Utah Risk Management Agency

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

April 11, 2024, 12:00-2:00 p.m.
Draper City Hall
1020 Pioneer Rd., Draper, UT 84020

Members Present:	Alex Jensen, Chairman (Layton); Brant Hanson, Vice Chairman (Centerville); Derek Oyler (Brigham City); David Dobbins (Draper); Adam Bowler (Enterprise); Brigham Mellor (Farmington); Cory Branch (Mapleton); Trudi Simpson (Ogden); Margaret Plane (Park City); Seth Perrins, (Spanish Fork); Duane Huffman (West Bountiful); Eric Bunderson (West Valley City)
Absent:	Paul Bittmenn (Cedar City); Kyler Ludwig (Kanab)
URMA Staff Present:	David Petersen, Executive Director; Brandon Crowther; Jason Davis; Jordan Rapp; Elizabeth Christensen; Ann Richey; Shianne Wadley; Libby Lowther (Lowther & Associates)
Others Present:	Jeff Miles (HBME Auditor); Gary Ogden, Robert Oldroyd, Kendall Trump, Judi Davis (Moreton & Company); Jack Urquhart (Spanish Fork Risk Manager)

1. **LUNCH**

2. **WELCOME** – Alex Jensen, Chairman

MINUTES

Mr. Jensen called the meeting to order, welcomed attendees, acknowledged Mr. Bunderson representing West Valley City and commented that West Valley has hired a new city manager, Ifo Pili, who just started Monday. He recognized Ms. Simpson representing Ogden City, and Margaret Plane as the Board member from Park City.

3. **MOTION – APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Board Meeting December 14, 2023
   DRAFT BOARD MINUTES 12 14 2023

   MINUTES & MOTION

   Mr. Jensen asked if there were any proposed additions or deletions to the minutes. There were none. He asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Motion to approve by Mr. Dobbins. Second by Mr. Perrins. Voting was unanimously affirmative to approve the minutes from December 14, 2023 Board Meeting.

4. **CONSENT AGENDA**
   - 4.1. **QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT**
     FY2024 QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT 2024 03 31
   - 4.2. **ACTUARIAL STUDY**
     ACTUARIAL STUDY AND REPORT 12 28 2023

   MINUTES & MOTION

   Mr. Jensen asked for questions from the Board about the Quarterly Financial Report and the Actuarial Study and Report. Mr. Petersen said these items are presented annually to the Board. Mr. Jensen asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Perrins motioned to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Mr. Bowler. Voting was unanimously affirmative to approve the Consent Agenda.

5. **SCHEDULED ITEMS**
   - 5.1. **PRESENTATION – AUDIT REPORT** – Jeff Miles, HBME
     AUDITOR REPORT FY 2023

   MINUTES

   Mr. Miles presented the audit report to the URMA Board, for the period of time ending June 30, 2023. He quoted from page one of the report, "In our opinion, the accompanying financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of Utah Risk Management Agency, as of June 30, 2023, and the respective change in financial position and cash flows thereof for the year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America." He remarked that the report was dated January 3, 2024, and technically the report is due to the state on December 31, but there was a delay with the actuarial study which delayed the report. He said he anticipates receiving the actuarial information in a more timely manner in 2024 and the audit report will not be delayed.

   Mr. Miles provided a brief overview of the financial statements for FY2023. Total assets increased by $300,000, driven by collections of member billing. He said liabilities increased by $900,000, a result of the actuarial studies projecting out the number of *claims outstanding, based on the estimated cost of settling the claims, including the effects of inflation and other societal and economic factors. Overall assets were up, and liabilities were up slightly. He explained the insurance cycle has high and low claim years, and URMA is seeing a peak right now, hopefully will have low claim years in the future.*

Mr. Miles said the Compliance Report identified no significant deficiencies or material weaknesses in internal controls.

