I've reached out to Tina at UCA. We're going to start setting up appointments at each one of the stations to look into those radios and see if it's a programming issue or if it's a hardware issue. We've also identified several blocked channels and bad channels that they've corrected. It's on the southeast side of the Valley. Nelson Peak, which is a site that we should be hitting quite often, is also experiencing some ongoing problems that they're consciously trying to work on. The Draper site also experienced some significant issues while we had a search and rescue in that canyon. They identified the issue and have fixed it.

Duplicate IDs is an ongoing process. They have decided to listen to hours and hours of radio traffic to try to identify that, so it is going to take a long time. That's all I have.

Scott Harrington:

Okay, thank you. Any questions on the UCA radio project update? Nope. All right, AVL Pilot project status. Ambir, again. Sat down too soon.

### **AVL PILOT PROJECT STATUS UPDATE**

Ambir Widdison:

We have had two meetings with the AVL response configuration committee. We are currently knee-deep into an approximately 300 call type reconfiguration. We've tasked the agencies with going through all of those and seeing where we can set up mock response configurations, response plans, and also identify if we have missed any as we've been going through the call types that we want to decompress. Where we only have one call type now as a priority one or a priority two, we're now looking to further decompress so we can identify exactly what the call is, whether it's not just going to be a breathing problem now, it could be a breathing problem that's not alert or a breathing problem that has asthma. We're going to further identify those and then reconfigure how we're responding to those, whether we're responding with an ALS ambulance and a BLS engine or we're just sending an ambulance. Those are the conversations that we're having now. We are meeting bi-weekly on that, hoping to have it done in the next couple of months.

We are also implementing on July 1st a proximity adjustment in the CAD where we'll be dispatching by zone and by four-minute proximity to the call, eight minutes on the ambulance, four minutes on the initial BLS.

Scott Harrington:

What was it before we changed it, four and eight?

Ambir Widdison:

Right now, on priority ones, it's whoever's closest and on priority twos it's the zone BLS unit, so the heavy apparatus and then the closest ambulance.

Scott Harrington:

So you'll give the responding city four minutes then? Is that what I understand then?

Ambir Widdison:

Whoever's zone is identified. So if it's station 109 zone, they're going to get priority to go on that as long as they're within the four-minute proximity. Right now, in the current environment, we're seeing that it's skipping over the zone unit based off as little as a one second difference when it's already been identified that that zone should be handling those calls. This will now give that zone those calls and they can respond quicker to those as we work through the other phased approaches that we're going to take on getting better at the AVL.

Scott Harrington:

Any questions for Amber on this?

Ivan Whitaker:

I just wanted to jump in. We have some Fire Chiefs on. I want to make sure on the response configuration, the goal of that committee is to get a recommendation over to the Users first and then the Fire Chiefs and then up to the Board of Trustees. The configuration that we put together so far, and that's Ambir just repeating, it's a mock, so it's just trying to see how far apart we are in the response, correct. Or configurations per agency. And those things that we don't have to work on or come to consensus on we're just going to throw out and just they're good to go. Those things we need to have tougher, harder conversations, those are the things that we'll start working on with the response configuration group.

Scott Harrington:

Okay. Any other questions?

Dom Burchett:

Yeah, Scott, this is Chief Burchett. Ambir, did you say the four-minute proximity is going into place or are we still testing?

Ambir Widdison:

It will go into place July 1st.

Dom Burchett:

Okay. I thought we weren't even testing until next week. Is that correct?

Ambir Widdison:

Correct. Your testing is the beginning of next week. If we do encounter any problems, we'll push it back, but that was our deadline and as of right now, we're on track for that.

Dom Burchett:

I think maybe this will come up in our testing, but I think we had maybe a concern about the eight-minute ambulance response in some of our areas where that could be pushed to 12 minutes, but we can talk about that detail as we're testing.

Ambir Widdison:

We've been able to make those adjustments as we've had meetings with all the agencies. Anything that we saw that was not as expected performance wise, we've made those adjustments during the meeting.

Dom Burchett:

Okay.

Scott Harrington:

Any other questions on this one? All right, let's go ahead and move forward to the Executive Director report.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT**

Ivan Whitaker:

Right now, with our openings we have about three communications officers opening. That changes Monday. I think we're down to 9-part timers now. What we're doing is adjusting and updating some of what the part-timers are doing and some of those aren't lining up, so some of them have just been able to come and go and we're kind of being more structured. In the new budget, we're moving to the 25 part-timers that we've been talking about.

