

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

October 15, 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
Ms. Cynthia Archuleta – SLCo
Mr. John Evans – West Valley City
Mr. Dwayne Anjewierden – UPD

MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

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. Shondra Young – VECC Chief of Prof. Stand. & Dev.
Ms. Rachel Nipper – VECC
Ms. Nicole Lopez – VECC
Ms. Ambir Widdison – VECC
Ms. Rosa Olivos – VECC
Ms. Tammy Cornelison – VECC
Ms. Chelsea Ridge – VECC
Mr. Neal Bennett – VECC
Mr. Joey Mittleman – MFD
Mr. Derek Maxfield – WJFD
Mr. Terry Addison – SSLFD
Mr. Troy Carr – HPD
Mr. Dustin Dern – UFA
Mr. Chris Dawson – SJFD
Mr. Rich Ferguson – DRPD
Mr. Rob Hansen – SJPD
Mr. Marcus Arbuckle – Kennington & Christensen

The meeting was called to order by Scott Harrington at 2:00 p.m.

Scott Harrington:

It's two o'clock. Let's go ahead and start this meeting. It looks like we have a quorum present. Do we have any visitors today? Okay, no visitors. Review and consideration of approval of September 17th, 2025 board

meeting minutes. Does anybody have any changes or questions on those? All right. Can I get a motion to approve those, I guess?

Doug Hill:

I motion to approve.

Scott Harrington:

Okay. I have a second?

Josh Collins:

Second.

Scott Harrington:

All in favor?

Board members:

Aye.

Scott Harrington:

Any opposed? None. Okay. All right.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Doug Hill, to approve the minutes from the September 17, 2025 meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. Josh Collins; the motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Scott Harrington:

Public comments? We haven't got any online or anything. Is anybody from the public here willing to speak? I see none. Move on. All right.

OPERATIONS BOARD REPORTS

Scott Harrington:

Operations Board Reports: Police Operations Advisory Board Meeting, Chief Ferguson.

Rich Ferguson:

Hi. Thanks for having me today. We had a meeting with the police chiefs on October 9th in Sandy. Some of the things that we talked about, I'll go over really quick. We talked about officer skills that VECC has requested that if our officers have specific skills, canine, PIO, drone, that they contact VECC and let them know. We're in the process of putting those lists together and they should be coming into VECC.

VECC advised us that they conducted active shooter training recently with South Jordan PD and that it was a success and it was available to all agencies in the valley to do. So it's being considered and we're glad that that went okay.

We talked about lockdown channels. Lockdown channels are times when the UCA conducts its systems optimizations and there was a bit of concern on the part of the chiefs that when this occurs, it's supposed to only be for, correct me, I mean I could be wrong on this, but I thought we said 30 seconds or less, which is ideal, but that there is a possibility it could be for longer. So, VECC was developing a new plan of action so that in the event that this optimization occurs, which happens I think every six months, that there's some kind of an alternate plan for us to be able to communicate with each other.

We talked a little bit about agency codes when it comes with NCIC codes. As officers are clearing their calls and it's more agency specific. I know Draper is one of them that we've requested specific codes be used and it helps us when we're trying to track with our crime analyst's crime trends that are occurring. If it's just a general code that each call is cleared with, we have no idea what happened where at what time if I'm trying to track a group of vehicle burglars, so we're using specific codes with NCIC so that we can help track crimes and crime trends, and I appreciate VECC working with us on that.

VECC talked about a recent error that was made at one of our schools. A firearm was reported on the school. It was mistakenly dispatched as Midvale Elementary, but it turned out it was Mid Valley Elementary. And it wasn't VECC's problem when they listened back to the tape. It was actually the reporting party that reported it wrong, so that was handled.

Some of our PIOs have been bypassed recently. The media has been calling into VECC, so we were all asked to notify our PIOs to make sure that our numbers are up-to-date with media, so that doesn't happen and burden VECC anymore. We talked about the radio emergency button. For you that don't know, on the top of our portable radios is the orange button. Some agencies call this maybe an Echo Alpha button.

Where it benefits us in law enforcement is if we're in a fight and we can't get to our radio, we can't key our mic or whatever it may be, but we need help immediately. We push this orange button, at least we try to find it. And when it's activated, it will clear the air for up to 15 seconds. That typically goes over that agency's primary channel so everybody in the field hears what's going on and we can get assistance to the officer immediately. Through my career, I've had that happen several times in emergencies, but mostly, it occurs when officers are kind of adjusting their belts or something and they activate it.

VECC has recently taken all of that emergency traffic when these EA buttons are activated to their own dispatcher, so it's not going over the primary agency's channel. And that was quite a concern to a lot of the chiefs in the room that we're not hearing it when it's occurring and we're the first responders who can get there right away to help our officer. I did reach out to a couple of other dispatch centers I know and asked them what their policy is on this. And Utah County brought up an interesting point when it comes to this that I hadn't considered.

During the recent Charlie Kirk incident down there, Provo Dispatch had five different agencies patched in at one time. And they had four Echo Alpha emergency buttons hit during that time. None of them turned out to be an emergency. It was officers probably in haste trying to get there or something. But every time that button was activated, it overrode all of the channels and they all had to be re-patched together and that can really affect operations. It's something I hadn't considered. I don't know if the other chiefs knew about this or anything, so there could be some argument for what VECC is now doing in going to a different channel or a different dispatcher. Just some food for thought there.

There was some discussion about Versatarm concerns. Primarily with the fingerprint scanner, that there's too many steps that are attached the officer in the field has to do to get this to scan correctly. There are probably people in the room that could speak better to this than I, but essentially the officer takes a fingerprint in the field, it goes through the scanner to the phone into V-Mobile. And it's just too many steps.

The concern we have for officer safety is that with all of these steps, you're taking your eye off of your subject that you're working with and it becomes an officer safety issue and so we'd like to see that streamlined to where it's truly just a fingerprint and that's it and the officer doesn't have to manipulate the computer or the phone. Then there was some discussion about the accidents, the accident reports, the EMVA that the mandates have not been rolled out. I believe that's it. Any questions for me?

Scott Harrington:

Doesn't look like it. Thank you, Chief.

Rich Ferguson:

Thank you.

Scott Harrington:

All right. Fire Operations Board, Chief Addison.

Terry Addison:

Thank you. We also held our meeting on October 9th. During that meeting, we had an update from the fire users community where they discussed SWAT staging. What's happening is the SWAT Commander, they're moving out, they're doing their warrants and then they're not communicating back to the fire department or anything, so it's leaving our units out for quite a length of time before we understand that they can go and end that. They're in the process of working that up.

We discussed zone and access freeway discussions. And then I do want to send out a thanks for our Response Committee. We have a committee working on updates to our response configuration where they are updating the protocols across multiple call types of sick card updates, traffic accidents, and mental health. We're trying to reduce the automatic medical dispatch on mental health. It relies heavily on MCOT with some PD coordination.