Mr. Miles said for the State Compliance Report, this year they tested Budgetary Compliance, Fraud Risk Assessment, Fund Balance, and Cash Management, and did not identify any instances of non-compliance. Overall this was a clean audit with no findings to report. He said Staff and Dave Sanderson had information ready for audit and did a very good job.

Mr. Miles mentioned that the bulk of the audit was complete in late October, but they waited two months for the actuarial study to update the liability portion of the report. Mr. Miles asked for questions.

Mr. Perrins asked, with respect to state auditor, do we expect a negative response from them? Mr. Miles said sometimes they will draft a letter, but URMA is a little different because it does not receive tax money like cities and counties, which might be more time sensitive. He has not received any communication from state auditor's office. Mr. Petersen said URMA has not received anything from the auditor's office.

Mr. Perrins asked Mr. Petersen if he expected timing to be an issue going forward. Mr. Petersen explained this year we had to switch actuaries because AON no longer wanted URMA's business, so there was a transition to get the actuary enough background data and history this first year. He said he does not anticipate a problem with timing this year and will emphasize the deadline.

Mr. Jensen thanked Mr. Miles for the review.

5.2. PRESENTATION – INSURANCE MARKET UPDATE – Moreton & Company

MINUTES

Mr. Jensen turned time over to Moreton. Mr. Ogden presented the insurance market update, saying they are excited with the current market, and that there is a strategic advantage to being in a pool. He said URMA has strength in numbers, which results in much better pricing than they are seeing for stand-alone cities. He reviewed that last year we moved liability coverage to Great American and negotiated a fixed price with them for three years, depending on loss history. He said the market increase this year is about 9-11% increase but URMA's increase would be minimal, maybe 2%.

He said worker's compensation rates are down, and Members should see a good renewal rate. He said cyber risk was trending down, and they are expecting a favorable renewal for cyber in July. He said auto is a troubled line of business and URMA has had a couple of large auto losses. He said URMA is with WCF and Moreton will be getting quotes from other carriers. He said they are expecting increase on auto.

Mr. Ogden said the most problematic coverage for every entity (not only public entities) is property. He said property capacity is shrinking, and losses have been bad. He said carriers have been remodeling their pricing over the last couple of years. He explained in the U.S. market, catastrophic losses (weather related) annually from 2012 to 2022 averaged $18 billion. The losses for 2023 are at $95 billion. He said property valuations are very important with the inflation we are seeing, and Moreton has built in inflation increases in property valuations. He said with property being bad, the market is seeing 14-15% rate increase in renewals, URMA will see less than 10% because they are selling URMA as a pool, as a large schedule. He referenced a market index report from The Counsel and said the fourth quarter of 2023 is the twenty-fifth consecutive quarter of rate increases. Mr. Ogden asked for questions.

Mr. Jensen asked if there was anything individual cities could do to moderate losses.

Mr. Ogden said losses are not often seen on large structures, and that it is specific to the property itself. He said Moreton has three Safety and Loss Control engineers available to URMA members for building inspections and to review new building designs. Ms. Plane asked if the city were involved with a private partner, would that service be available. Mr. Ogden said if the building will be on the city's schedule, it qualifies. Mr. Perrins said Spanish Fork has used the service twice, and they ended in a good place, but there was effort, discussion, and compromise involved. He said they appreciated the input.

Mr. Jensen asked for other questions. There were none. He thanked Mr. Ogden for the partnership and update.

5.3. DISCUSSION & ACTION – DEDUCTIBLES – METHODOLOGY & APPLICATION TO JPP – David Petersen

CURRENT DEDUCTIBLE SCHEDULE 2014-2024
JPP DEDUCTIBLE LANGUAGE
BYLAWS LANGUAGE DEFINING DEDUCTIBLES
BYLAWS DEDUCTIBLE INFORMATION
MAY 14, 2014 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES RE DEDUCTIBLES
JUNE 27, 2014 BOARD MEETING MINUTES RE DEDUCTIBLES

Mr. Petersen said Park City had a question about deductibles (according to the JPP, a city may only handle property damage claims under that city's deductible and Park City's deductible, based on its size, is $1,000). He said even a very minor vehicle accident is over $1,000. URMA last adjusted city deductibles 10 years ago, and the adjustment was a decrease. He told the Board he wanted them to be aware of the question Park City had and discuss whether the deductible amounts set ten years ago are appropriate today, and let them know other possibilities which are available.