Most of this conversation is going to be about the SS4A grant. We introduced it at the last meeting but spent more time on the demonstrations. I put up some numbers and talked about some justifications, but the goal here was to come into this meeting with more detailed justifications. This won't take that long, but I just wanted to show a little bit more of why we're wanting to do what we're wanting to do with the grant.

If you go down to the non-emergency AI call taking that we talked about last month, clear goals, improve service for our citizens. We've already talked about how long it's taking to answer our non-emergency lines. We're nowhere near where we want to be. This thing answered this immediately. That's an immediate response for the citizens. We want to offset our FTE needs. I know it was big when Mission Critical's numbers came in, but we can offset that by technology, a lot of it. We've projected a 40% reduction in additional FTEs after we ramp the AI.

Also, rapid scalability, 40% reduction is achievable within 24 months. This will take about three to four months to implement. First year we wanted to get about 20% reduction or diversion in the non-emergency calls, and

then by 24 months we want to get to 40%. The way we do that is working with the AI to tweak those decision trees and questions that are asked to the citizens. The goal is to get the citizen not to hang up and you have got to figure out what's the right thing to say in the AI to get the best or optimal performance.

Keeping on that, we knew by Mission Critical's assessment that just call takers, not dispatchers and everything else that we need in the building, but it's projected that we needed 18 additional call takers right now. We believe if we can get to the 40%, that takes care of about 11 FTEs. So you see the number of hours we believe it could take care of. And again, efficiencies were more available. Our call takers are more available for critical calls so this thing is handling those non-emergencies. I had a video to play to show it's about a one-minute video, but we had some technology issues, so we'll keep going.

The AI, I just wanted you to see the numbers again. I showed these numbers last month, and so the annual calls versus the five-year, the grant would cover that. That would be VECCC's portion at the 115 and then that would be our portion over five years after the grant.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Ivan, this is Nathan. Sorry to interrupt. What is the cost for a call taker?

Ivan Whitaker:

\$98K.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Okay, thank you.

Scott Harrington:

Up there you've got \$575K annual cost, five years, \$575K as well.

Ivan Whitaker:

That \$575K would be the total if you took the \$115K over the five years.

Scott Harrington:

But then after the five years it would be \$575K per year for us to the VECC budget.

Ivan Whitaker:

If we decided to continue, yes.

Scott Harrington:

All right.

Ivan Whitaker:

Then number two is the AI translation. That's kind of, I'll explain it. Right now we're doing about 84 calls a day that's involving a language translation, which is accounting for about 800 minutes a day and about 24,000 minutes a month. If you look on the left-hand side, there's about 17 different languages that we are having to deal with on a daily basis. Diversity here is growing of course, and if you look at the graph in the middle, about 90 plus percent is Spanish. So again, a lot of calls were upwards about \$200,000 a year of what we're paying for language translation services right now because it costs us about 69 cents a minute.

If we do implement the AI, we're still looking at the 84 calls daily, but that drops down to about 336 minutes daily that we're having to use human intervention because the AI would help with that versus doing a language translation line. So that decrease has a cost implication as well to where we could pretty much implement this



AI right now without the grant and we would be under what we're paying right now with this implementation. So we're pretty solid with this.

Scott Harrington:

You would feel confident enough to get rid of the interpreters then?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes. We wouldn't completely, because there'll be things like CPR instructions and things of that nature we'd want to have them on, but it wouldn't be nearly what we're doing right now and that would offset the cost. So this would be the cost, \$155K for the solution five years, and then after the grant, our cost would be \$31K total over five years or \$155K. If you go into it, here's some numbers, kind of what we're doing right now versus what it would be. We're at about \$17,000 a month right now, and you'll see the annual cost. We think right now without the grant, if we just implemented, we have a little bit of savings, about \$10,000 savings right now. If we implement the grant, the cost after the grant would be about \$64K. So that grant, we would have a huge cost savings with that grant with what we're doing right now. Really simple.