Our cardiac arrest card updates, fire response revisions, AGC response variations. It was noted that the agency is going to use their internal protocols when they respond. As an example, in South Salt Lake, we won't send single unit response. We'll always have a heavy in an ambulance where some agencies will determine if they want to send one or the other. We discussed dispatch communications and acuity levels and then response modes versus running lights and sirens versus not. We're going to leave that up to agency discretion and work on it from there. That's mainly our meeting. Any questions on any of that? All right. Thanks, everyone.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you, Chief.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Scott Harrington:

Awards and promotions, recognitions.

Ivan Whitaker:

All right. Starting this fiscal in July, we implemented the promotional process, and we have a few that we're very proud of that have gone through everything they need to be promoted. We have the communications officer three position where you'll see Tiffany Twohill, Shelby Chancey and Sharee Montague. They've all been promoted this month. A lot of work in that, a lot of progress. We're very proud of them.

There'll be leads on the floor to where they can act in the absence of the supervisor, support the supervisors on the floor as well. We also have promotions to communication officer two, which are dispatchers. They were previously call takers and have trained on dispatch, Wesley, Keianna, Dallas, and Jessie. So just want to make sure that you all know these promotions are taking place per the start of July. There's one more thing that we wanted to announce.

Elyse Haggerty:

The APCO NENA Awards. Each year you're allowed to send in nominations for awards. We sent in three for our VECC employees this year. I'd like Ambir to talk through the two fire incidents and a suicidal subject that both got honorable mentions and then I'll mention the one I put in.

Ambir Widdison:

We submitted a nomination for Devin Bohannon, who was the dispatcher on a critical incident where he had a female who had called in. She was suicidal. She was talking to the call taker through the entire incident and ended up hanging herself while she was on the phone with the call taker.

We had very little idea where she was. We just had a very general location. Devin was critical in finding her. He was looking at the maps that we have on our screens and pinpointing the things that she had described on the phone to the officers who were responding. They were in the dark, had no idea where they were going. He was directing them based off of water towers and field geography.

None of those things were requested of him. He took it upon himself to take the information that was provided by the caller before she had actually hurt herself. He was able to not only direct them in the dark, but was able to find her in time to save her life so that was a submission that we turned in and received an honorable mention for that one. We wanted to recognize Devin and his ability to not only think outside the box to help those police officers who had zero idea where they were going or where to even start to look for this person.

The other honorable mention was for our entire fire crew and all the supervisors, managers, call takers who were on duty during the multi alarm that started as a grass fire, turned into several structure fires in Millcreek this year. We had seven channels open at the time. We had several incident commanders who were working on multiple structure fires and multiple hot spots of grass fires. We basically drained our city of apparatus during that fire and then used multiple outside resources, so we turned that one in for a nomination for NENA and received an honorable mention for that as well.

Elyse Haggerty:

Thanks, Ambir. Then I nominated Ivan Whitaker for Administrator of the Year and he has actually won, which is really exciting and very deserved. Not just anyone is getting this award and we're really excited for Ivan. The changes he's made here in the past 18 months feels like 10 years because so much has changed and so much has improved. I did send the nomination letter to our chair, and he is invited to go and get the award with Ivan next Wednesday. We're very proud of him and we feel very lucky that we got Ivan. Thank you to the board members who assisted in getting him for us. We're very lucky, very grateful.

Ivan Whitaker:

Thank you everyone.

Scott Harrington:

That's great.

PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR SEPTEMBER

Scott Harrington:

Okay, next one. Operations report, performance report for September.

Elyse Haggerty:

All right. I'll keep going. In September we hit the 15-second answer time at 92.11%, which we have to be at 90% or above. Our 95% in 20 seconds, we just missed it. We did find out though that rather than looking at every single month, they look at the year, so we still have the opportunity to get 95% and above for the entire year next July.

Ivan Whitaker:

Before you move forward, can we click on that October one? We've made some adjustments where you'll see at the less than 20 seconds for the month of October, we're at 97.2% right now, so we're on track to hit it this month. We knew, as I warned the board, that we're going to have a couple of months of some challenges, but we're digging out of it as quickly as we can. I'm sorry, keep going.

Elyse Haggerty:

We took 21,565 calls. Our transfer rate is still well below the 2% that's required. We're actually at a point where we're almost so low that this year when we turned in the report, you have to go through every single transfer call. So transfers from Salt Lake City to Denver, Colorado, which happen far more often than you would imagine, those don't count against us.

So if it's an out-of-state and either they've been routed incorrectly by their phone system or, "I just talked to my mom who lives in Florida and she's having a heart attack and she didn't call 911, can you send?" We obviously can't send anyone, but we do transfer them to the correct agency. I had to go in, line by line, and find out exactly who all of those calls went to and we're so low this year that I believe I won't even have to do that.

Korban Lee:

Is all that's left the non-pattern stuff out of state or not? Or is there still a pattern? We're transferring a lot to Weber County or we're transferring to-

Elyse Haggerty:

No, it would be nice if we could get our CAD-to-CAD system to work for Bountiful and Central because we do still have to transfer there and Tooele. It's a possibility. When we went online with all of the same VESTA system, that's now a possibility that we could work through that. It's just not on the roadmap right now and because it's so low, it's not a high priority, let's get it done now.

Ivan Whitaker:

UHP was 80% of the transfers?

Elyse Haggerty:

Yeah.

Tyson Montoya:

Is that why it's higher in '24 because of the-

Elyse Haggerty:

Yeah, for the year 2024, we didn't start the CAD-to-CAD until June 1st, 2024, which was when it was expected to be done and ready. 68,535 calls total. We have found some instances where calls are not being captured by eCATs, and so we're investigating that. We had a South Salt Lake incident where the person called 840-4000 four times and it never came through into eCATs. So in that one incident, four calls that we missed, it's concerning how many more calls are also being missed. So we're investigating with eCATs and with UCA.

Our abandoned, still below the 5% that Ivan has requested we stay below. Last month, I think I troubled Riverton and I'm very sorry. It was not 215, it was 15 calls. I've corrected that on here and then this past month is 608 calls, so it continues to decrease. We don't know if that's because the phone tree, which has been updated. So please, if you hear any concerns from any of your citizens, please let us know so we can fix it. There was a West Jordan issue today that we can get it fixed very quickly. We just need to know about it.

It now has each agency specified and a quicker way to get to either your public works or your records departments. So it's unclear, but it has gone down. Our SpiderTech, 4.52 out of five from 10,000 responders, which is great. Every month I can very quickly find one that they're even pointing out that the dispatcher was great to work with. That is our report for the month.

UCA RADIO PROJECT UPDATE 36:32

Scott Harrington:

Thank you. Okay, UCA radio project. Brice.

Ambir Widdison:

I'll take it for Brice. We are continuing to try and get a solution to the lockdown channels. Having conversations with UCA over the last couple of weeks, the system was not built to need lockdown channels, so that was obviously none of us were here when they were originally talking about this so we reintroduced that conversation and right now we don't have a solution for it, but we will continue to work for it.

It is necessary that we have some solution that when they do take us down every six months that we have a means of communication. Best case scenario it's down for 30 seconds. Worst case scenario, it doesn't come back up, and we need to have a redundant option, so we'll continue to work on that option.

As far as the emergency channels go, I just wanted to briefly mention that we have always gone on the law enforcement side to a VECC emergency channel for emergency activations on the police, the law enforcement side. UPD went to TAC1. So we have just moved everybody to VECC emergency on the fire side, they remain on that channel so that they can do red operations and that they can continue to operate off of that incident.