Ms. Plane said her city adjusts claims in-house and is comfortable doing so. They involve the URMA claims adjuster for complicated issues, but suggested URMA could allow Park City to adjust their own claims up to $100,000. She said that was a big shift and Park City does not want to alter the way URMA handles claims, but also does not want to make additional work for URMA staff when they have the staff and knowledge to handle claims in-house.

Mr. Petersen said one option is to adjust deductible amounts to be more realistic with current costs and the inflation which has occurred over the past ten years. Another option is to allow members to set their own deductible amounts.

Mr. Branch said he likes the flexibility that would allow but is concerned a claim could become complicated, and the member would later need to turn to URMA for assistance.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the wording in the JPP, that members handling their claims is only for property-related claims. Other claims could trigger the necessity of notification to the excess carrier.

Mr. Perrins asked for clarification, using the example of a $50k claim, that in year-one, the city would pay $10k because that is the deductible, and in years two through six, the city would pay one-fifth of the balance each year, to repay it; and the difference would be the city paying more or less in year-one by adjusting the deductible up or down. And if the city chooses a different deductible, that is possible.

Mr. Petersen said that was correct, the Origami system is capable of handling more than three deductibles (the current deductible amounts) so each city could choose its own deductible amount, and the system can accommodate that.

Mr. Rapp confirmed the system can be set to use any deductible amount, and any number of deductible amounts.
Mr. Perrins said he was concerned URMA's cash flow would be affected and asked if URMA could handle the change financially. He also asked the impact if the deductible amount were zero.

Mr. Petersen said URMA could handle the change, since ultimately the member repays the claim. He said if the amount were zero, it would affect the reserves the first couple of years, but when the repayments started coming back in, it would take three and a half years to recover from the loss of the $100k per quarter which URMA bills in deductibles currently.

Mr. Jensen said the original question of allowing Park City to handle property claims at a higher amount has led to exploring a number of ideas which were not part of Park City's inquiry. He said URMA is not suggesting everyone else change or that the whole system changes and emphasized that everyone else can continue exactly as they are now. He said given the realities of inflation, it seems reasonable to discuss raising deductible amounts. He asked if there is an administrative burden associated with allowing each city its own deductible (even though the system can accommodate the change).

Mr. Petersen said, with the risk management information system software in place, altering deductibles would be a matter of Mr. Rapp entering the amounts into the system, and is not a capacity issue at all. He said to modify the deductible for one city would require a Board action to change the JPP. He referenced the Joint Protection Program (JPP), Section 6: Deductibles: "Each member may adjust, settle and pay, or deny all "property damage" claims which are less than one hundred percent (100%) of that Member's deductible and which do not include bodily injury, personal injury, or alleged violation of civil rights."

Mr. Jensen said he wanted to make clear to the Board if the adjustment were made to allow Park City this flexibility, the change would not have a negative financial impact on the rest of the Agency Members, and the rest of the Members could continue unchanged without any additional exposure.

Mr. Huffman asked if the deductible schedule was part of the JPP, and said if so, then the schedule could be changed and the JPP language remain unchanged. Mr. Petersen said the schedule is set by Board action but is not part of the JPP itself, and the deductible schedule could be changed or the JPP amended.

Mr. Bowler said as the smallest city as far as budget, Enterprise could handle a larger deductible than the current $1,000.

Mr. Huffman said having each city choose its own deductible or assigning deductibles by group (based on population), may not be the best way. He said having three schedules from which each entity could choose (Park City could choose the highest schedule) would result in flexibility and consistency. Mr. Petersen said deductibles fall within the self-retention range and are not associated with the excess policies which make deductibles a Board decision. Mr. Huffman asked that staff return to the Board with options.