Some of the things that we're doing with the language translation, it's not just the AI. We're actually starting a language translation program. We're really going to focus on something more comprehensive here to where we'll have an emergency dispatcher translator certification. What we found is that just because a person speaks Spanish doesn't mean that they'll do well on a call. There are certain things you have to do when you translate, and so there are certifications out there, an annual stipend. A lot of times these call takers are interpreting and doing a lot with that and they're not receiving extra for that. So we want to take care of that.

Language integration into the dispatch protocol. So all of our protocols right now, when we're speaking to a caller are in English. If we have those translated in say Spanish, it will be easier for the Spanish translators that we have internal. So right now we've already reached out to APCO and Telecom. That translation has already taken place and we're just waiting pretty much for the software upgrade here. The AI integration that I just talked about an overall goal, I think we can decrease our talk time by four minutes. We're averaging about 9.6 minutes per call where our normal is about 3.8 minutes per call. So that's a huge difference in being on the line.

And then community outreach, there's some studies that have come in that's shown locally that the community is afraid to reach out to 911 because of the language barrier and we want to get out in public. There's some news teams that have reached out to us and communities that have reached out to us and so we want to get out there and work with them on some of this stuff as well.

The next one is the data dashboards. Not taking a real deep dive into this, I think it's self-explanatory but being VECC as the central hub in the consortium, we're blind to a lot of what's going on in the county. When we're looking at our users groups in those committees and our ops groups, we should have data dashboards that we're all looking at that are county-wide that tells us everything from response times to on-scene to just the daily distribution of calls. We're having to do exports out of CAD right now.

Individual municipalities have their own dashboards, but it's not collective across the county. The Board of Trustees should have access to those dashboards as well. If you ask me what is our cardiac arrest save rate, how many patients go into cardiac arrest, walk out of the hospital. A particular agency might be able to tell you that, but we couldn't tell you that across the county. We're working through trying to collect all that data, but where will we put it? Annual costs \$94K, five-year costs, \$470K, but the annual cost to us would be about \$18.8K after the grant.

The tow services, I'll be really quick with this because we've talked through it. The Police Chiefs didn't have a meeting last month. Next month they're not going to have another one as well, but the August one coming in, we're getting two vendors, Tow Pro and Autora, to come in and do demonstrations. Tow Pro, what I'm hearing is they're free, but some functionality things that we need they might not have, don't know until we do the demo. So this could even be better if we go with Tow Pro, but we need to make sure that VECC is whole, which is why we still need to look at the difference between the two.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Ivan, this is Nathan again. I have a question. Of the 66,000 calls, are these generated by our agencies or by private parties? Do you have that breakdown?

Ivan Whitaker:

These are all by our agencies, by our municipalities, that's correct.

Elyse Haggerty:

No, the 66,000 includes private property impounds for possessions and street checks. There's a parade and we move it for them.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Does this include like HOA's? They call into tow, are they then tying up our line?

Elyse Haggerty:

No. And the tow companies are technically supposed to report to the state website within a certain amount of time. That's difficult when they take 60 cars from the Real Stadium parking that are illegally parked. So they're calling VECC and we have to enter it into our CAD system so that when that owner comes back and calls 911, my car was stolen. No, it wasn't. It was towed. Here's the phone number you have to call. So we're going through a whole process just so we don't have a hundred or 66,000 stolen vehicle reports a year that are false.

Scott Harrington:

It's more or less agencies and then private parties. HOA's would be on the hook for their own more or less.

Nathan Cherpeski:

But it sounds like when they do those tows, it does impact us.

Elyse Haggerty:

Yes. Anywhere from three to seven minutes, depending on how quickly the information comes back because we have to run it to verify it's not a stolen vehicle. So we have a whole process that has to be done on every single call.

Scott Harrington:

Any other questions?

Ivan Whitaker:

With this, and I know some of the data that came from Mission Critical was a bit shocking, but Tyson and I we're going to try to do is work with UCA and others on the tax. We feel that the tax that we're receiving right now, what is it, 76 cents right now? 74. I keep saying 76 is we think it's too low and I think 26 cents is what we're looking at is substantial for us and get us what we need. But again, some of that stuff is a long shot and takes a lot of coordination to make that happen. I know we need to involve Senator Harper in that conversation as well. So this is just one piece that we believe we can effectively do now, but the other piece about the additional FTE's it's going to be some other movement that's going to get us there. Again, I think we've reached our point with the assessments that we don't think the assessments can get us there in the future with what we need.

Scott Harrington:

Great. Financial reporting items.