On the law enforcement side, it activates throughout the entire dispatch center. The dispatchers are all aware of that. The reason that we do that is to make sure that the incident can continue and that there's no one walking over the top of that emergency activation. I just wanted to clarify that we also had meetings with every agency prior to make sure that that was how they wanted it configured. That can definitely be undone, but that was the intended purpose was to take that emergency activation off into another dispatcher so that the incident can continue to be handled by the primary dispatcher.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you.

AVL PILOT PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

Scott Harrington:

Okay. AVL Pilot Project. Ambir, again.

Ambir Widdison:

You can see that this document is very, very large, but this is a view of what the response configuration committee has been working on for the last several months where we took each and every medical call type and evaluated what type of response changes we could make to it.

Not only that, but we took it from one priority out to multiple. I mean, some of them go down 20, 30 different call types. Our main goals in this project were to reduce the number of apparatus that are responding on every single one of those medical calls to only the necessary apparatus so that we can divert those resources to the higher priorities and keep them available for the higher priority calls. We want to make sure that on those low priority calls, we're also addressing when we send those out as dispatchers, we're prioritizing our dispatches based off of the acuity of those calls. We have assigned acuity now. We have Omega, Alpha, Bravo, Charlie, Delta and Echo call types. We also have a canned response now.

Ambir Widdison:

In today's environment, if we are unable to completely interrogate a call, we still have to get through the interrogation and through the protocol, the software, to get to a final determinant code. We have actually added a canned code into this where if we are unable to fully interrogate a call, we can now classify it as such so that it's very clear that we did not get to finish our interrogation as opposed to marking unknown for everything because we didn't get to ask those questions, so it's very clear now to the responders that we did not arrive at a final code.

In addition to that, we have override call types that we've incorporated into this where if the call taker sees or hears something that's said, hears something in the background, we have a child caller, we can do an override code and make that a higher classification that doesn't coincide with a medical condition. We've incorporated that into it. I wanted to talk just a little bit about specific codes. For instance, the sick card, as you can see, we have a lot of Omega call types where these are calls that can be handled in a clinic. We can set ourselves up for future enhancements where we can use telehealth and those type of features where several agencies chose to do single company medical responses to these. We're really happy with the response configuration results on this where we are able to send less equipment to these calls that really shouldn't have been handled through 911 services. They should have been handled in a clinic or through some sort of telehealth. We saw some good results on this sick card. In addition to that, we have the traffic accident cards. I'm just going to point out some of the bigger changes.

Ivan Whitaker:

Before you go there, I want to jump in and I want to try to simplify it a little bit. So today, what we're doing is we have one complaint called a sick person. That's ambiguous. It's unclear. We have one response to that sick person, but that sick person can be anything. It could be a person that's vomiting, it could be a fever, so we're just drilling down into the different response types based upon what's really going on.

They're going to see some of this in the field as far as the actual type. They'll know, "Okay, I'm going to a patient with an elevated temperature," versus, "I'm going to a sick person." From a communication standpoint, it's better. From a data perspective, when we get into the meetings, we can now drill down into the different codes, things like community paramedicine and other things that they want to implement in the field, they can get to those now. In our current state, we just couldn't get there. The group where this is some complicated stuff, but it's meant to simplify everything across the board and it will.

Doug Hill:

So who determines the activity level? Is it the dispatcher that makes an assignment to Alpha, Charlie, Delta, Omega, or is it the software?

Ambir Widdison:

The next step of this project that we're going to go into is now figuring out what questions need to drive us to each and every one of those codes. So that's the biggest part of this project is making sure that we're asking

the right questions, we're interrogating the call correctly and that we're arriving at each one of those call types.

Ivan Whitaker:

One more answer to that. Dispatch never determines how response works or who goes, it's the chiefs in the field in medical control that determines the response. This is just we're taking what they want and putting in the system.

Doug Hill:

Got it.

Ivan Whitaker:

Thank you.

Doug Hill:

And so I'm assuming that Alpha call is more serious than a Charlie call versus a Delta or no?

Ambir Widdison:

Alpha is the top and it comes down to Echo is the worst.

Doug Hill:

Which is more serious?

Ambir Widdison:

More serious is the Echo level.

Doug Hill:

Echo. Okay.

Ivan Whitaker:

Echos are, if you don't do something right now and see no response right now, the patient will die. Omega is, a lot of these patients could be treated within three to five days. That's the difference in the range. Yeah. Sorry about that.

Ambir Widdison:

No, go for it. So that was one of our other goals is better classification of these calls. Right now, we can't tell you how many gout pains we get. We can't tell you how many unconscious seizure patients we get. We cannot determine that, so that was something that we really wanted to get drilled down into. How many of these calls are we responding on, and how are we responding on those calls?

Korban Lee:

Ivan, correct me. I might be way off than usual. We used to have protocols which were rigid and required you to ask all these questions even if you knew the answer or you knew the dispatch, you were still required to ask all of these protocol questions. And I thought collectively we determined we didn't like those strict, rigid protocols and so we switched protocol systems, fought a lawsuit to switch protocol systems to give us more flexibility. Are we going back to where we were with this?

Ivan Whitaker:

The reason you went away from those protocols is because it was thought that it was holding you up from being able to do what we call pre-alert, which we get the call out early. I'm going to say this but I'm going to be clear, you didn't have to move away from those protocols to pre-alert. You could have just changed when you dispatched. And that's all just process related.

So, we, with this protocol app and Telecom, we're still keeping in the pre-alert notion to where you'll get the notification out but on the lower acuity calls, that's where the response will be altered when we get that particular code. So that's the difference between the two. When we say that it's a chest pain, that call's going out. We know early in the interrogation process that it's a chest pain, that call's getting banged out.

If it's a cardiac arrest, that call's going. We can also control the trigger point with that as well. If we feel like it's not going out faster enough in outgoing Telecom, you can move that trigger point up. That is the difference between the two systems.

Korban Lee:

I like the clearing out, especially on the sick sheet. Hey, there's a lot of Omega level calls and agencies can decide how they want to handle those Omega level calls or even the Alpha calls, may not be running a heavy in an ambulance. I mean I like generally broad this. I just wanted to make sure we weren't going back to what we thought to get away from.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yeah. The goal here is, one, this is fluent, right? We implement it, we look at the data. If it starts going in the wrong way, we can tweak it. That's the goal here is to make sure that we keep looking at the data and from what we saw internally. I have to be careful about saying this, but we saw an over response traditionally by about 47%. So that's what we're trying to help tackle here is if we have an AVL issue, that's one thing, but AVL doesn't work very well if there's an abundance of units that are being sent unnecessarily.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Question. So, the data itself is set when the call is received, so once we know chest pain, that's what's logged here. That's what we're talking about here?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yeah.

Nathan Cherpeski:

So then is there any value or does this ever happen that afterwards we go back and say, "Actually, it wasn't really a chest pain call, it was," whatever?

Ivan Whitaker:

So new and updated information is provided often, and we have the ability in the protocol to update the codes or update the system based upon that new information.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Because if we're tracking types of calls to this level, it would be more helpful to have accurate data.

