

**SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER**

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING**

***March 18, 2026 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. Craig Burnett – Murray  
Mr. Dustin Lewis – South Jordan  
Mr. Josh Collins – South Salt Lake  
Mr. Nathan Cherpeski – Herriman  
Mr. Bruce Kartchner – Bluffdale  
Mr. Jared Gerber – Cottonwood Heights  
Mr. Dom Burchett – UFA  
Ms. Rosie Rivera – SLCo  
Mr. John Evans – West Valley City  
Mr. Dwayne Anjewierden – UPD

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Ms. Gina Chamness – Holladay  
Mr. Mike Morey – Alta  
Open – Midvale

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Ivan Whitaker – VECC Executive Director  
Mr. Tyson Montoya – VECC Chief Financial Officer  
Ms. Elyse Haggerty – VECC Chief of Operations  
Ms. Shondra Young – VECC Chief of Prof. Standards & Development  
Mr. Scott Young – VECC Legal Counsel  
Mr. Brad Morris – VECC  
Ms. Rachel Nipper – VECC  
Ms. Jodi Morris – VECC  
Ms. Brice Rawlings – VECC  
Ms. Nicole Lopez – VECC  
Ms. Ambir Widdison – VECC  
Ms. Danni Harris – VECC  
Ms. Rosa Olivos – VECC  
Ms. Tammy Cornelison – VECC  
Ms. Chelsea Ridge – VECC  
Mr. Mark Lewis – VECC  
Mr. Terry Addison – SSLFD  
Mr. Rich Ferguson – DRPD  
Mr. Clint Smith – DFD  
Mr. Derek Maxfield – WJFD  
Mr. Matt Evans – BFD  
Mr. Cody Stromberg – HRPD  
Mr. Jeff Carr – SJPD  
Mr. Jeremy Robertson – WJPD  
Mr. Mark Anderson  
Ms. Heather Anderson  
Mr. Jason Rasmussen  
Mr. David Spatafore  
Ms. Ashley Spatafore

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

Scott Harrington:

Let's go ahead and start the meeting. It's 2:02 on the 18<sup>th</sup> today. Let's call a meeting to order. Do we have any introduction of visitors?

Ivan Whitaker:

No.

Scott Harrington:

All right. Review and consideration of approval of the February 18th board minute meetings. Any questions?

Nathan Cherpeski:

I didn't get a copy of those. How did those get sent out? On yours, it just had the packet. Did anybody read the minutes? I didn't see any minutes.

Scott Harrington:

We'll table this item then until next meeting.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Scott Harrington:

Does anybody want to speak for public comment right now? All right. Was there any online?

Tyson Montoya:

There were none.

Scott Harrington:

So, none online. We'll close the public comment portion. Okay. Special District's Overview Questions and Answers, Heather.

Heather Anderson:

Hi, our attorney, UASD, the Utah Association of Special District's attorney is about two to three minutes away just in case we get into the weeds. Would you be comfortable moving that agenda item to when he walks in the room?

Scott Harrington:

Yes, we can move it down, that's fine. No problem. So, we'll come back to this one. Okay. Operations Board's Report. Chief Taylor. Chief, are you there?

### **OPERATIONS BOARD REPORTS**

Shane Taylor:

So, this is Chief Shane Taylor, but Chief Ferguson is the one conducting the operations.

Rich Ferguson:

Yeah, I'm here. Okay. We had our meeting on March 12th and a couple of things that we discussed that might be of relevance here. We had a presentation from CARFAX. They came out and talked to us about their ability to dispatch forms directly to persons in the field on minor traffic accidents that could ultimately save officers having to be dispatched to the scene. It will require a little bit of work on their side.

Scott Harrington:

Can we have everybody mute their microphones if you're not speaking?

Rich Ferguson:

I'll keep going here. It created a bit of a group discussion after the presentation. Main benefits that we discussed as law enforcement were that there would be a faster handling of low damage crashes.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Hold on, Chief. We have technical...

Scott Harrington:

He's on somebody else's though.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Chief, can you unmute yourself?

Rich Ferguson:

Okay. I'm unmuted now.

Nathan Cherpeski:

There we go. Thank you.

Rich Ferguson:

I have no idea where I left you off at.

Scott Harrington:

At CARFAX.

Rich Ferguson:

Okay. CARFAX. I'll start over again. I'm hearing voices. We had a presentation by CARFAX. CARFAX has an opportunity to come into our dispatch center. They've done a demo from other cities that they've done this, where they actually can send out driver exchange information to lower collision accidents, saving us from having to send an officer. It was an interesting presentation. I think most of the Chiefs felt that way, that it is technology using it to our advantage. Some of the discussion after the presentation, however, were the main benefits that were discussed from being able to use CARFAX on lower priority collisions were faster handling of these, reduced officer workload, improved public service. But some of the questions that we have that are still lingering and that we feel like we need to get further clarification on are really having to do with data privacy. What happens with this data? Does CARFAX, they own it obviously, do they ever share it? And so we've decided that we would take a deeper dive into the data privacy section of that before we move forward with CARFAX.

One other item that we did discuss was unassigned calls by dispatch. During a round table discussion, we talked about calls that are sitting in the queue for sometimes 20 minutes before being dispatched out. There's

a variety of different reasons why these probably lower priority calls were waiting and dispatch committed that they would monitor that and after five minutes of being in the queue, those calls will get dispatched. Other than that, I really don't have anything to share with you today.

Scott Harrington:

All right. Thank you.

Ivan Whitaker:

Just so you know, I have a meeting on Friday with the Chief Privacy Officer of the state about CARFAX, and CARFAX will be doing a demo, taking them through the keystrokes.

Scott Harrington:

Anybody have questions for the Chief? All right. Seeing none. We'll move on to the Fire Operations Board. Is that still Chief Addison?

Terry Addison:

We also met last week. During our committee meeting, Ambir brought up a reminder that April 12th through 18th is the dispatcher week. We'll probably discuss that more. And then we discussed NERIS timestamps. I know we transitioned from the NFIRS to NERIS when it comes to fire data, so we discussed some of the timestamps on our RMS systems to work through that. Ivan gave us some NFPA 12/25 numbers. There were benchmarks hit there. We also had the same CARFAX presentation. I don't think it fits much beyond fire investigations for the fire department. And also, a Motorola Vesta Assist discussion and Reverse 911 discussion, which Ivan will probably discuss more with you all on the Reverse 911 business. So those are just updates, for us.

Scott Harrington:

Any questions for Chief?

Tyson Montoya:

So, is that going to be a more in depth on what's going to happen next year with the Reverse 911?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes.

Scott Harrington:

All right. Thank you. Let's jump back to item 4.0, the Special Districts' Overview.

## **SPECIAL DISTRICTS OVERVIEW**

Ivan Whitaker:

So let me do kind of a segue into ... Over the last few meetings, I've talked to you about getting more information on special districts and didn't really want all of the information to come from Tyson and I. We wanted you to hear from experts that actually know and can answer your questions. Several of you have provided questions to us that have been ... It's just going to be best answered in this format. Some of them are very detailed, board structure, taxation, those type of things. And so we reached out. Tyson, would you like to provide an intro?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes. As Ivan mentioned, we reached out to the special services district. It's been, what, six months? About six months ago, and as Ivan mentioned, we believe it's really going to help us take VECC to the next level. The current infrastructure that we're on, the assessment model, is set up for a purpose to get back up and running and functioning and to maintain. We're at a point where we really need to accelerate growth. We're really focused on serving the public better and doing this, this is really the only way that we can see a logical path forward.

We don't want to have double-digit assessments every year that we have to go back and forth with, with each agency. So that is kind of the catalyst for us bringing this to the table. Heather was kind enough to offer her expertise to answer any questions you guys have. I think we'll just let you guys, or if you guys have any immediate questions, we can just kind of dive in. I know that this is a topic that each of you guys have your own opinions on and own take on, but we need to get it out and open and discuss.

Heather Anderson:

Like I said, I'm Heather Anderson. I'm the Government Affairs Director for the Utah Association of Special Districts. There's about 400 special districts and special service districts in the state of Utah. I do government affairs for all of them. This is our attorney, Mark Anderson. He's the general counsel for UASD and knows more about special districts and special district law than almost anyone, if not anyone else in the state. He's been practicing in this field for 45 years, 50?