**FINANCIAL REPORTING ITEMS**

Tyson Montoya:

Through May, we should be at 92% of budget. Our revenue is right on target, just over 21 million. Our personnel costs are coming in a little bit high at 15.5 million. We have one more payroll to go and then we have some year-end entries to make, but we should be pretty close to our budgetary estimate on this. The final admin and operating cost, we're at 85% of budget at 5.4 million. Our overall expense is just over 21 million or 91%. As an agency, we're just under budgetary estimate by about 1%. We've got some year-end things that are balance sheet related and then some additional adjustments that we'll show next month.

Right now, we're showing a \$278,000 profit. We have in our fund balance as of the end of last month, just over 2.9 million. We will receive June's e-tax, and then we'll have this month's expenses so we should finish the year kind of as I mentioned last meeting at what we did last year in terms of our ending fund balance June 30. This is the check list for the month. We had a couple of payroll corrections. We had some debt payments. Mission Critical was in there for the second half of them. Insight is our Microsoft licensing. Capital One is our debt finance. Nothing out of the ordinary last month. Unless you guys have any questions, that's all I have.

Scott Harrington:

Does anybody have any questions on the financial report?

Dom Burchett:

Yeah, Scott, this is Chief Burchett again. Tyson, what's your anticipated close out for the franchise tax?

Tyson Montoya:

For the fund balance?

Dom Burchett:

No, up on revenues. You're at 80% and I know that comes in a little bit later, but what are you anticipating there to be final?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, so the reason why it's 80% is they're actually two months behind, so we should be at that 8.5 figure when we include May and June.

Dom Burchett:

Ok, thank you.

Korban Lee:

Tyson, how variable is that revenue source? Are you pegging that really close or does it kind of swing?

Tyson Montoya:

On the e-franchise tax?

Korban Lee:

Yes.

Tyson Montoya:

It should be pretty consistent throughout the year. I mean, it's going to go up as we have more calls. Back in January we received a 3% increase in our tax, so that definitely helped a little bit, but it should stay pretty consistent. It should just go up with our average call count. Does that answer your question, Korban?

Korban Lee:

Kind of. I didn't think it was tagged to our call count. Oh, well our portion of all of the E-911 revenues is associated with our call count, right? I guess what I'm asking is how stable, how predictable, how elastic or inelastic is the revenue source as a whole statewide, I guess? Because it's tied to cell phone lines and phone lines, it's pretty stable and predictable I assume.

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, it is. I think for next year we put in a 3% increase in that budget line and that's pretty close to what we would expect to see.

Scott Harrington:

Any other questions?

Ivan Whitaker:

Would you like for me to finish? I kind of hopped over some of the Executive Director stuff. Would you like for me to do that?

Scott Harrington:

If you want to.

Ivan Whitaker:

I just want to make sure that I didn't skip over anything that was pertinent. July 1st events, we have the COLA, the 2.5% that's going into effect, updated job descriptions, updated employee handbook. We started some morale initiatives that month as well, and we're launching a new leadership program. One of the questions, Scott, we reached out to you about that leadership program. We have anywhere from 25 to 40 registrants per class right now, which is pretty good.

### **NO CLOSED SESSION/NEXT BOARD MEETING/MOTION TO ADJOURN**

Scott Harrington:

No closed session, I don't believe it is needed today.

Scott Harrington:

On the next board meeting in July, do we want to have that? Is everybody going to be around? I know typically July is a hard month to coordinate and have everybody here. What's everybody's thoughts?

Nathan Cherpeski:

I will not be available. I'll be in Europe.

Scott Harrington:

Okay. Everybody else be able to join?

Korban Lee:

I think I can be there, but it's not been uncommon to cancel the July meeting historically.

Scott Harrington:

It'd be my recommendation to go ahead and cancel it now unless you had a pressing issue. What's everybody's thoughts?

Josh Collins:

I'm good with that recommendation to cancel.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you, Josh.

Mike Barker:

Let's take it off.

Scott Harrington:

Okay, let's go ahead and for the next meeting we'll be in August and we'll see you then. I need a motion to adjourn.

Josh Collins:

I'll make that motion.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I'll second. Okay, thank you. All in favor.

Group:

Aye.

**Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. Josh Collins, to adjourn the meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. Nathan Cherpeski; the motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 2:38 p.m.