Ivan Whitaker:

And that's my concern is even our medical director can't make certain decisions on even processing a dispatch center because that delineation is not there. So now we have it, or will have it.

Nathan Cherpeski:

It's not slowing down to the actual dispatch.

Ambir Widdison:

No. We actually have the ability to better interrogate calls where we can identify the priority of the calls and allow the call taker to thoroughly interrogate that call so that when the responders are responding on these calls, they know what they're going to. Right now, those calls are classified immediately based off of a caller statement, which is not giving us a true picture of what we're responding.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Yeah, someone could say they've got a fever or whatever, but they actually have no idea because they didn't check temperature. They just feel warm.

Ambir Widdison:

Those high priority calls, they'll tell us right away, "This person's not breathing." We can easily classify that call and get that sent out quickly.

Nathan Cherpeski:

How's the data getting updated? Is it the departments are updating it? How are you getting the actual updated data later? So, you dispatch on a chest pain, turns out to be something different. How's that data coming back to you?

Ivan Whitaker:

It's going to auto update. It's going to auto update the CAD.

Nathan Cherpeski:

In the CAD?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes. One of the things I do want to make mention is in FPA 1221 now 1225, there are certain call types that they be or recommend as emerging. Every individual system also has the opportunity to identify what's an emergency locally. And those are what they're reporting on as far as speed when we're talking about how fast we're getting out of shoot and responding to calls. So, we'll have those types as well identified to where we'll look at those to make sure that we can work with each individual municipality on if there's just changing or we need to go in a different direction, but this allows us to get there even better as well.

Scott Harrington:

Any other questions or comments?

Korban Lee:

Sorry, you showed us the sick sheet had a lot of change. Any others have a lot of change to them?

Ambir Widdison:

Yeah, I want to show the mental health card. On the mental health card you can see there's a bunch of no responses at the top and we're tracking this protocol very closely. Right now, if we receive any call where there is a mental health concern with the patient, we are immediately sending medical help.

Those medical responders cannot go in on any of those calls until it has been secured by law enforcement. Law enforcement is not always able to respond on these calls because they're not equipped to handle them, so

when we communicate with MCOT and our mental health professionals, we are consistently seeing that 50% of these calls can be handled by their team over the phone. And the other 50% of those calls can be handled by a response from their team with no law enforcement or medical interventions at all.

So, where we've identified a no response, those will be referral based to the mental health professionals that are trained to handle those type of calls. And if at any time there is any safety concerns, we'll send law enforcement to make sure that those professionals are safe and that they're accompanied by law enforcement to ensure their safety. If at any time they need us to respond because they have a concern, they'll request us. But no longer will we be responding initially having medical ambulances sitting for a significant amount of time while law enforcement secures the scenes.

Ivan Whitaker:

In psychiatric suicide, there's a couple classifications. One is intent, one is desire. Intent would be, "I have the means, I'm thinking about it, I have a plan to carry it out." Desire could be, "I just want to speak to somebody, I'm just here, I just want to talk to somebody." A lot of times when we send apparatuses to the wrong stuff, it's an instant escalation. That's why there's trained professionals out there that know how to handle these situations and that's what we're trying to get the calls through.

Korban Lee:

What's MCOT?

Ambir Widdison:

It's the Mobile Crisis Outreach Team. So, anyone who's in any level of crisis, they have a team, all over the state of Utah, that will respond out, create safety plans for them, talk them through their crisis. They can even transport them to receiving facilities where they can receive extended care.

Terry Addison:

On that transport though, sometimes when MCOT is just having it over the phone, they will request an ambulance transport from the local agency without them being there so they can work that out with the patient. We're seeing more and more of that.

Ambir Widdison:

Yeah. So, if they're intervening with that crisis and they at any time think that medical help is needed, they'll call us back and start an ambulance.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

Are you seeing a difference, time of day? Some of our complaints that we're getting is MCOT's not as available into the evening hours or after regular hours and so we end up going anyway. Are you seeing that in data?

Ambir Widdison:

No. We've actually done significant work in preparing MCOT for the increased volume that they're going to receive based off this. As with any of our agencies, they have to see the increase in order to get the staffing that they need, but they are very much aware of it and if there are any concerns with them not being able to respond, then we'll address those directly.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

The data is driving the conversation. That's great.

Scott Harrington:

All right. Anything else? All right.

FINANCIAL REPORTING ITEMS

Scott Harrington:

Executive director report, five-year plan discussion.

Ivan Whitaker:

Before we do that, would you like to do the financial portion?

Tyson Montoya:

Yeah.

Ivan Whitaker:

One at a time. Okay.

Tyson Montoya:

Marcus, are you online?

Marcus Arbuckle:

Yes, I am.

Tyson Montoya:

Do you want me to share the audit, or do you have something that you want to present?

Marcus Arbuckle:

No, you can share that financial statement and I'll talk about the opinions and the reports. They're on page one.

Tyson Montoya:

Do you want the financial or the supplemental?

Marcus Arbuckle:

Go on the financial statement. Am I good to go ahead right now?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes.

Marcus Arbuckle:

All right. Well, I'm Marcus Arbuckle with Kennington & Christensen. I'd like to thank the board for the opportunity to audit Salt Lake VECC. We've completed the fiscal year '25 financial statement audit. As part of the audit, we're required to report several items to governance. We consider the board to be governance, but part of your responsibility is to oversee the financial reporting process where management is responsible for the financial statement.

An audit does not relieve governance or management of those responsibilities. As auditors, we plan and perform an audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and government auditing standards. The goal of the audit is to obtain reasonable assurance that the financial statements are free of

material misstatement. But along with this audit, we issue three different reports. The first is the one that's on the screen right now, it's the independent auditors report. This is basically our opinion. We've given a clean opinion on the financial statements. That opinion, it's on the basic financial statements and the footnotes. There are a couple other required schedules as part of this report, like the MD&A and the pension schedules. We just make sure that those are in line with those audited financial statements.

In fiscal year 25, there was one new accounting standard that needed to be implemented and that was called GASB101. It just changed how sick and vacation time are accrued. Tyson was able to get that implemented into the financial statements as it should be. Another report that we issue with this audit, and Tyson, you can go over to the supplemental report, but on page one of that supplemental report. This report is a report on the internal control.

As part of the audit, for this type of audit, we don't give an opinion on the internal controls, but we do analyze internal controls that are directly related to the financial reporting process. We go through and look at the internal controls related to the cash receding, the cash disbursement, the payroll process, and then the overall financial close process. If necessary, we make recommendations on the internal controls. This year we didn't have any recommendations. We feel that the controls in place are adequate, which last year there was a recommendation in one of those areas but we feel that Tyson and his staff have made adjustments and things look great in those controls.

The next report that we issue is a report on state compliance. This is a requirement from the state auditor's office that they come out with a state compliance guide and then we go and test certain areas of compliance. Maybe go down one more page, Tyson, on that. Right there. So, the areas that we looked at this year were budgetary compliance. We looked at fund balance compliance, we looked at the fraud risk assessment and then compliance with URS and how employees are enrolled and tracked.