Mark Anderson:

I like the first number better, but it's definitely close to it.

Heather Anderson:

We are not here to try to convince you to create a special service district or a special district. That is not our job and it's not our goal here today. However, knowing that that is an option on the table, we want to be a source of information if you do choose to go that way, or even just to give you enough information to decide if you want to go in that direction.

It is not unprecedented to have a 911 communication district. Utah Valley Dispatch is a special service district. Weber Area Dispatch 911 is a special service district, as well as Box Elder County Communications Center. So, there are 911 communication dispatches in the state of Utah that function extremely well. With that, what questions do you guys have for us?

Ivan Whitaker:

I know you have a lot.

Scott Harrington:

Right.

Kevin Hicks:

Well, I'll go. I don't know if this is necessarily a question for Heather or Mark or just everybody in general, but I guess I'm still not convinced how having a special district versus the model we currently have changes in terms of allowing more ability to raise revenue, for lack of a better way of saying it. Because whether you're issuing property taxes, or you're having a member fee that assesses the individual agencies, maybe it's split a little differently. I get that. I understand that. But I guess I don't understand how that might be the only way forward, more flexibility, more freedom, because the needs are going to be here, whether it's from property taxes or from member fees. The needs are here no matter what. And in my mind, it boils down to the ease to get it approved. And I would argue that, at least here in Utah, it seems like property taxes are a lot harder to

get through to the finish line sometimes than member fee increases to individual cities. Just throwing that out there as conversation starter.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I mean, I think the reality is, this was said at the legislature this last year, they're looking hard at property tax and they're now going to be looking at special districts and their ability to do property tax. So, without an elected board, and that doesn't mean appointed by other electeds, I don't see how it works. And I don't have any real questions. I know how they function. I guess I agree with Kevin. I don't see how it just solves the issue.

Scott Harrington:

Right.

Mark Anderson:

If I may, or if somebody had something else to say. Let's talk about semantics first. A special service district is a particular type of district. That's not a generic term, although it seems like almost everybody uses it as a generic term unless they're really in the special district world. Heather mentioned that there are a little over 400 special districts and special service districts in the state. Roughly two thirds of them are special districts and one third or a little less than one third are special service districts.

Special service districts are under Title 17D as in dog, chapter one of the Utah Code. They can be created by a municipality. If the special service district is entirely within that municipality, they can be created by a county for unincorporated areas or if there are multiple municipalities that want to be involved in the special service district. The distinction, the primary distinction between a special service district and a special district is independence. A special service district, if the county were to create one, would ultimately be under the county's control.

An administrative control board could be appointed or elected, and usually it would be appointed with each of the municipalities, et cetera, and the county appointing members to the administrative control board. And certain duties and responsibilities can be delegated to the administrative control board. But statutorily, there are some duties that cannot be delegated. And statutorily, the county could withdraw a delegation of authority or expand the delegation of authority. And a property tax can only be imposed by a special service district if it is approved by the voters.

So, some of the complications there that I think would veer against a special service is the necessity of going to the voters to get a property tax approved and the lack of independence that you individually might feel. A special district, on the other hand, is under Title 17B, as in boy, of the Utah Code. They are independent political subdivisions of the state of Utah.

Now, the creation process for a special service district is easier, much easier, than for a special district, but once a special district is created, it would have taxing authority, statutory taxing authority. And it wouldn't be necessarily to go to the voters each time, but it would be necessary to go through the truth and taxation process. I suspect most, if not all of you, are familiar with that process.

The creation in your instance, and I'm probably getting the cart ahead of the horse, but just so you understand, it can be initiated by a voter petition, a property owner petition, or by a resolution adopted by each municipality that wants to be part of it and by the county council if incorporated areas are desired to be part of it. And then the county would be the one responsible for going through the creation steps, and I'm not going to do that with you today, the steps because we'd run out of time and you're not there yet.

But once it was created or once it is created, then the board of trustees, and I anticipate that each of you, each of your municipalities, each of your jurisdictions, including the county, would appoint someone to represent you on that board of trustees. And in the truth and taxation process, that individual would be required to go back to the legislative body that appointed them in the first place.

Ofttimes, it's an elected official that gets appointed by the municipalities or the county. Doesn't necessarily have to be. But once it's created, it does have taxing authority, which gets back to the original point and that is

yes, it's an either/or. Now, could a special district instead of taxes receive fees from each of the member agencies? Yes, absolutely. But it could also use the taxing format. And in fact, if a special district were created, it could contract, for example, with the municipality that wasn't within the district to do it on a fee basis. I don't know if I've clarified anything, but...

Heather Anderson:

And as far as the board makeup goes, that would be determined as the district was created. So, it could be created with each member having the appointing authority to appoint an elected official or a non-elected official, however, that is set up in the creation documents, but it also could be created that there is a directly elected individual from each of your areas to serve on the board.

Mark Anderson:

But that would be your decision, because you would put it in the resolution that you present to the county and the county, although it would orchestrate the creation process, it would have to be within the confines of the resolution. There are about 11 or 12 different types of special districts, and in the resolution, you would designate the type that you wanted it to be. Most fire districts in the state of Utah... Let me rephrase that. Most districts that provide fire protection services in the state of Utah are either service areas or special service districts.

That doesn't mean that... And a service area is a type of special district. That doesn't mean you'd have to organize under the Service Area Act though. My gut is you would probably want to do it under the Improvement District Act, because it gives you more control over the makeup of the board. And like Heather said, in the creating resolution, you could specify, not creating the resolutions that initiate the creation process. You could specify the type of district, special district you wanted to be. But again, that isn't a decision you'd make today. In fact, you haven't made a decision. You just want information.

Ivan Whiataker:

That's it, yes.

Mark Andesron:

Which is why we're here. We're not pushing anything.

Korban Lee:

Tyson, given your introduction to this topic, I think what I'm hearing you say is the... I'm thinking to myself, what's the problem we're trying to solve? And then why is this the proposed solution? I think what you're saying, the problem is you and Ivan foresee VECC needing large annual increases in the budget this...

Ivan Whitaker:

Absolutely.

Korban Lee:

Next five or 10 years.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes.

Korban Lee:

10% annually. 20% annually.

Ivan Whitaker:

... and I'd like to bring some clarity on that. So, when we went through the finance committee, they can tell you, the members, I didn't really push hard on what we actually needed. I watch it, and again, I'm thankful for everything that we were doing with the 5.2%, really thankful. But the things that I really wanted to push on, I said, "Let me take a pause." Because I know we're going to do some things here, but at the same time, I know that it's not where we needed to be. So, we started at what Tyson, 12%, and we needed everything in that 12% and we need it now, but I saw the appetite and the appetite is not there to provide a 12% increase.

Korban Lee:

Okay. So, let me reframe then, what I'm hearing the problem is. The problem is you need large, at least from your perspective, the problem is you need large double-digit budget increases over the next several years on an annual basis, and you perceive that the appetite for those increases is not on this board.

Ivan Whitaker:

That's factual. Yes. I mean, the finance company even said-

Korban Lee:

That's okay. I'm trying to frame the problem.

Ivan Whitaker:

... the finance committee even mentioned that 3% to 5% is where they want us to be every year. And I was quiet, I didn't say anything.

Korban Lee:

And then, okay, but to Kevin's point, I'm still not quite understanding how you perceive that going to a special district is a solution to that problem, other than it gets rid of this board or changes this board to a board that may have a different appetite for those increases.

Tyson Montoya:

That-

Korban Lee:

Is that why?

Tyson Montoya:

... no, that's-

Korban Lee:

Help me understand.

Tyson Montoya:

... no, that's-

Korban Lee:

I'm trying to understand why the special service district solves the perceived problem.

Tyson Montoya:

No, that's not the intent at all, Korban. The intent really is we provide a very unique service here. It's different from what each of you guys provide as city managers or city attorneys. So, as a city, you have all of these various things underneath your plate that you guys are doing.