Mr. Branch asked what Park City's purpose was. Ms. Plane said Park City wanted to avoid putting property claims into the repayment program, as it seemed inefficient to exchange money with URMA. She said the idea of setting a schedule to which cities could opt in was elegant. Mr. Branch asked Ms. Plane if there was a deductible amount she proposed. Ms. Plane said $20-25k would be a big improvement from $1,000. (She earlier suggested $100k.)

Mr. Petersen said he would research and reach out to AGRIP (Association of Government Risk Pools) to see what other pools are doing with deductibles and come back with recommendations. Mr. Huffman asked if it would be possible to adopt something at the next Board meeting. Mr. Petersen said yes. Mr. Jensen asked if there were any concerns about that approach. Mr. Crowther asked if there was an objection to having a zero deductible option. Mr. Oyler said he liked a budget-based approach over a population-based approach, because cities like Park City, or those with a power utility, have a higher budget than a similar population city.

Mr. Jensen thanked Park City for the inquiry and said this is an example of a city raising a question in their own interest, which results in making the organization better.

5.4. DISCUSSION – FY2025 BUDGET PROPOSAL – David Petersen

PROPOSED FY2025 BUDGET MEMO

PROPOSED BUDGET FY2025

EMPLOYEE SALARY STUDY

2023 AND HISTORIC SALARY STUDY INFORMATION

MINUTES

Mr. Petersen referenced the budget memo and explained that increases are in the costs of goods and services, and some salary increases. He said there is an increase in interest earnings of $70k from moving funds into different investments. He realigned some accounts that that have transitioned or become obsolete. He reviewed increases that are fixed, such as PEHP benefit expense, and a three-year contract with the risk management information system that expired, whose rates increased. He estimated other items based on the consumer price index. He said the TechNet salary study resulted in a 9.4% increase in salary ranges over a year and a half time period. Mr. Petersen asked for questions.

Mr. Huffman said it would be helpful to break out revenues into operational and claims revenues, as is done with expenditures. Additionally, he said his city is anticipating a lean budget year, with sales tax growth slowing and projected to slow next year, they are looking at ways to reduce or defer expenses that can wait, and he questioned if URMA should do the same. He said his city is doing inflationary salary increases only.

Mr. Petersen said that he can talk to Dave Sanderson about restructuring the budget to reflect operations and claims separately. He said he has continued with the budget format that was in place when he came to URMA.

Mr. Petersen said when the Board established the 60th percentile in the TechNet system the goal was employee salaries not falling further behind.

Ms. Plane said in Park City revenues and taxes are down, visitation is down. They just completed a comp study and are trying not to fall behind in salaries but have a different philosophy about the comp study, that once you spend the money and time to do the study, you go to council and ask for it, even though there are changes in the market. Mr. Branch said he agrees with that philosophy and Mapleton is taking a similar approach.

Mr. Huffman said the budget proposes using $180k in fund balance and asked if that is for operations or claims related. Mr. Petersen said the overall increase of $126k (down from last year) is within current revenues, that revenue is up from investments, and the investment income received from fund balance more than covers salaries. Mr. Huffman said his opinion is investment income is the same as membership contributions. Mr. Petersen agreed. Mr. Jensen asked for other thoughts.

Mr. Perrins said URMA bills cities from the budget upfront, and if, at the conclusion of the year, URMA does not go over budget, then there is money which was collected that was not spent on operations. That budget could have included spending from fund balance, but usually at the end of the year some is unexpended. Mr. Petersen said historically that is the case and the unexpended money goes into the reserve. Mr. Petersen said in the August Board Meeting a reserve priority (Reserve Reinvestment Policy) established that carryover goes back into reserves to offset losses from bad claims years.