We didn't have any findings to bring up related to those compliance areas. We feel that Tyson and staff, they do a great job keeping up on the state compliance. I mean there was one new test that had to be done this year. I mean you've been doing the fraud risk assessment for a couple years now, but this year they asked that we verify everything on that fraud risk assessment. So, we look at backup and just make sure those answers are in line with what's actually happened. We didn't find any issues with the report that you've submitted.

I'll stop there. Are there any questions about these reports or anything so far that we've talked about? Okay. And as part of a couple other things just to wrap up, we didn't have any significant difficulties performing the audit. There's no uncorrected misstatements. We didn't have any, what I call disagreements with management. There's no significant issues.

We feel that the management estimates are reasonable. If you look on note one of the financial statements, that's all the estimates and an overview of different areas of the financial statements. We felt that those were reasonable. Overall, I mean things went well. I'd like to thank Tyson and his staff for all the time and effort they put into getting ready for an audit because that does take a lot of time. They were well-prepared and had appropriate backup to support their numbers and that helps the audit go a lot smoother. So, I'd like to thank them for that. But any questions at all? That's really all I had. I mean, things went well, so I appreciate that.

Scott Harrington:

There were no significant findings or anything?

Marcus Arbuckle:

No, and if I'm remembering back, I think this is the first year we didn't have any findings or comments. So great job, Tyson and staff, with that. I think we've had at least one the last few years, so that's great.

Scott Harrington:

All right. Thank you. And thank you Tyson.

Tyson Montoya:

Thank you, Marcus.

Marcus Arbuckle:

All right, thank you.

Tyson Montoya:

I'm going to just go on to finish.

Scott Harrington:

Yeah, go ahead and finish the financial report.

Tyson Montoya:

Okay, fiscal year '26, so we're done for the first quarter. We should be at 25% of our budget estimate. You can see our revenues are at 42% year to date and putting as much money as we can into interest this year. Our E-tax is a little bit high. This is, as I mentioned, each month we get 50% of the assessment upfront. So, this will flatten out as we progress through the year.

The next one we have is our personnel cost. You can see that we are at 22% of budget. Our overtime is a little bit high. We're monitoring that on each individual payroll, to ensure that we stay within budget on that. Some of these other items that are a little bit high, are we've either prepaid or they're part of the initial accrual from this year '24 audit that I made. These should roll back once I do all of the reversal entries for this year.

We're looking good in personnel wages. We do have three pay periods in October though. So next month see this and it might be one or 2% higher than our budget estimate, but that will flatten out as we progress through the year. Admin and operating expense, we're at 39%, but the vast majority of that is due to we pay Versaterm upfront for half the invoice or half the annual bill.

Our overall total operating expense is at 26%, so we are a little bit high. Nothing out of the ordinary. Everything is really in line with what we think and what we budgeted. This is our 9-30 ending cash balance. We finished the month at 4.9 million in the bank. Did you guys have any questions on P&O?

Korban Lee:

Tyson, Versaterm is our single largest expense in the budget?

Tyson Montoya:

Other than personnel costs, yes.

Korban Lee:

Right. I mean separate than all the employees collective, but the one check you write, that's the biggest check or whatever the biggest is Versaterm. Is it once a year, twice? It looks like it's 50 but it's twice a year?

Tyson Montoya:

Twice a year.

Korban Lee:

Is that fine with you from a cash flow perspective? Do we need to try to break that into monthly or quarterly?

Tyson Montoya:

No, I think twice a year is perfect the way that the assessment model is set up right now.

Korban Lee:

Okay.

Tyson Montoya:

This is our check list. Nothing out of the ordinary. This month we had some employee reimbursements. These were from '22. Some of these were garnishment reimbursements. I didn't get with Jodi before she left town to get clarification on this, but I will next month just because of the dates of them. I'll bring this back up next month and clarify those. These two here are employee reimbursements related to garnishments. We had several last paychecks and then we had a few of the December bonuses clear as well. Nothing out of the ordinary. Here's another reimbursement. These are our P-Card transactions here. We have one below.

Scott Harrington:

On the P-Cards, you have a manager review all those expenses?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, the process is I send out the transactions to each individual member. They submit the receipt back to sign it. Send it back to Jodi, and then we process it once everything's signed up.

Scott Harrington:

Great. Thank you.

Tyson Montoya:

Any other questions?

Doug Hill:

So that last one there, Voiance Language Services, since this leads into your five-year plan. So that was how much we paid-

Tyson Montoya:

Last month.

Doug Hill:

... for translation services just for one month?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, it varies based on call volume.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT (5-YEAR PLAN DISCUSSION)

Ivan Whitaker:

The good thing is, and going into the five-year plan, if we do this the right way with the AI, we can offset some of this expense and bake it into what we're already paying. So that's one of the initiatives that I know that we should be able to move forward with.

I provided you with the deep dive because I wanted to make sure that you had an understanding and justification of where my brain was in this. The cusp of all of it is based upon this particular chart where you'll see the FTE minimum requirement and that's the number of shifts that we have to have every single day to

meet the minimum. I have about a couple of pages in here that describes what minimum means, and I'll talk to it as well. Then you have the optimal requirement, and I'll explain what that is. You have current what we're staffed for as far as FTE is what we can meet and then you have the actual at the end.

So, looking at the FTE minimum, we have to have 47 shifts per day to do everything it is that we need to do just from a call taking and dispatching standpoint. That doesn't include breaks, that doesn't include constructive feedback through QA that all of us have to do, whether you're the fire department or dispatch or law enforcement. It doesn't include, I have to meet with my supervisor, discuss something in a one-on-one. It's just you're call taking and dispatching. You have to have 47 shifts per day.

Optimal includes all of that, where you can have constructive feedback, one-on-one quality assurance, those discussions that need to be had on a day-to-day basis. It allows the supervisors to branch off and not be tied to the court or the console. That's 56 shifts a day. Our current allocation puts us at 49 so that's why in the past when it was said, "Do we have enough staffing?" I think it was based upon, okay, if we just look at pure FTEs, we do, but it wasn't accounting for the actual. This has been for years when we looked at the calculations about 37 shifts per day. So, we're accounting for a good... And you can do the math there to show how many shifts that we're having to account for from overtime. We have some part-timers that we're trying to fill it, but we have about 500 shifts a month that we're trying to cover, whether it's with the overtime or part-timers or whatever it is that we're trying to do.

We reached a point where if the call volume trends the way I think it is, which nationally is about 1.7% to 3% a year, how from a standpoint of a five-year plan are we going to get there or what are we going to infuse or what process are we going to move forward with to be able to not only keep pace, but to deal with the deficits that we've seen since 2012 to where we weren't able to meet the national standards?

We've made some movements, we've done some things. I'm concerned because like I've said before, from a supervisor and manager standpoint, you absolutely have to have managers that are able to untie from the console and actually be able to answer questions in real time. It's a liability not to do so. We don't have that right now.

Everything that we're talking about in number of FTEs that are added, the 12 that we want to add this upcoming year, if you do the 12 and you look at the 36, we're just trying to get to six per rotation, not up to about 42 per day. The rest we're trying to fill in with AI because we don't want to come to the board. There is a hesitancy to come to you all and ask for FTEs. I'm telling you that. There is fear.