We do one very narrow, specialized service, and that there's precedent for it, as Heather mentioned, Central and Weber, are service districts. And yeah, the financial implication is the big piece, because it's very difficult to have back and forth where we say that we need X, Y, and Z, and we only get X and Y, right? And so, we need to be able to put that behind us and be able to have the financial, the capital to grow and to expand and to have the population growth that we're dealing with and...

Ivan Whitaker:

... yes, it's clear to me, and again, I'll open it up. It's clear to me that this model hasn't worked. To have 20 plus years to where we haven't met the state mandates, and the state mandates are laughable. It's the bare minimum, and to get to a point where we're just meeting it and we're doing patchwork, we're far away where we need to be. From an operational perspective, I think the people behind me will let you know that that's where we are. So, we have to find a way to really fund and supplement this. We're doing patchwork to even meet the state mandates, which the state mandates are bare minimum. We can't continue to operate like that. The bow will break, and that's what we're trying to do here.

Josh Collins:

How does this solve that problem?

Jared Gerber:

Yes, how do you get over that? I mean, what Korban said, do you think there's going to be a different board or a different appetite? Because I think we all have a similar experience in our cities when we go back to the same people you're going to deal with on this board, and we're just trying to figure out how this solves the problem, because we understand, we get it because we do the same thing every year at the city and we say we need X, Y, Z, we get X. Understand it completely, but I don't know who else you're going to deal with that's going to have a different take on it, especially in the state with the feeling towards taxes and property taxes here. That's where I think we're struggling understanding how this is going to change that because...

Scott Harrington:

Even if it's not a property tax, even if it's a rate, you can't just raise the rate 10% every year and have people be happy with that.

Jared Gerber:

Well, then who's voting on raising that rate? It's going to be your board.

Scott Harrington:

Right.

Tyson Montoya:

Right.

Scott Harrington:

It's the same people.

Jared Gerber:

These are the same people...

Scott Harrington:

Yes.

Jared Gerber:

So, that's what we're trying to understand is how this...

Tyson Montoya:

Can you guys clarify how much money we would need, how we define that and how much money we would receive via property tax if we were to move to a 17D?

Mark Anderson:

If you were to create an improvement district, the maximum statutory mill rate is 0.008. If you were to create a service area, and what I'm about to say is going to explain why most fire districts are service areas, it is 0.0014 or 0.0023. I don't think you would qualify for the 0.23. So, you'd have to do the math to figure out what the amount would be, what you need. And if the 0.000... I better make sure that I'm putting the right number of zeros in there, but if the 0.0008 gets you there, great. If not, then you probably look at a different statutory model for purposes of taxing authority, but it does vary depending upon the type of district that you create.

Kevin Hicks:

But to be clear, that's still just the max rates that you can get.

Mark Anderson:

That's correct.

Kevin Hicks:

You're still going to have to get whoever sits on the board every year to agree that, yes, we'll go to truth and taxation and then you go through the whole process of truth and taxation. And we also haven't fully talked, I know Tyson, you and I, and Ivan talked a little bit about this, but we haven't talked about the fact that there might be some cities that say, just flat out, we're not going to participate, so we still want to stay as a member agency, which then creates almost double the accounting for Tyson and his team.

I say team loosely, because I know Tyson doesn't have much of a team in accounting, but Tyson's team to do the accounting. And I think, I mean, Tony of UFA fills that burden, because he's the accountant or the CFO for UFA and UFSA, and he literally is constantly doing two entities. I used to do that for years, and I was doing the accounting for the city and two service districts. And that's the part that, I mean, even beyond the decision-making body, that's extra accounting, extra work, extra cost.

Rosie Rivera:

Tyson, have you guys talked with Salt Lake County yet?

Tyson Montoya:

No.

Rosie Rivera:

Okay. Because I don't speak for Salt Lake County. I'm an independent and elected, but I represent the law enforcement piece and animal control, but I would suggest you speak to them. Heather knows the issue Salt Lake County's having with special districts, and I don't know whether or not you've gone to Salt Lake County and talked to them, but it could be an issue with them as well.

Mark Anderson:

If I may make a comment, I'd rather stay here, but I've got an endodontist appointment at 3 o'clock. I'd much rather stay here. If you're familiar with the Northview Fire District up in Weber County, it's a small, much, much, much smaller than what we're talking about here, but there were three municipalities up there that had an interlocal cooperation agreement pursuant to which they put together an agency like yours, only much smaller, because it was only three municipalities.

I couldn't tell you exactly how long ago it was. I think it was probably 15 or 20 years ago. They went through the same mental process that you're going through now, and they decided that it would be beneficial to convert to a district, and so what you're talking about has been done. They went through the steps, they created a district, but that is now the Northview Fire District. It took over the operations of the interlocal entity, and I haven't talked to them. I haven't given them a heads-up. So, if you decide to contact them and discuss the... In fact, the people that did it aren't even there anymore. But in any event, what you're talking about has been done, but on a significantly smaller scale, as far as Northview Fire's concerned.

There could be some that are bigger scale that I don't know about, but that's one I particularly know about that is in your world in a sense and noticed the fire districts, and they did make that conversion some time ago. And if anybody's got a legal question, I would love to respond to it now. If not, I may scoot fairly quickly, because my appointment is on the other side of the valley.

Scott Harrington:

Any other questions, comments?

Korban Lee:

I'm still wrestling with... I'm still trying to understand the perspective of how the go on the special service district or the special district route solves the funding challenge more readily than the current model.

Tyson Montoya:

So, back six months ago when we did the numbers, it would bring in about 30 million from just at that current rate that they were at.

Scott Harrington:

Is that the max rate?

Kevin Hicks:

I don't know if that'll happen.

Jared Gerber:

You're assuming you're going to have a board that approves that. That's what we're saying. It's the same people we report to and we go to. That's the struggle.

Kevin Hicks:

Speaking from Riverton, there's no way we would support, one, doing it, and two, letting the new entity go to the max.

Jared Gerber:

And then the concern I had was we would be going from a model where we're paying on a percentage based on the amount of work versus a value-based system on property tax, because our average home price is \$818,000.

Jared Gerber:

I'm just telling you, if you have a representative on the board from Cottonwood Heights, that's getting a pushback.

Korban Lee:

Yes.

Jared Gerber:

So, I have to. I can't-

Ivan Whitaker:

I just want to make mention-

Jared Gerber:

That's why we contract with UFA.

Kevin Hicks:

Hey, Ivan, can I interrupt something real quick? Just maybe, sorry, not to step on your toes, Scott, but if nobody has any questions for Mark, maybe because he did say he needed to leave, because I know my questions aren't really anything legal.

Scott Harrington:

Right.

Mark Anderson:

And if you have follow-up questions, we're more than happy to come back. We're happy to provide information via emails, discussions. Like I said, we're here to be a resource. We're not advocating for anything, but we're more than happy to answer questions.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you.

Mark Anderson:

Thank you.

Ivan Whitaker:

I think my major concern with all of this is I've sent the proof points around. I've sent the documentation. I've sent in the graphs, charts, documents, you name it. We've sent all of this stuff out and we're willing to do more of that. There's some real things that I'm troubled with that... Yes, see you later.

That we're not far away with what we're doing from going in that other direction. I think a couple of challenges, the call volume, arising the call volume, and we're right back where we're started. And that's my concern. When I talk to you about non-emergency AI, that is a solution to try to help fill a gap that I don't think is going to completely fill the gap that we need. So, those are the concerns that I have is if it was a couple of FTEs here or there, or the need and training, for example, where Shondra mentioned the numbers that she need over there. Those things, but this is a massive amount of need in all directions that when we brought you in the room, here, we show you in every department what those deficits are. So, if a special district is not the way, what is the way?

I want to start talking about the solutions to help get us there, because frowning every year when we start to talk about three or 5% or six or 7%, that's just not going to get us there. What's going to get us there? And I don't think we're talking about that. So, we continue to talk about proof points, we continue to provide that, but we got to get in a room somewhere and talk about how to fill that gap before there is an issue, and that's where Tyson and I are. Tyson, I don't want to talk before you but...

Tyson Montoya:

I mean, we're headed in the summer months where we don't have the staffing. We're doing forecasts to look at what we're going to need, and yeah, we're just not there. We're not good. We could have a July, August. Those are going to be the hard months here.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes.