Mr. Jensen said a challenge of serving on a board is that members wear multiple hats and bring the background they have to the organization they serve, and cities have different approaches to compensation. Mr. Jensen said he tries to evaluate what is proposed, even if it is different from what is happening in his city, to determine if it is reasonable within the group, and then gives deference to the process. He said he has looked at this situation with the same thoughts as Mr. Huffman and found what is proposed is well within the range of what is being done around the state and is reasonable. He said a pay system should be predictable and consistent. Once a system is established that is not arbitrary or capricious, based on whatever principles are applied, then unless there are very good reasons, you stay with that system, and it is a sign of respect to employees that there is predictability. If the system does not produce the desired result, then it should be changed.

Mr. Perrins said he is comfortable that the budget is projecting basically flat, which is a safe place to be. He said it is smart to understand better how the claims area is *working as Mr. Huffman suggested, comparing last year's actual to this year's budget, and he would like to know how expenses are tracking, year to date in 2024, to see how realistic the reduction from $3.3 million to $3 million is. He said he is comfortable with what is proposed on the operations side, lowering expenses from last year.*

Mr. Petersen said operational expenses are down, but he anticipates a rough claims year. He said the claims budget is based on averaging, about every four years there is a significant claims year, and this is one of those. He said URMA will be overextended in the claims area, but the uniqueness of URMA's model is it recoups that over the next five years.

Mr. Oyler asked what URMA has used fund balance for, if it has always been claims or if it is used on operations. He said when we use fund balance we need to be specific about the purpose and using it for operations or maintenance is not tenable.

Mr. Petersen agreed and said the only two times fund balance was used was the unexpected large increase in cyber premium approved by the Board, and when the Board authorized the purchase of Origami from unexpended funds that were budgeted for, rather than returning those funds to the reserve. Mr. Petersen said he is not aware of any other use of fund balance for operations, that only occurs on the claims side. Mr. Oyler said he agrees with using fund balance for capital projects which is how he classifies Origami.

Mr. Jensen asked for other comments on the budget. There were none.

5.5. PUBLIC HEARING – FY2025 BUDGET PROPOSAL

MINUTES

Mr. Jensen asked for a motion to go into public hearing.

MOTION

Mr. Oyler made the motion to open a public hearing regarding the FY2025 Budget Proposal, seconded by Mr. Huffman. Mr. Jensen asked for roll call vote. Voting was unanimous to go into public hearing.

MOTION

Mr. Jensen asked for comments regarding the proposed budget for FY2025. There were no comments. Mr. Perrins motioned to go out of public hearing, seconded by Mr. Oyler. Mr. Jensen asked for roll call vote. Voting was unanimous to go out of public hearing.

5.6. RESOLUTION B0424 -5.6 – ADOPTION OF FY2025 BUDGET

MOTION

Mr. Jensen asked for a motion to approve the budget. Motion by Mr. Bowler to approve the resolution as presented, seconded by Mr. Branch. Mr. Jensen conducted a roll call vote. Voting was unanimously affirmative to approve the resolution. Mr. Jensen thanked the Board for the great discussion.

5.7. DISCUSSION – TASER REVIEW

TASER USE IN LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING REPORT 03 20 2024
INCAPACITATION RECOVERY TIMES FROM CONDUCTIVE ELECTRICAL WEAPON EXPOSURE

MINUTES

Mr. Petersen said research was presented in the Taser Use in Law Enforcement Training Report and there was discussion at Board meeting in which Mr. Perrins asked that we return to this meeting and have further discussion regarding whether this should be part of the loss control inspection program. There was discussion about going back to individual police chiefs for their feedback and input. One discussion point was that a police chief expressed that getting tased gave officers a better idea of how long it took to recover from tasing. Mr. Petersen asked Mr. Rapp to research, and a forensic report on Incapacitation Recovery Times From Conductive Electronical Weapon Exposure is attached. The conclusion was that normal reaction time appears to return immediately after CEW exposure ends. Mr. Petersen said the premise that being tased gives an officer an idea of how long it takes to recover is a flawed theory from a clinical research standpoint.