Scott Harrington:

Good. Good.

Ivan Whitaker:

There is a hesitancy.

Nathan Cherpeski:

We experience it in our own jobs.

Ivan Whitaker:

Exactly. With that, I have to paint the picture and tell you what's going on because, again, we're trying to be fiscally responsible. A little bit of FTEs or it's not a lot, a little bit, but FTEs here, AI here to where we think in the next three to four years we can take care of the half of our non-emergencies, which is 300,000 calls with AI. We have to start now though and build up and get there to be able to do it.

So that's what this plan is all about. It's a collection of can we do it with FTEs in addition to AI? Mission-critical said we needed 40 plus. We're not going to get 40 plus FTEs. We know that. My calculations were 20 to 25. I'm not asking for that, but what we're trying to do is be creative in how we move this thing forward with technology in addition to some FTEs. That's the spill.

Doug Hill:

A couple of questions, Ivan. So, when you use the term shift, you're not referring necessarily to a time period, but an actual employee is a shift, right?

Ivan Whitaker:

Correct.

Doug Hill:

You talk about minimum standards, but I heard you also say, "National standard." So is that what the FTE minimum requirement is as a national standard?

Ivan Whitaker:

The national standards would be those processing things that we have to do. For example, the fire department have to adhere to ISO and FPA. We adhere to NENA to where we have to answer the calls in a certain amount of time. That's what we're talking about. This just, okay, based on the call volume that comes in to be able to meet those standards and the non-emergencies, you don't have to adhere to a standard to be able to answer those calls and have them not wait on the line for 25 minutes. This is what we would have to have.

Doug Hill:

So, the 47 minimum requirement is what you and your team have come up with that is necessary to meet the minimum job responsibility?

Ivan Whitaker:

It's more than that. What's supposed to happen, which hasn't happened traditionally, is if we get to that 47, bells and whistles supposed to be going out, notifications are supposed to happen, breaks are supposed to stop, right? We're in trouble. And we have traditionally fallen below that FTE count when you tag in FMLA and vacations and all of that. So, when you have the police chiefs that are fussing because we're patching channels, that's what it is.

Korban Lee:

Sorry, when I heard Doug ask, I think it's been my same question, is who sets that minimum? Is that minimum FTE minimum and that FTE optimum, whose standard is that? Is that VECC's standard? Is that of our own creation or is that the mission-critical?

Ivan Whitaker:

No, that is the state standard. We'll start there. That is the state where we have to answer the 95% of calls within and in the 90% of calls within. For us to be able to meet that, and because I think we're talking about standards, but we also have to have 14 dispatchers during the day and 14 dispatchers during the night to dispatch. So that's all-inclusive of that. It's call-taking, it's non-emergency calls that we're having to answer. How many of those are we going to have to... We're not even including the 90, the national standards in that, but then also the number of dispatchers that we have to have for normal operations.

Doug Hill:

So, the optimal requirement of 56 is really the number you need.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes.

Doug Hill:

But you're currently at 49?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes, we're currently allocated at that, but the actual day-to-day is 37.

Nathan Cherpeski:

And that's an issue of just time loss at work, their vacation, their sick, their-

Scott Harrinton:

Training.

Nathan Cherpeski:

... training, whatever. I just want to close the loop with what Korban and Doug were asking, they may already, but the minimum you're setting there, you all are figuring out a number of people to do to meet the state standard. You're looking at it saying, "Okay, in order to meet that state standard, I need at least seven people in that six AM to six PM. Seven call takers at a minimum." It would be, we'd clearly meet it with nine. So we've been budgeting you at the seven, but with loss, you're at four. So help me understand, because if we went to nine, how does that get you to... You'd be at six, right, if they show up. I'm just trying to understand what's happening on the actual daily that's pulling us down so much.

Ivan Whitaker:

If we look at this plan and we just think about it as trying to account FTE count, we wouldn't get there. But if we look at incorporating the AI in addition to this, that's where we start to bridge that gap. That's the piece where I want to make sure, I do a good job of explaining, that's what the document does is that's the 24 additional. It showed you every single year, if we do 60,000 calls that we revert the first year, that's equal to four FTEs and that's how you're adding it over the years to where you're offsetting live people.

Doug Hill:

So if I rephrase that in a different way, instead of needing 19 employees to meet the optional requirement, you're only needing 12, filling that gap of seven with AI technology.

Ivan Whitaker:

Exactly.

John Evans:

Ivan, are those 9A, 9P, 10, those are supervisor positions? Is that what those are on the chart?

Korban Lee:

The two, the ones in the middle, Chief? Is that what you're asking about? Yeah, I was wondering that too.

Ivan Whitaker:

No, those are mid-shifters, just regular call takers. Dispatchers.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I guess this is more of a process question. We just adopted the '26 budget. We're in the middle of the '26 budget. What is the timing of this? I can't go to my council and ask for a mid-year for VECC. I'll get strung up. So that can't happen. I'm not even sure I can go, when we put the number of 12 in how that's going to go over

when that changed because I think every one of us gets requested every year from our staffs, "Hey, we need this," and they can have wonderful justification and we say, "No." So I'm just trying to understand the timing and if there are some things we should do, what should happen first instead of trying to do this all at once?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yeah. Good question. So, there's a couple of things. Last year when we came to the table, there was some sticker shock when we were going through finance and I vowed that would never happen again. One of the things we're doing here is we're putting it up as early as we can. This is what we're facing, this is what we're trying to do. So that's one thing.

The next thing is from a conversational standpoint, we know if we get the grant, and again, I'm not wanting to talk too much about the grant because we just don't know, but if we do get the grant, things like the non-emergency AI, we should be able to start right away. Things like language translation, we should be able to start right away. Things like the tow services, we should be able to start those.

Those are the things that we're looking at to where, as soon as January, February, if we could move forward on those things and then deal with the FTEs through the finance committee, that's what we're trying to do here. Knowing that the approval is what we're up against.

Doug Hill:

So, if we don't get the grant, then 12 employees isn't going to cover what you need done?

Ivan Whitaker:

Correct. So that's why-

Nathan Cherpeski:

I think \$200,000 more a year, right?

Scott Harrington:

Unless you purchase the AI.

Ivan Whitaker:

Exactly. So that's why I put the grant and without grant so you can see the difference.

Kevin Hicks:

Ivan, this is Kevin. Can I just ask one bit of clarification though? I am understanding that the ask is for this next budget year and we're just getting ahead of time.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes.

Kevin Hicks:

Are you saying that the hope from you guys is all 12 or none? I mean, I guess I was a little confused there. I think it was Nathan asked with, well, what if you were given nine or what? It's to try to go all the way to 12 is going to be the difficult part as well. So I mean is it, hey, if we can at least get some, that would be great, but we'll still tell you here's what the problems are? Or is it getting some, but not the 12 will actually cause you more harm than good? I guess that's my question.

Ivan Whitaker:

We need the 12. It's not an all or nothing because we're going to take anything that we can get, but I have to stand firm on the need so that two, three years from now, you're not coming back to me saying, "Why didn't you tell me?" So, the 12 is what we need to offset to give the AI enough time to work, to give the other things enough time to work that we're trying to implement so that we're comfortable enough to be able to move into the future. That's the goal here.