Jared Gerber:

I hope you don't think we're coming across not understanding. It's just we understand, I think more than anybody else will understand, because we do go through the same thing and that's where we struggle because I have the same issue with my staff. I need a ton more FTEs. I don't get them. How do I then vote for something that my employees aren't getting as well and my staff isn't getting and I'm not showing appreciation to them through that? That's where we struggle. And you're going to end up with the same people in this boardroom that we report to and don't get all the things we need from, because they're so focused on keeping taxes low.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes.

Jared Gerber:

So, I hope you understand. We understand. I don't know what the solution is because I haven't come up with them. If you guys have one, I'd love it.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Base needs, every one of our cities deals with this, and the service providers, they know when they have these boards, it's not just a shoo-in that taxes get approved. I'm not... I appreciate I think, as we said, yours were the first really look at how are we funding this? And before Doug retired, when he said we've been probably starving this too long, I think we're aware of that. I think that's why we need to say, "Okay, what's a reasonable plan?" But I don't know that there's the political will to just let you raise. I think even if you had that board, you would run into it where they have to do truth and taxation, there's enough pressure and again, at the legislative level to, I think, rein some of that stuff in. I don't think it's going to be the way it is right now.

Jared Gerber:

And I guess you could turn to UFA and ask how difficult is it?

Dom Burchett:

It's not fun.

Jared Gerber:

Right.

Dom Burchett:

It's not a blank check that you just say, "I need through the ExCap and let's get all the money." and you're asking over every single year.

Ivan Whitaker:

So, anytime that there's a funding issue like this, the next thing that you have to start looking at is economies through operations and efficiencies and the way we're doing business internally, and I got to have some uncomfortable conversations with you. Things like the number of channels, we have 14 to 15 channels that we have to support.

The numbers show that we only need eight, nine, eight, sorry, eight to nine. That's what the numbers show. The stuff that I got to pull out and talk through it, because that's where we can free up our managers and supervisors as we start looking at the channels. So, some of those things that are native to the way we have been doing business for years, if we can't get the funding, we got to go in a different route, and that is the efficiencies by changing our operations.

Nathan Cherpeski:

So, I guess I would question, why do we have so many channels? What is the nexus there?

Jared Gerber:

Demand for service from us probably.

Korban Lee:

Ivan, having those uncomfortable conversations, that is the point of this board.

Ivan Whitaker:

Okay.

Korban Lee:

Having those conversations about costs and benefits or efficiencies versus economies of scale versus increasing the assessments and those trade-offs, those are the conversations we should be having.

As you were talking about the needs and the struggles, I'm thinking to myself, "I think the main challenge is one of communication and persuasion and understanding." You're seeing needs that I'm not seeing all the way, and so I'm not quite appreciating your perspective as much as I would like to.

Ivan Whitaker:

Sure.

Korban Lee:

And therefore, I'm maybe not as sympathetic to the budget increases as you would want me to be, but talking about, "Okay. Well, here's the trade-offs. Here's what we can do with the 5% budget increase, and then here are the trade-offs we got to make operationally." With that, then we can wrestle as a board with, "Oh, maybe we better go up to 10." Or, "Okay, we're okay. We understand the trade-offs and the consequences." And we'll have to wrestle as a board with those hard decisions. Going to a special service district or being in this current member assessment model, I don't think it changes that underlying...

Scott Harrington:

... I agree.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes.

Korban Lee:

the problems that the board wrestles with.

Tyson Montoya:

What more can we show you to help convince you?

Nathan Cherpeski:

Well, I think you just said what is that trade-off? If we're running 14 channels, but we could do it with nine, what are those five channels for?

Kevin Hicks:

And can I add to what Nathan's saying. So, those extra channels, if those channels are there because a previous board has demanded that you have X number of channels, maybe that's something we all need to now understand. I mean, I'm one of the newer members of the board. I don't fully grasp everything. I think you guys made some good strides over the past few months, as I've shared, in getting us out and educating us on what's going on and getting to meet some of the staff and seeing what's going on. But I mean, I'll be the first say, if we have 14 channels and you're saying we could be shifting down to eight or nine, I'm very... Why do we have 14? Is it a demand that the board has put on you guys to have the 14? And that's where my brain goes. And if that's a way of saving some money and the board demanded that, maybe we need to rethink that.

Josh Collins:

Or if the opposite is true that we absolutely need it for whatever reason, then we'll have to spend that extra money and I think we have to make that decision in that hard conversation. As Korban was saying, if that's the case where that's the hill we're going to die on, then we'll spend the money. It's much easier for me to go back to my elected officials and say, "We've got to spend the money because this is the service you're demanding." But I can't do that if I don't know of stuff like that. I didn't know this.

Rosie Rivera:

If you reduce the number of channels, does that impact officer safety?

Ivan Whitaker:

I would say no, and that's based on the numbers that are used on the channels, the additional channels at the percentage that we're seeing. Some of the things that we're doing operational, UCA even took a console from us, because we have a lack of usage on certain channels and so I would say no.

Rosie Rivera:

I would suggest coming and talking to the police chiefs at VPA, explaining that, because that's what I'm hearing all the time when I was over at UPD, that's all I ever heard is if you start combining too many channels, it's officer safety that gets impacted. That's why we have supported additional channels, but if that's not the case, we need to hear from you as police chiefs and sheriffs, so we know whether or not that is accurate, because these guys can go talk to their own chiefs too and see what they want to do.

Josh Collins:

Well, and if that's what the chiefs believe, then that's what the elected officials are going to hear.

Craig Burnett:

That's what I'm saying. I'm right with the sheriff, that's because we have a different perspective and I think we need to have it be part of this discussion. Which of these six channels are you talking about getting rid of? Who are you combining? How are you combining that? Because, to tell you, you're going to get in a room with these chiefs and they're going to argue, and it's not about territory or anything else, but it's about officer safety and our perspective is completely different from our side of the fence.

Josh Collins:

That's helpful to me.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I will say right now, Herriman, South Jordan and Riverton are all on one channel.

Craig Burnett:

Yeah, and I don't know how you do it.

Nathan Cherpeski:

And it works.

Kevin Hicks:

It works great.

Craig Burnett:

And I know that because now we're starting with a lot of this silent dispatching, but some of us are a little... Even though we may not population-wise, every once in a while, we get put on with South Salt Lake, and I'm telling you, nobody can get on the radio, and there's a lot of talk. So, it is a discussion that needs to happen, for sure.

Kevin Hicks:

I agree. I think so.

Craig Burnett:

And I wouldn't die on that hill, but I want to have a good discussion as to who, how, where is this going? And I know all the other chiefs will be the same.

Josh Collins:

Well, but for me, that's important to know, that my chief would die on the hill or whatever, or would be willing to compromise. I need to know that. If I don't know, again, that that's an issue or a place where we could shift funds around, because we're changing personnel assignments or whatever, then how can I make that decision? How can I tell my elected officials to make that decision or commit to an extra 5% or whatever it is?

Ivan Whitaker:

And I want to be clear, my approach thus far has been to try to fund operations as status quo. That's what we've been on. That's why I haven't come to you and talked about channel changes or anything like that, and wouldn't want to have that conversation without the chief's inputs. I've been very collaborative with that group, but that's where we are. We're at a point where we have to start looking at everything, like Korban was saying, and I'm willing to provide all the information you need.

Bruce Kartchner:

I think, I'm obviously a very small percentage of the channels being used, and so maybe it doesn't weigh in, but I remember we went as a finance committee and went in detail on how to allocate the cost to different people. So if there are certain agencies that are feeling some anxiety that they need more channels to be able to cover their needs, maybe we need to re-look at the allocation model so that those that are wanting them, needing them and demanding them, are simply paying for their share, for that portion, for that need, for that desire.

And that the rest of the agencies that aren't demanding that, aren't having to bear any of that cost, that we figure out a way to allocate 100% of that cost for the additional channels. Then those agencies, their cities or whoever can determine, "Do we want to do it at that level?" And that's their choice. Part of the difficult conversation for you, it takes that off the table because you're not having to address it in the same way that you otherwise might be. Part of that, though, is going to be that the elevated management aspects of those additional channels needs to be part of the cost structure, not just the channel itself.