Mr. Petersen said in the risk management industry when something is identified that has potential risk, and not doing it has no risk, the recommendation is to not do it. He said this would not likely reach our general liability program because the risk from tasing is workers' comp related which URMA does not cover.,. He said good risk management is to make the Board aware of things that are going on, and the Board decides if it should be addressed. Mr. Petersen said he has heard mixed comments, a couple of police chiefs do not like the idea of not doing it, although they have no data to support continuing doing it. And a couple said, ' as soon as we saw this, we stopped doing it.' There is no increase in liability if tasing is not a part of training, and no reduced liability if it continues as part of training.

Mr. Perrins said URMA does not really have a risk management role here because if an officer gets hurt it goes to workers' comp. He said Spanish Fork has moved away from tasing in training. Mr. Perrins said he is not ready to say, "You can't do it." He said if it affected URMA's liability he would have a stronger opinion.

Mr. Huffman said he disagrees on two bases, even though there is not much data on claims, he believes this is ripe for hazing and civil rights claims beyond workers' comp; and two, there are other items in the inspection program for which there is not much data to show a large risk, but they are still in the program. He said when we are aware of a risk and do not do anything about it, we move away from being a risk management agency. He said his opinion is that it should be included in the risk inspection; that including it does not make it mandatory but does provide clear incentive.

Mr. Perrins asked if any organizations had a requirement to be tased or if it was always voluntary. Mr. Petersen said some are voluntary, some are mandatory. Some use waivers but they are ineffective because an employee cannot sign away their right to workers' comp. State and Taser manufacturer do not require it, yet there are departments that make it a requirement internally.

Mr. Perrins said the hazing element worries him, depending on how it is implemented in the city. As Mr. Huffman suggested, the liability could end up on URMA.

Mr. Hanson said he supports what Mr. Huffman said, that this is part of the risk management side. He supports URMA providing guidance if it includes flexibility. He said his department encourages it, making it almost mandatory, but it is not technically mandatory.

Mr. Perrins said the environment matters, and the environment should not cross into a level of pressure that goes beyond the intent of the training.

Mr. Huffman suggested an option is for URMA to require that there be a policy in place if an agency decides to continue to allow it, but he is concerned that a department would interpret that as permission.

Mr. Branch said that most officers generate no concern, but there may be a few who look for an opportunity to take a city to court.

Ms. Plane asked if the policy would be in the form of a prohibition in the inspection report. This was confirmed. She said in an organization she no longer works for, which has since changed their practices, an attorney who represented police department was invited to training and encouraged to be tased, and he felt like he needed to be tased to be 'included in the team.' She said that is the kind of hazing she is concerned about.

Mr. Oyler said he has witnessed two types of hazing. He said after the Board meeting he talked to his police chief, and they determined that tasing as part of training would be voluntary. He said they had four or five new officers at taser training, and being tased was optional for the first time. Some chose not to do it, and they were treated differently than the officers who did. He said he is concerned about making it optional, it should be required or not done.

Mr. Huffman said, to clarify, if this were part of the inspection program, a city would be deducted a point if they chose to include tasing in training, which would be a small financial cost to the city, but the city would remain in good standing as a member of URMA. Mr. Huffman proposed that at the next Board meeting when the inspection program is adopted, there is a vote regarding whether or not to make this a part of the inspection program.

Mr. Jensen said that is a good approach, consistent with what has been done with other risk management principles. He said as we articulate best practices, as there is more discussion, evolution takes place. He said if there is logic to it, it will become the norm.

Mr. Petersen thanked the Board for reviewing the issue, having the discussion, and bringing it to their cities for discussion. He said risk is eliminated and mitigated through education, which is what this process has been.

5.8. INFORMATION – GIG RULES – Brandon Crowther
[GIG MEMO 03 05 2024]

MINUTES

Mr. Crowther reviewed the new rules from the Department of Labor and how they classify employees as independent contractors. He said the adopted rule reverses 2021 changes that results in more people being classified as employees instead of independent contractors. The 2021 analysis focused on whether the employee had control of their work and if they profited from their work, then they were an independent contractor.