My concern is what we're up against in call volume. And so that history of what we've seen in the past versus looking forward versus another 100,000 citizens hitting Salt Lake County. I mean those are the things that we're looking at, trying to project this thing.

Scott Harrington:

So, what has our call volume increase been year over year for the last two years?

Ivan Whitaker:

About 1.7%.

Doug Hill:

I know this isn't a budget meeting, but do you have an idea of what percentage increase on member assessments, what 12 employees would compute to?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, I think it's just under 11%.

Korban Lee:

You showed us last meeting sorry, I thought, yeah, nine to 11% per year for the next five years or something in Salt Lake. Am I remembering right?

Tyson Montoya:

Year one and two were... Well, no, excuse me, 13 without, and then it stays at under 10 and then goes down to six over the five years.

Ivan Whitaker:

That's without the grant.

Josh Collins:

So we're factoring in, because next year it starts, well, for the employee dollars and cents, right? You're saying next year it's going to be 1.09 million? Is that what you said? So, then each year after that, are you factoring in with COLA merit, all the other stuff? In year 2, 3, 4, 5.

Tyson Montoya:

That's correct question. I did factor in a 3% COLA in all of this in addition to 3% for Versaterm for the next two years and then I assumed a 5% increase.

Josh Collins:

Because if you assume that each employee, all 12 employees that start next year stay for five years.

Tyson Montoya:

They're going to make more money, right? Sure.

Josh Collins:

As opposed to the turnover that really will happen?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, I think we tried to present this as a worst-case scenario number with the AI, the tow, and then the FTEs.

Nathan Cherpeski:

When we look at these numbers right here, and you have \$375,000 for FTEs, are those new FTEs, or is that your COLA issue with the COLA issue.

Ivan Whitaker:

It would be new FTEs.

Nathan Cherpeski:

And is that in this five-year deep plan? Does this one match what you're showing us today? Because this was, I don't know if that's in here.

Ivan Whitaker:

No, it's not.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Okay.

Ivan Whitaker:

The numbers are in there. I'm sorry. Yeah.

Doug Hill:

I just wanted to clarify. So, you said, "Worst case scenario." So that 13% assessment increase, 30.8% assessment increase would be if we didn't get the grant and we did move forward with purchasing the non-emergency AI and tow services.

Scott Harrington:

And the FTEs.

Tyson Montoya:

Right, it's showing the current price that we're being quoted right now with the software but there would be negotiation, so we would be able to get it a lot lower. This is with the grant. The year two through four are the biggest decreases obviously because we don't have that first year and the last year.

Doug Hill:

You're not showing on there the language translation AI. Is that included in there or are we just saying that's a wash cost-wise?

Ivan Whitaker:

It is on there. If you slide down, if you look at FY 2008, it's on there, the language translation.

Nathan Cherpeski:

But you're showing there an added three FTEs. You have 12, and then an additional nine shown through that. Where do they show up in this? I guess I'm not seeing them in your deep dive that you sent.

Ivan Whitaker:

I didn't include those annual in the deep dive because those are different.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Those are projected or thinking based on growth?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yeah, exactly. The deep dive is just the justifications of the four elements that we're after right now.

Josh Collins:

The 12 is to catch up?

Ivan Whitaker:

Exactly.

Josh Collins:

And then the three that Nathan was just talking to us is the projections.

Ivan Whitaker:

Exactly.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes, so things like technical services, human resources, training department, those types of things that we want to take a deeper dive and focus on those when that time comes. For example, right now we have a training department with five individuals and it's not going to cut it, but we're putting that on the back burner now because the focus now is operations and getting us up to par there.

Nathan Cherpeski:

If we meet the 95% whatever the state and we're eligible for those funds, how much money are we talking here?

Ivan Whitaker:

So, they're not doing the funds any further. This last year that we met was the last year that the funds will be distributed. I had a call with UCA today that we did indeed meet it, making sure. I was wondering why we haven't gotten our letter. They're drafting a letter and then we'll know what we're getting this year.

Nathan Cherpeski:

But they're not collecting that tax anymore? They're not sharing that out?

Ivan Whitaker:

No. So what I've done is, I've been part of a group with Senator Harper and five dispatch centers that I've actually helped write new potential standards that hopefully, and this is what we're pushing for, if you meet the state mandate that it could positively impact E-911 funds. And so that's what we're working on in the background there as well.

Tyson Montoya:

That would give us more of the one-third of the revenue that we're currently getting.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I'd also still like to talk to him about the cost of tows being generated by private parties, HOA's and things that we are having to bear, whether it's a surcharge we can put on the tows that come back somehow to the dispatch. I can't imagine we're the only dispatch center that has to deal with aggressive HOA's towing and then those people calling us, because they forgot that they parked illegally.

Tyson Montoya:

Yeah, 75% of the 911 dispatch centers are two, three-seaters. We do more tows every single day than those do 911 calls. We do 180 tows a day.

Doug Hill:

We're not charging for any tows?

Ivan Whitaker:

No.

Doug Hill:

But we have the ability. I talked to Dave Spadafore. I think he was going to talk to you. We have the ability to charge. It's just we've chosen not to.

Ivan Whitaker:

Well, it's all about personnel. So, you get into that game, you got to have the personnel to be able to go through it. When we were looking at Autura, we were trying to find an automated way to do it to where we weren't inundating Tyson and Jodi, but we can definitely revisit that. That is a huge-

Tyson Montoya:

Yeah, we can strategize and try to figure something out.

Scott Harrington:

Is there a limit on what we could charge?

Tyson Montoya:

I think there's a limit on the administration fee. It can't be above a certain amount, but I don't remember what it is off the top of my head. I'll have to look and see.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Ivan, we haven't heard about the grant?

Ivan Whitaker:

Well, it's good news in that it was a few weeks ago they asked for an additional document and we provided that and it satisfied everything we needed. So they're still in contact with us, which is a good thing. Previous years, the notification went out on October the 30th, but with the shutdown, who knows?

One of the things I wanted to make mention is I had an opportunity to go to Phoenix dispatch. Phoenix is facing some of this as well. They do 2 million calls a year. They have 280 call takers and dispatchers. They're

30% understaffed. Well, they have 40 positions open right now. They can't train fast enough to get people on the floor because of how long it takes to train.

We're trying to stay out of that cycle so a lot of what we're trying to do here is that as well. It takes a year to get someone really, really proficient doing a good job. So, it's not just to shift deficit, it's the length of training time. It's the amount of trainers that we have. It's all of that that I have to do a good job, articulating to you. I don't know if you want to step in and talk about it, but-

Elyse Haggerty:

I think it was last year or the year before, where Chief Burchett said, "Don't you need more FTEs?" And my response is, "We always need more people." Even when we can say, "We're full," we are never full. Every day I call in and talk to the managers and, "Hey, how many channels do you have patched?" Every day I am running eCATS reports and I feel like we've seen a really good impact in this month so far but it's almost like they just want me to stop talking to them because they are exhausted by me saying, "Well, what channels are not patched that we could patch? Where is this dispatcher sitting? How busy are they? How do we get them over into call taking so they can do that?"