Ivan Whitaker:

Got it. And Korban, with you, one of the things that I need help with, and maybe it's more one-on-one conversations between, but how do you want to see that data? Because honestly, I've provided more data, I've been working with boards for a long time, and I provided more data to this board than I've probably provided previous boards, so whatever help that you could provide on how you want to see that information.

Korban Lee:

Right. If it's a communication, like I said, one of the underlying issues I think is one of communication and understanding, it's two-way.

Jared Gerber:

It's not the amount of data. It's what's presented and how it affects and how then that relates. We need to figure that out as well. One positive that I see of going to a special service area, or a special area or district would be you cut out this middle group, but then you have to deal directly with this. I just don't see it changing.

Craig Burnett:

I guess I don't see it changing either, but when you said, "Hey, we need 10%," you're going to go back to the same elected officials and say, "You need to raise taxes."

Josh Collins:

Exactly. Right. No, I understand.

Craig Burnett:

Somebody's going to raise taxes whether it's a district or whether it's this.

Josh Collins:

So it's a question of who's raising taxes directly.

Craig Burnett:

Who's going to do it? Right.

Josh Collins:

I understand.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Well, I would like to explore, again, what Bruce just said. If people are demanding, if there's a way we could consolidate based on calls, we'd go this, but people feel strongly... officer safety. Again, we have three cities, a quarter of a million people using one channel and they don't talk over each other.

Kevin Hicks:

No, in fact-

Nathan Cherpeski:

Because of silent dispatch.

Kevin Hicks:

I've been listening in over the past week, for obvious reasons, and I think it goes very well. They're doing a great job, they're doing great work. It doesn't seem like there's too much overlap for people talking over. There's some quiet times.

Nathan Cherpeski:

It's often pretty quiet.

Kevin Hicks:

Yeah. I'm not saying that to say we would want a fourth city into that mix. I think the chief might come after me if I threw that out there.

Nathan Cherpeski:

So again, if the cities feeling like they need two channels, we can figure out what that cost is and then we look at the allocation and if you want that service, you're paying for it, right?

Bruce Kartchner:

That is an interesting aspect though. And I'm going to bring Bluffdale up in this case, because ultimately, we will be having our own police force in some fashion.

Kevin Hicks:

Is that an announcement?

Bruce Kartchner:

No, it's not. It is something that was determined some... When I was actually on the city council, when we decided to contract with Saratoga Springs, the goal was eventually to have our own. That was the goal back then. It's still the goal. We're still working on our future goals, as all of you are with your own entities. When we come on board, we don't want to be this poor redheaded stepchild that now has pushed it to where we need one more channel, and so we're paying the full bore of the channel. That would also seem somewhat unfair. But I think it can be addressed in a way that helps to share the load, but simultaneously not punish in a way that's detrimental.

Kevin Hicks:

And just one thing to add, Ivan, I think this type of conversation is exactly what, at least I personally, am looking for. That yours and Tyson's role is not... it's partially also thinking outside the box and challenging us to think about, like we're saying, the channels, and is this still the right model? Is it still the right model to have these extra channels, versus not, and challenge us to have that conversation? I think there is an element that Korban just said, that it is a little bit of a two-way communication.

I've been on this board now for a short time, but I've noticed that there have been some meetings where we really haven't said much, and maybe we need to also insert ourselves a little bit more and provide a little bit more feedback, and I'm going to challenge all of the other board members that we need to do that. I was educating myself, just earlier today, to get a lot more up to speed on the whole towing issue, to get more involved there. And I think that's part of our role as board members, is to make sure we insert ourselves more and more.

Ivan Whitaker:

Correct and I sent a document out with data in that document. I'm expecting questions, I'm expecting something and crickets. So, in this meeting, when we say, okay, delivery of the data different or whatever, I want it to be that two-way communication. I want those questions answered. I want to have those one-on-ones if we need to go through it, and I'll pursue that more on my side as well.

Tyson Montoya:

Just for clarity, we do have a defined number of channels for law enforcement and fire, and then it's the calls and the sworn officer count. The law enforcement's a hybrid fifty-fifty, but we're essentially doing the same thing that you guys are talking about on a per-call basis right now, under this assessment model. So, dollar for dollar, it wouldn't likely change all that much.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Well, I maybe disagree. Depends on how you look at it. If somebody has a channel that is severely underutilized, but they're only paying for their call of service, but you've got somebody staffing that, that cost would shift. It wouldn't be equally. You would have to somehow figure out how you do that. So, in where we have three cities sharing one channel, that's different than say, a city who has the calls that we do, or maybe even half the calls, but they're using one channel, we've got three... This, it would change that.

Jared Gerber:

The cost of staffing a channel isn't split in order to utilize the channel.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Yes.

Bruce Kartchner:

To that end, when we were talking about how to allocate it at that point in time, VECC did not have the data that we wanted to be able to allocate it, I think the way some of us wanted to. It just didn't exist and so this model was actually not our preference, necessarily. With all of the changes that we've had in VECC it's very possible that you could dial it in very tightly.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Based on use.

Bruce Kartchner:

Based upon usage.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

You have got to remember too though, it's not just traffic or calls or people. It's the potential traffic that's going to show up on that in an emergency case and we move things around, and we try and do the best that we can. But the second that we start to narrow the number of frequencies or call channels that are here, and then we have a staffing issue, now I narrow that even more and even more, because the way we fix staffing

issues is we close channels down. And so, when we talk about, when the sheriff talks about, does this create an officer safety? It might not on a Monday or a Tuesday, but on Wednesday, Thursday, it might create all kinds of problems for us. So, we try and staff and schedule those things based on what we can see as a worst-case scenario, and sometimes that costs money, and that's just the cost of doing business for the way it is.

Yes, can we go find efficiencies? Absolutely, we can look at that. On a regular basis, is this department under-utilizing what it is, or how it's going, or what's happening? But I find, my experience, and please jump in here, that the more people you put on a radio, the more the risk goes up to the officers, because they can't get particularly emergency traffic onto a radio that is so jammed with people that they talk over each other. And so I would be willing to offer up more frequencies so that we can narrow that out. That would be my goal to go that direction rather than to go to less.

Ivan Whitaker:

There lies the impasse that I know that's there that we need to talk through.

Korban Lee:

This issue of more channels or not, tweaking the assessment model or not. It's not on the agenda, but I think it's illustrative of the desire of the board to explore alternative revenue sources. We pushed for that, and I know you're looking into that with other things, towing and the 911 tax, and on and on. Keep doing it, keep being creative, keep pushing. I think we've demonstrated as a board, we're open to reconsidering the assessment model. If the assessments need to be tweaked because new data is available that wasn't prior, we were limited by the data available when we made the formula we did, but I don't think... It doesn't sound like we're open to changing the governance model of VECC, because we don't think that it solves the underlying problem. It just changes this board with a different board, but the root problem still exists.

Ivan Whitaker:

And just for clarity, it was never discussed in this building going away from this board because of friction or concern with the board. That wasn't the case. We're just trying to-

Korban Lee:

I know I ended up implying that, and I didn't mean to.

Kevin Hicks:

I think, and I know we're kind of derailing this conversation probably beyond what you were hoping, but hopefully it still is good feedback and information. One thing I'd like to understand, because I want to be very clear, I'm not against if we truly have a need for more channels, let's get even more channels. Over the past five to 10 years, have we ever used all 14 at any given moment?

I mean, those are some of the things that I'm curious about, that I'd like to see, because if the statistics tell us we need eight or nine 85% of the time and we need 12... You know what I mean? The math, five to 10% of the time, but if we've never needed beyond 12, so maybe you go from 14 to 13 and still have that coverage, that's where I'd like to see. Not saying that we go all the way down to eight. And I'm just using that as an example that I don't want to be one to think that I'm not for officer safety to the contrary. I'm very much for officer safety.

Tyson Montoya:

So, the fire and police meetings, where they're saying that they need more channels, right? We have a board that says, we don't know why we had X number of channels to begin with, so what's the solution?