He said now they are looking at totality of circumstances, focusing on whether the worker is economically dependent on the organization. He said although most of this is likely targeting ridesharing companies it could have application for our cities. Mr. Crowther encouraged cities to look at areas of operations in which they rely one hundred percent on contractors and decide whether this analysis applies. Mr. Crowther asked if there were questions. He said he is available to discuss any situations that are in question.

Mr. Oyler asked if the analysis looks at the percentage of the independent contractor's income paid by the city.

Mr. Crowther said it does matter how much they are economically dependent on the city. He said if the city provides 95% of a contractor's income, the contractor is very likely to be determined to be an employee. He said if a city provides only 50% of the contractor's income, it goes the other way. The new rules are vague as to some *independent contractors. The analysis requires looking at all six of these factors "and anything else that is relevant," with no clearcut guideline.*

Mr. Hanson asked about an engineer who can turn down city work, and the city can hire someone else. Mr. Crowther indicated that is not likely an employee situation. Mr. Hanson asked if the contractor does not want to be an employee and does not pursue, does the city have risk. Mr. Crowther said the city most likely does not.

Mr. Oyler asked if the burden of proof is on the employee or employer. Mr. Crowther indicated it is on the employee unless government comes for withholdings. Mr. Petersen indicated that risk is expected from a disgruntled contractor who thinks they should be employee, or if the Department of Labor audits under the fair labor standards and wage division, they might identify contractors who probably qualify as employees. Mr. Hanson said he is not actively gathering that information.

Mr. Oyler asked about an independent contractor which pays employees they hire. He said for their golf course, they hire a company to do all the work, that company hires employees. 100% of the employees' income is the city's golf course, but the city is less than 50% of that company's income. Mr. Crowther said that is outside of this range. He said the company has a manager who manages employees, who has all the potential of profit or loss. This is not one person reporting to the city. He said number 4 applies, the nature and degree of control over work. The city is not going to those company employees, saying, here is how you have to do your job.

5.9. INFORMATION – CITY COUNCIL AWARENESS AND MARKETING – Alex Jensen

INSURANCE OVERVIEW 03 26 2024

MINUTES

Mr. Jensen recommended that Board members review the Insurance Overview and forward it to risk managers.

Mr. Jensen said one of his discussions with Mr. Petersen has been how to interact with the cities in a productive way. Rather than wait for meetings and wining and dining, it was suggested that URMA offer to come to city councils and talk about the virtues of organization and why it is a benefit. He said there are multiple examples of the benefits of being a part of this organization. Providing for health and safety of our residents. Not many organizations have that as the focus and core responsibility. He said he is not trying to push but that there is value in reminding organizations the value of URMA, and we are happy to do that. He asked for questions or concerns.

Mr. Petersen said if there is value in us making a presentation, we are happy to do that. He said he recently did Ethics and Compliance training and welcomes any opportunity to put a face to URMA.

Mr. Jensen thanked Mr. Dobbins for providing the facility.

Mr. Jensen recognized Ms. Richey and Mr. Petersen for five years of URMA employment.

6. OTHER ITEMS

6.1. DATES for upcoming meetings:

- Risk Managers' Roundtable – May 23, 2024, 11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. Lunch provided, Draper City Council Chambers, 1020 East Pioneer Rd., Draper
- Summer Conference – July 31-August 1, 2024 – Ruby's Inn, Bryce Canyon
- Annual Board Meeting – August 1, 2024, 12:00 p.m. – Ruby's Inn, Bryce Canyon

7. ADJOURN

MINUTES

Mr. Jensen asked for a motion to adjourn. Motion made by Mr. Mellor, seconded by Mr. Hansen. Voting was unanimously affirmative.

Meeting adjourned at 2:06 p.m.

APPROVED THIS 1st day of AUGUST, 2024,

Utah Risk Management Agency

Alex Jensen, Chairman of the Board

ATTEST:

Ann Richey, Secretary