I mean, we've limited ourselves. Our dispatchers are not good call takers because they are required to dispatch every single day. And I hesitate to ask them to take 911 calls while they're on a channel because then do I give CPR instructions, or do I tell this officer what direction the suspect is now running? And some are just not qualified to be able to handle that. If I had 150 Rosa's and Ambir's and Nicole's dispatching, it would be different, but our newer dispatchers don't take phone calls because it's two ears is all you've got. You've got the radio coming into one, your phone call coming into the other, but then thing on the console that's spitting out another channel that you're supposed to be watching. It's a lot. It is a very difficult job.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I do have a question about the number 12 because if I am asked to add an officer, add a car, that's not one person on a shift for 365 to it's at minimum of five. Depending on how senior they are, it might be five point something so I have to add a six to get full coverage. So when I'm looking at 12, you're not really talking about putting 12 people a day on.

Ivan Whitaker:

It's six and then we offset with the way we're doing it, and maybe I should show a chart of that to where it's six per day, but then you have the offset with the part-timers and you have the offset with the overtime. That's what we're trying to get to, bump up to that number.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Okay. So with your part-timers, you're trying to get that coverage as well. So these would be additional full-time, which would be more like two a day if they were covering 365?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yeah.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Okay.

Doug Hill:

So just as a general statement, as a board member, I'm not speaking for my city or what our city council might do, and I've been on this board a lot shorter than probably most of you sitting around this table have. During my period of time on VECC, I've been through three executive directors. When I first came on, I felt like we were, picking my words carefully here, so conservative with the funds that we had really done a disservice to

the employees of VECC and that we had put the Executive Director in a position where basically he couldn't succeed. I'm not saying that was the only problem, but I felt like since that time we've gotten progressively better with each Executive Director. I think Scott came on board and I think he at least opened my eyes to a lot of national issues and how we could improve.

We took a big increase back during Scott's time, as I remember. That was hard to sell as I remember, but I felt like it made VECC better and was better for the employees. And then Ivan of course, I think is even better. We're making, I think great changes and improvements. It's not easy to sell to 15% increase, but I support the five-year plan because I think it supports Ivan and his staff and his team and it makes VECC a better organization overall.

I guess that's just a statement as a board member that I'm making that I do support the five-year plan. Ultimately, it has to be funded. That's always the harder part. But as far as what we're talking about today, I just want to lend my support towards the five-year plan as it's written.

Ivan Whitaker:

Thank you. Thank you.

Scott Harrington:

All right. Thank you.

Doug Hill:

And I don't know if that means that we have to adopt that five-year plan or it's just information at this period.

Ivan Whitaker:

It's just information right now.

Korban Lee:

I am grateful you made this five-year plan. You're giving us a heads up on where you're trying to go. Every department in the city in West Jordan where I work, would come forward and say, "I need this. I need more. I need more. I can't maintain our parks unless I have more. I need more officers. I need more employees."

I feel like that's what you're doing. Good. I want to know those increases. I want to know those desires. I want to know the ramifications and the trade-offs. I'm struggling with this a lot because what I'm hearing you say is, "We need 12 FTEs and we need the non-emergency AI calls support, which will save us 24 FTEs. And we need the language AI support, which will save us one FTE and we need the tow software, which will save us four FTEs." If I sum all that up, that's 41 FTEs. VECC only has 148 FTEs.

You're saying we're failing unless we get 28, 29, 30% more employees than what we have now. Yet, the main performance measures I care about is how fast are we answering those 911 calls and how safe is the public and the officers when they're getting dispatched and we're meeting our performance measures. By and large, we're doing better with our performance measures than we've ever been. So say we're failing unless we get 41 FTEs or a combination of software and other things, I can't reconcile those two things.

I don't think VECC is failing. I think VECC is very, very successful and very, very efficient, very resourceful. And so I'm just not there yet for this. I need to spend more time. I need to see it. I need to understand better the limitations you're describing with the training or with the ramifications of what happens when the supervisors can't supervise. I don't understand that.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yeah, Korban. One of the things I'll be doing, the fire chiefs have already gotten the notification. Police chiefs will get it as well. The board, I'll be meeting with you all individually to talk through because there's some things at a board meeting that I have to be careful with saying, but I'm at a point of liability right now with

some of the things that we're doing to try to meet these standards. And my folks know that. So I'll explain it well as to what-

Korban Lee:

Yeah, let's spend some time. Yeah.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes.

Scott Harrington:

Any other comments or suggestions?

Korban Lee:

I am sorry. I have just been on a soap box today. 20 years ago, roughly, it probably needs a lot of verifying, but E-911 was roughly 50% of VECC's revenue and assessments were 50% of VECC's revenue. Now, E-911 is only a third of VECC's revenue. We're out of balance. We need help. To me, we've got to get back to a roughly 50/50 somehow. We can't keep putting this on the back of assessments to the cities.

Ivan Whitaker:

We completely agree.

Tyson Montoya:

We're going to meet with Senator Harper. Was it next week?

Scott Harrington:

In the next two weeks, yeah.

Tyson Montoya:

Okay.

Korban Lee:

Am I getting that right, John? It was roughly, wasn't it 50/50? It seemed like those revenue numbers were about equal revenue.

Tyson Montoya:

Yeah. I can go back and look and see.

Doug Hill:

When was the last time that fee, that our revenue increase?

Tyson Montoya:

It went up 3 cents in December. So that ends up being about \$400,000 over the course of the year.

Doug Hill:

Prior to that, do you know what the history is?

Tyson Montoya:

Prior to that? I don't know, off the top of my head, Doug, I'd have to look. We're going to go in and ask for almost an extra 4 million to try and help because, Korban, I'm well aware of the assessments and I mean, internally, I'm the fiscal guy. I'm trying to measure things and what it causes, we have all kinds of internal conversations about this because of this, and I don't want to come with another 10% ask. We don't want to do that.

Doug Hill:

I agree. That would be ideal to get more revenue through the fee.

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, that's a big push that we're going to try.

Scott Harrington:

And they're working on it as well, but I mean it's going to probably take all of us to do that as well.

Tyson Montoya:

Yeah, I was going to say we need to do it now because I mean, they go into session in January, but they start putting stuff together in November. So, we're trying to get everyone's ear right now.

Doug Hill:

Does every call center in the state benefit from that fee?

Scott Harrington:

Yes.

Doug Hill:

And they all get the same percentage of that fee?

Tyson Montoya:

I don't know.

Elyse Haggerty:

It's by number of calls, yeah, call volume. So we get the most.

Doug Hill:

Right. But every call center would benefit from a fee. So that'd be something that the Utah League of Cities and Towns could get behind because it would benefit every city.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes.

NO CLOSED SESSION/NEXT BOARD MEETING/MOTION TO ADJOURN

Scott Harrington:

Another discussion? All right. I think that's the end of the meeting then. Next meeting will be November 19th.
Got a motion to adjourn?

Korban Lee:

So moved.

Scott Harrington:

All right. Thank you, Korban. Everyone, nice meeting.

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Korban Lee, to adjourn the meeting; the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.