Ivan Whitaker:

And that's the discernment that we get, when they start patching channels because of staffing issues or call volume, is that comes up in those chiefs' meetings, "Why are we patching channels?" And to me, it's obvious.

Craig Burnett:

As a chief, and I know I'm sitting here as somebody else too, but... we're not closed to that, but come and tell us why, and what, and show us the alternatives. "Here's what we need to do and here's why. Here's what we would do and here's why." I don't think anybody's going to sit there and say, "Well, no, we've been doing this since before VECC because we had our own dispatchers. Now for the last 35 years, we've been doing this because this is how..." No, I don't think anybody's going to do that, but as with anybody else, you're going to have to sell me.

And why do I... Yes, Murray, are we the busiest around? No, but there are times we're really busy. We're different than some of the south areas because you're mostly residential. We've got all this other stuff. That doesn't mean we should have our own, but who are you going to pair us up with? Why would we need to... That's all I'm saying. I think as chiefs, if you brought that to us and we had that kind of a conversation, we could have some constructive discussions.

Scott Harrington:

And especially if you have a number attached to it, there'll be X amount of savings or that type of stuff as well.

Ivan Whitaker:

We can go that route. To this point, I haven't wanted it.

Craig Burnett:

Yeah. No, no. I know that. And that's not been that discussion, but I know as this discussion's going on here, I'm saying don't look at the chiefs and think that the chiefs are going to say no. We might, but that's just what we do up front, but we're open to the conversation.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

Ivan, do we have a time of day, day of week, look at those calls and what they roll out, and then do those break out by frequency or just as a single?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes, we do.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

I think that'd be a great presentation for everybody to look at right here. As we start to break that down and say, "See, look, here's where your peak is. What are we going to do?" And so we really staff for the peak, because we don't want Herriman to come on, on Mondays and Tuesdays on this channel, and then on Wednesdays and Thursdays on this channel because that works.

Does that make sense? We're trying to roll that stuff around, and we really do argue for, this is where we staff. We look at this point, and this is where we figure it out, but I think it's a good one to put out to everybody. And I'm happy to help you if you need some help throwing some stats on that too.

Bruce Kartchner:

Sure. I think the beauty though is that you have this broader view and have the ability, your comment that the modeling would say that we only need this many channels, I think that's an important thing for all of us to listen to, including the chiefs, that those models aren't designed to say, "Okay, we're willing to let 10% of the officers die." That's not what the models are going to be based upon. They're based upon safety, cost, all of

the other inputs. And so having presentations regarding that, why, going to Chief Anjewierden's comment of why it works and how it will work, I think it'd be very valuable.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

I think it's important to recognize in the PSAP world, we have a little bit of a unique situation here where we have so many entities working under one roof. As opposed to in Chicago, where the Chicago Police Department lines it out like this, and they can move precincts one direction or another. We're a little more territorial, I think, than that. And sometimes it's harder to move half of your traffic to one frequency and half of your traffic to another. There are some reasons that we do the things, but I would really like to look at the study on that.

Bruce Kartchner:

But once again, we should be able to calculate that and to that extent, charge accordingly.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

I mean, sure.

Rosie Rivera:

Take into account, because I know that the Sheriff's office is a little bit different, when we tried to combine with Holliday, and we did for a short time. So, we have animal control for the whole county. We have the courts, bailiffs, the jail transportation. If you're on our channel, it makes it very difficult for you to get on in the mornings when they're hauling everybody to court or doing these transportation things. So, it didn't work.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

Unique traffic for sure.

Rosie Rivera:

Yeah, it didn't work for Holliday because the one time they needed to get on, somebody's checking out, "Hey, I'm driving a bus with 30 people," and it didn't work. And that's where the officer safety piece came in. So they actually designed it a little bit different for the sheriff's office because we're all on one channel, the sheriff's office. There's a ton of traffic between those entities, but they bill them as well, so they're billed out.

So, we're a little bit different, but I don't know. I would talk to your chiefs again, especially if you have Herriman, Riverton and South Jordan and it's working. It would be interesting to have your chiefs come in and talk about that too. How does it work? And of course, I mean, Taylorsville and West Valley can't share a channel. I mean, that's just common knowledge as a police officer. You don't want to-

Scott Harrington:

Yeah, It's too busy.

Rosie Rivera:

It's too busy, so you have to be very careful who you do. So you might take one of your three and share it with West Valley, one of your three with Taylorsville. But that's probably how it would work. I don't know.

Nathan Cherpeski:

And I'm guessing we all do silent dispatch down there so between the three of us, at least in '24, we had 84,000, almost 85,000 calls for service in the year, on one channel. Again, I think the operations should talk about it. I don't know. West Valley, you have a lot more than that. There probably are needs. Yeah, they're just on volume, but I agree with Bruce. Let's see what those models say and not just knee-jerk, "Well, we can't do that because we've always done it this way."

Again, we've got to go in front of our elected officials. Frankly, it comes out of the police budget in Herriman, so if that dispatch comes up, the chief's got to figure out where he's cutting from. I don't know if it's like that in Murray. So maybe that's why they... I mean, I get as much pressure from my police department about dispatch fees as I do for the elected officials.

Scott Harrington:

All right, Awards and Recognition.

## **AWARDS AND RECOGNITION**

Ambir Widdison:

We had three employee of the months this month. Emma Kunz is a police dispatcher who received the nomination for her positive environment and her team-oriented attitude and strengthening those around her. She's a positive force on the floor.

James Waite is a call taker. He received this employee of the month nomination. He's an important trainer on the floor. He trains a lot of calltakers. Both on and off the floor he's kind. He's kind to the callers. He provides great customer service, and he provides great customer service to his trainees and to those around him. So he was nominated for those efforts.

We also have an employee of the month, Matt Schultz, who's our GIS coordinator in the technical services division. He was honored by one of our commanders who recognized his exceptional contributions to not only just GIS, but he has significant contributions to both the fireside as far as recommends and as far as mapping. He provides significant data to all of us. So, he was recognized as employee of the month for the technical services division.

We also have Jessica Fry who has received employee of the quarter report one of 2026. Jessica is a leader that... I don't think we have anyone like her out there on the floor. She is not only a trainer who has trained a significant amount of people who have been released out onto the floor, but she also is a member of several committees. So her input is very pivotal in making decisions, getting that floor perspective. And so we recognize Jessica for employee of the quarter for quarter one.

We had several just individual accommodations for performance. Victoria Palaita is a call taker who was exceptional on a full arrest call. Ryan Brudnicki. He's a presence on the floor, and it was recognized that it is very much needed to have a positive influence on the floor during those calls. So Ryan Brudnicki was recommended for that. Jessica Nelson took an armed robbery carjacking and was very calm and very precise. She's newly released on the police side, and it was recognized the performance on that call.

Emma Clements is a very new call taker who found herself faced with a CPR call that also included Narcan and an allergy, and her performance on that was incredible. Amy Bishop and her leadership team was recognized for not only the environment that they bring out there for C Platoon, but they are very active in providing constant training while they're on duty, focused on the needs that they're seeing on their team and making sure that they're providing that additional training on a daily basis to their team. So C-Squad was also recognized.

Elyse Haggerty:

So these are some pictures from Chrise Vawdrey's. She has a new last name. She hit 25 years and she has retired. She retired five years early, but earned every minute of it. She's living a whole new life, just got remarried, and is going to enjoy her retirement the right way. No more working. Many of you probably, definitely all of your chiefs have heard Chrise dispatching. She does both. She did both police and fire. She's a big loss to us, but that's the goal, right? Retirement. So, we're really grateful for her and all that she did over her 25 years.

Ivan Whitaker:

This one is not up there. I'm very excited about this one. One of our members, we went to a conference and they saw a certification. It's called the Emergency Number Professional Certification. It is the most difficult certification in 911. There's only 1,100 in the nation that actually have that certification. I saw her taking notes and said, "Is she going to go for it?" And she sent me a text and said, "I passed the ENP. And so, I want to recognize Ambir Widdison with the Executive Director Achievement Award for her commitment.

So, remember, the reason you got this award the first ever, and this is the desired behavior that we want. We want excellence and this is a show of excellence. So, thank you.

Scott Harrington:

Nice work, Ambir. Any others? All right, thank you. Operations Report. So, performance report for February 2026.

## **OPERATIONS REPORT**

Elyse Haggerty:

All our numbers were great again. February 95.72 for 90% and more, 96.87 for 95% of our calls, transfer 0.64, so we're still meeting all the requirements for the state. We took 18,157 calls in February. I looked two days ago and we're already at over 10,000 for March. It's getting warmer out, which means people hang out outside, which means they do illegal things, start fires so they're going to keep us busy this summer.

Our abandonment rate was 3.63. Again, those are the pocket dials. I don't know how we ever got down to two, but anything below five, I'm confident that we're answering 911s fast enough. And then our total was 55,880 on our non-emergency calls and spider check from UPD 4.53.

We have a really awesome employee named Tanya Landers, who when I walk by her and she's taking a call, I always have to stop and listen because she's so polite every time. If I had to call 911, I would want Tanya to answer because she's very empathetic. She's just really great at her job at call taking. So randomly, as I was looking on the board of kudos, someone mentioned that Tanya was amazing and kind and thoughtful, which absolutely describes her. So, I was excited to offer that information up in our momentum session, which keeps our employees up to date.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

So, 911, what's your emergency? Is Tanya available? Can I talk to her, please? So that's what you're asking?

Elyse Haggerty:

And honestly, if it was me, I probably would, and they would say, "No, I'm not going to transfer you, Mam." Yeah, she's great. And as for the whole conversation about channels, it's something that has been very much on my mind, how we're going to get through this summer. I know Ivan and I have talked about it. It's interesting the points of view from your guys' standpoint on how well a channel is being handled versus what we're hearing from police agencies and on our end, what we hear from the employees of how difficult something is versus not. So, I hope I can bring a lot of clarity to that for you guys next month.

## **UCA RADIO PROJECT UPDATE**

Scott Harrington:

Looking forward to it. Okay. UCA radio project update.

Brice Rawlings:

Last week we were decommissioning the old legacy Motorola system. At the same time, UCA was in the prime site doing the same thing. They removed a bunch of channel banks that were hooked up that affected fire and police, mainly the sheriff's office for the Mill Creek channel that went down. And then also the backup to our US digital fire station. It was just the backup site. It was the Granite site and the Mahogany site that went down.

The next day they came in, they were here at seven in the morning, they were here until 11 at night getting that equipment put back in and reconnected. So that affected for fire, their belt pagers, the BCs. So, we did some final testing yesterday and everything seems to be working fine. They completely cut cables and removed the equipment out of there. They promptly brought them back and tried to get it hooked up.

The other thing that I have is UCA went to their board. They got buy off on the Motorola radio management system. And what that will do is they'll be creating these boxes that will be available for purchase to the agencies. The number they threw out was anywhere from \$2,000 to \$2,500 for a box. And they're wifi capable, they're mobile, so they can move them to a vehicle. You can program five to six radios at a time on that.

And what the UCA will push out, like version updates for the Motorola radios. And also, if you want to change your code plug or whatever in there, they can push it out to that. And then you guys can update your radios at will on that. They're going to put out probably a newsletter once they get those box numbers and what the cost of that will be and then they'll probably reach out to see if there's a need for agencies that want them. The chiefs that were on that call last time, everyone wanted them. Think you wanted five.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

Four. Yeah.

Brice Rawlings:

Four. I think VECC will probably try and get one too just to update here. I know anytime they have an issue, they want to know what version of the Motorola radio you're on. That'll push those versions out when you come online. So, I guess we'll have to do that, just plugging into it and turning it on and let it update, so it'll be quicker. You guys won't have to do major reprogramming like we've been doing.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

Significantly reduces the need to have your people all come in for a radio update every time something changes.

Bruce Kartchner:

I've worked with technology now for a very long time and I have seen it fail frequently. Is somebody going to take one of these boxes, put it in the field and make sure it's actually functioning the way they say it's going to be? Or are they going to have to rush in to rebuild the channels that they just cut out of the wall the day before?

Brice Rawlings:

I think that's probably a better question for UCA on that. But Brian Lowe up in Logan is the one that's actually using that and so they're modeling that up. UCA is going to actually be building these boxes and that.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

They have operational boxes now that are working well within the system. The problem in the Motorola system is every type of radio has its own code plug so we're going to have to figure out which one of those code plugs that we're going to use. There could be some expense later for agencies to update their code plugs from UCA. But for the most part, once those code plugs are in the system, it'll recognize the radio, see that it's

this code plug, update it, send it back and all of that while your officer is at roll call or having a coffee or whatever it is that they do.

Brice Rawlings:

I think they charge \$10 a radio now to get it programmed.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

For programming.

Brice Rawlings:

That will go away, so just over wifi, come to that box and be able to plug into it. Except for if you need to change a code plug, they'll charge you the code plug charge.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

The big kicker in this meeting, I'm sorry, I'm stealing all your stuff here, the big kicker in this meeting was that we're all phase one compatible now. We just rolled everybody back to phase one. They set the phase two date for Q1 of 2030. Which means everybody, if you're not phase two compatible with both your handheld and your car radio, by that first quarter of 2030, you're going to have to have that done. So, your police chiefs will be coming to you saying, "We need to update this equipment so that we can be in compliance with what UCA is demanding."

Brice Rawlings:

That's all I have.

Scott Harrington:

Is that a purchase of a whole new radio?

Dwayne Anjewierden:

Most likely with how old our equipment and stuff is. Today, it's most likely new radio. There are some updates or some flashes that you can put into a Motorola system that will get it to there. I'm not telling you how to run your business here but by the time you put that many updates into it, you're better off just buying the new radio. It'll get you about 10 to 12, maybe 15 years out of that radio if you do that.

Brice Rawlings:

Thank you.

Scott Harrington:

Any other questions? All right. AVL pilot project status update.

## **AVL PILOT PROJECT STATUS UPDATE**

Ambir Widdison:

Ivan and I spent 16 hours this weekend and was able to get some final touches on that project. It is going into technology to start building it so we can start to see what the changes that we've made how they're going to play out in real life. We're very excited about the changes that we have made. Many of them will make us faster, many of them will make us more efficient in the questions that we're asking. And we'll be able to provide some significant data points with what we're coding our medical calls to.

There's even plans in there to look at how we can effectively combine our police, our law enforcement, and our medical questioning all into one. So, we're pretty excited with what we accomplished this weekend. We are also going to be incorporating some comms coach features, knowledge, and assist that are going to help us with this project as well.

It is a very large project, and we are making some pretty good ground. I'm hoping in the next couple of months we'll start to see some more things we can show as we start to build it into the technology.

The AVL enhancement update, Versaterm came out at the last, not this last one, the one in February, and met with all of the fire chiefs, and gave an update as to where they are on the original requests that were made a year ago. They have a traffic enhancement that they're going to be placing into our CAD system for us to beta test. We're waiting on some finance projections on that. I know Ivan is pushing heavily for a zero in that box and some other features that they have going into the end of this year.

So, we are actively still monitoring that AVL enhancement project, and we'll provide some updates as we get them. But right now, we're really focused on the traffic enhancement that should be coming out here shortly so we can start beta testing and see what impact that has on our closest unit and our AVL project.

Scott Harrington:

Are we still about a year out on the AVL then?

Ivan Whitaker:

I don't want to say that. We'll be able to give you a better update in a couple of months. If we want to go September, but that's going to involve the fire chiefs and some other things. And the 16 hours, if I seem a little ornery today, that's what it was.

Ambir Widdison:

I pushed him hard.

Scott Harrington:

All right. Thanks, Ambir. Okay. Executive Director Report, Ivan.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT**

Ivan Whitaker:

The first one, we have the Bill 242 that I'd like to go through with you. I requested a committee be formed. Police chiefs will be a part of that committee. Kevin's going to be a part of that committee as well. I've also invited the Spatafore's. Now that we're on the other side of the bill, which was a lot of work, I spent a lot of time at the Capitol working with several others on this.

How are we going to deploy? What are we going to do operationally? And that's the question. The concern right now is, again, by now you probably know that the tow vendors charge an administrative fee of \$45. We can now charge the tow vendors up to half of that, which is \$22.50. It's only on police-initiated calls, which is about 22,000 calls for us. Does not include PPIs, and we'll deal with that later.

But the concern that's out there right now three of our police agencies are using TowPro, but the new legislation allows us to take the money and totally keep it in-house for funding, whether it's positions, operations. Or it allows us to take that money and pay for a tow vendor service. The concerns internally are if we do that and we expand with the tow service, now that those monies are available when they weren't available before, what's the procurement process? Should we be opening up that for bid?

Some of the tow app services have contacted us and say that they're charging \$15 now. They're willing to charge \$22 and give us seven bucks because we're still involved in the mix, taking calls, and they'll take on all

the billing. There's just all of this stuff. We don't want to hurt any of the police agencies that are currently using the tow app and so we just need to get in a room and talk about the direction of what we want to do as a team and provide recommendations to the board.

We start our first committee meeting on the 30th. And then hopefully it won't take too long to report back. We're talking about, just so you know, dollar amount, if we totally did it in-house, we're talking 495K is the dollar amount.

The next update is non-emergency AI. We put out an RFP on February the 24th. We hope to have all of that closed out by mid-May. We had eight vendors respond to the RFP. And we'll keep you updated there. The goal there is to be live with the non-emergency AI by September of this year.

Motorola Assist. The goal is to be live with that by May. Motorola Assist, again, will provide the AI language transcription which will be huge for us because when a person calls in and they're speaking Spanish, which is about 90% of our calls, it'll be transcribed in English so that we can understand and hopefully we can get a quicker response. We're spending about nine minutes on language translation calls. On all other calls it's a little over three minutes so this is going to be huge. It also provides video and 911 and livestream and also allows the citizen to be able to send us media that we can get out to the field providers as well.

Reverse 911. I'll slow down a moment. We are working with the chiefs right now. We brought up to the chiefs getting out of the reverse 911 business, just because of the complications, policy protocol, when do we send it, et cetera. I think the police chiefs look primarily on board. I don't want to give an answer to that. But it was favorable on that side. On the fire chiefs' side, there are some concerns about the city's capabilities to be able to handle reverse 911s. I think anytime we send a reverse 911 out, there's some that say, "Oh, great." There's others that there's friction. "Why did we send it out? It's not right, blah, blah, blah."

We're trying to figure out, first off, there's an expense to it for us. If we can get out of it and let county emergency management or some other source handle it, we just think that it would be best for us. It's an emergency management function really. We'll get back to you with a recommendation, but we're going through those conversations now.

Rosie Rivera:

Let me ask a question. Have you talked to county emergency management? Because if there's a cost to you, that means there's going to be a cost to them.

Ivan Whitaker:

That's where Tara, I believe that's her name, I have a call out to her, I will be talking to her. Because I think they already have the functionality, but I just want to be sure.

Korban Lee:

What is the cost to VECC for reverse 911 capabilities?

Tyson Montoya:

35 grand.

Korban Lee:

35 a year?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes.

Ivan Whitaker:

Previously I said 70, but that's us and Salt Lake City.

Scott Harrington:

Is that software or is that people?

Tyson Montoya:

Software.

Ivan Whitaker:

Software.

Ivan Whitaker:

That's it on the executive report.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you. Any questions for Ivan? Financial Report. Tyson.

## **FINANCIAL REPORT**

Tyson Montoya:

All right so we're closed through February. We should be at 67% of budget. Our revenues are at 20.2 million for 85%. We've got the e-tax March, April, May, and June that we'll collect and then we've collected everything through the year.

This \$400,000, we're going to restrict for the emergency AI. Under personnel expense, you can see we're at 61%. We have some outliers here with overtime. We're going to bring a budget revision next month to take care of that special assessment of revenue that we received and then move some funds around internally with the personnel budget. We're at 61%, so we're right on target with where we want to be as an aggregate there.

On the admin and operation side, we're at 83%. Again, this is mainly because of that Versaterm expense that we pay. This will flatten out as we progress through the year. Everything else in here is looking really good year to date so I don't have anything that I'm worried about. With our non-cash expenses that we have at year-end, we should be able to build a little bit of money back into that equity account in our funds that we lost last year.

Overall, we're at 66% of expense to actual the budget, 15.69 million. And then our profit, operating rent, is at 4.5 million. Our ending cash account for Wells Fargo and then our PTIF account, favorable net change there, so that's good. We'll start to see that decrease next coming months.

This is our check registry and there's nothing out of the ordinary here. Payroll, just normal operating expenses.

Scott Harrington:

Any questions for Tyson? Anything else, Tyson?

Tyson Montoya:

No, that's it.

## **FY 27 BUDGET ADOPTION**

Scott Harrington:

Thank you. All right. FY27 Budget Adoption next. Anybody have thoughts, comments, questions?

Korban Lee:

Grateful to the budget committee, finance committee and Tyson and Ivan for working on it. Thank you. It wasn't easy. Thank you for your work on this budget.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Yeah, I appreciate that you sent it out the other day, again, the final ones so we could look through it. I didn't have any questions on it, but I did appreciate having a look through it.

Scott Harrington:

A lot of information in there. Tyson did a lot of work on that and Ivan and group.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yeah. And I've said a lot today, but I do appreciate everything, I know that you all are... for us to receive what we got, we're very appreciative, so I want to make sure you know that.

Rosie Rivera:

We just wanted to point out on one of your pages where you have all the entities, we still have UPD and the Sheriff's Office together. That was pointed out to me.

Tyson Montoya:

Sorry, it's not correct, yeah.

Rosie Rivera:

If you could change that. Sorry. It's petty but you know....

Tyson Montoya:

Is it this one?

Rosie Rivera:

It's the one that has all the badges and all the patches.

Scott Harrington:

Down below, I think.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

It's the logo screen, the front page, right there, next one down.

Nathan Cherpeski:

The very first page, it's a logo issue, page two.

Rosie Rivera:

I don't care if you put Salt Lake County. I don't care what it is. I could have emailed you, I guess. It's just the people I send the budget out to, because I'm also representing animal control and others.

Tyson Montoya:

We'll fix that.

Scott Harrington:

Any other changes to the budget document?

Kevin Hicks:

I make a motion to approve it, but split the logos for Sheriff of UPD.

Rosie Rivera:

I'll second that.

Jared Gerber:

Not on this one, right?

Scott Harrington:

What's that?

Jared Gerber:

Do public hearings?

Scott Harrington:

No, we did a public hearing last month.

Kevin Hicks:

Okay. Then I see it stands.

Scott Harrington:

So, we'll have to do this one by roll call.

Tyson Montoya:

Rachel, can you ...

Rachel Nipper:

Yes. I'm here and I can do that. Okay. I have Mr. Harrington, Taylorsville.

Scott Harrington:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Hicks, Riverton?

Kevin Hicks:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Lee, West Jordan?

Korban Lee:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Barker, Draper?

Mr. Barker:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Chief Burnett, Murray?

Craig Burnett:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Lewis, South Jordan?

Mr. Lewis:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Collins, South Salt Lake?

Josh Collins:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Cherpeski, Herriman?

Nathan Cherpeski:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Kartchner, Bluffdale?

Bruce Kartchner:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Gerber, Cottonwood Heights?

Jared Gerber:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Chief Burchett, UFA?

Chief Burchett:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Sheriff Rivera, Salt Lake County?

Rosie Rivera:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Chief Evans, West Valley City?

Chief Evans:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Chief Anjewierden, UPD?

Dwayne Anjewierden:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Okay. Thank you.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you. Once again, thanks for all your work, guys.

Tyson Montoya:

Thank you so much.

**Motion –**

**. . . by Mr. Kevin Hicks, to Adopt the Fiscal Year 2027 Budget, the motion was seconded by Ms. Rosie Rivera; the motion carried unanimously.**

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

Scott Harrington:

Okay. We already went over finance report, so I'd like a motion to adjourn.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

Motion to approve the minutes?

Scott Harrington:

No, I'll give everybody time to read them.

Josh Collins:

Motion to adjourn.

Scott Harrington:

We'll hit that next time.

Bruce Kartchner:

Second.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you.

**Motion –**

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

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.