SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

May 20, 2026 Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Mr. Scott Harrington – Taylorsville, Chair Mr. Ryan Carter – Riverton Mr. Korban Lee – West Jordan Mr. Mike Barker – Draper Mr. Craig Burnett – Murray Mr. Jason Rasmussen – South Jordan Mr. Josh Collins – South Salt Lake Mr. Nathan Cherpeski – Herriman Mr. Matt Evans – 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. Brad Morris – VECC TS Manager Mr. Brice Rawlings – VECC Facility Maintenance Manager Mr. Scott Young – VECC Legal Counsel Ms. Rachel Nipper – VECC Ms. Jodi Morris – VECC Ms. Nicole Lopez – VECC Ms. Ambir Widdison – VECC Ms. Tammy Cornelison – VECC Ms. Chelsea Ridge – VECC Mr. Mark Lewis – VECC Mr. Terry Addison – SSLFD Mr. Clint Smith – DFD Mr. Joey Mittleman – MFD Mr. Derek Maxfield – WJFD Mr. Cody Stromberg – HRPD Mr. Jeff Carr – SJPD Ms. Corinne Thacker – SJ Associate Director of Human Resources Ms. Holly Abdelkader

The meeting was called to order by Scott Harrington at 2:01 p.m.

Scott Harrington:

It's 2:01. Let's go ahead and call this meeting to order. Review of April 15th, 2026 board meeting minutes. Does anybody have questions, comments, or changes on the minutes?

Dwayne Anjewierden:

Motion to approve.

Scott Harrington:

All right. We've got a motion to approve. Do I have a second?

Dom Burchett:

I'll second.

Scott Harrington:

Who was the second?

Dom Burchett:

Chief Burchett.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you. All in favor? Say aye.

Members:

Aye.

Scott Harrington:

Any opposed? All right, none.

> **Motion –**
> **. . . by Mr. Dwayne Anjewierden, to approve the minutes from the April 15, 2026 meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. Dom Burchett; the motion carried unanimously.**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Scott Harrington:

Public comment. Does anybody wish to make public comment? There's nobody here from the public. Is anybody online? Seeing none, we'll close the public comment portion.

OPERATIONS BOARD REPORTS

Scott Harrington:

Let's go to the operations board report. Craig Burnett from Murray, Police Operations Advisory Board.

Craig Burnett:

Yes. Yeah, we met last week. I think a lot of what we talked about are things that Ivan will probably cover. We talked about the backup radio system and the possibility there's some funding from the state to help with that project. We talked about the 10-200 Response Plan and updated some of that information that I think a lot of us had forgotten we even had that plan, let alone what that entailed. So, I think that was good for a briefing for a lot of the chiefs that were there.

Other than that, a lot of what we talked about were things that Ivan reported on to us. I think what we're looking at mostly is where we're going and what's happening with the tow RFP, so we're all just working on that. Other than that, I don't have anything to share from our meeting unless you have any questions.

Scott Harrington:

Anybody have any questions? All right. Thank you for the report. Move on to the Fire Operations Advisory Board, Chief Addison.

Chief Addison:

Yeah, thank you. We also met last week. We had a discussion with our fire users board about protocol updates, moving garage fires to channel five and six, where we normally handle our structure fires, versus the dispatch channel. We also discussed the Rave to Everbridge transition planning. That is the reverse 911 that we've met and talked about in this meeting before. We had some interoperability and technology updates from Ambir focusing on the radio backup system that Chief Burchett mentioned. And then we also had a presentation from MD Ally, which is a 911 telehealth service explaining how they could provide physician level care for non-emergent calls. Basically, it's a telehealth type system. We had some other discussion that we're going to continue on tomorrow about some other call piping. That's it from Fire Ops Board.

Scott Harrington:

All right. Any questions for the Fire Operations Board? All right. Thank you for your time. All right. Awards and recognition, Commander Widdison.

AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

We received quite a large number of recognitions this month. Victoria Palaita was recognized for her work on a full arrest where it was a suspicious situation. She recognized the CPR was needed and continued that throughout the call. Also, on another call, she was recognized for an elderly female in a Discovery Inn room where there was not going to be immediate access to the patient and she proactively contacted the front desk to get them to open the door for responders before they arrived. She also managed a difficult overdose call and provided NARCAN instructions while also giving CPR and ensuring that patient's outcome. Supervisor Eggstaff received recognition for her work on late night house fires where staffing was below our numbers and she stepped in to assist the fire dispatchers for that.

Chief Haggerty was recognized for her work during Dispatcher Week. Her long days and continued dedication to her dispatchers was recognized from the floor. Joseph Faasu was recognized for managing a 911 call with four simultaneous full arrests and providing guided CPR instructions for all four patients. Nannette Bush was recognized while working a fire, she overheard CPR was needed on a stroke call and quickly assisted the call taker in starting the law enforcement to that call.

Shawn Hauenstein is a fire dispatcher who recognized that a call was being created with domestic violence that had shots fired and noticed that his responders were in the area on another call, a fire alarm, and quickly notified them of a critical call in their area that could put their safety at risk. Ryan Brudnicki was recommended for handling a stabbing call as he sat down for his shift the first call of the day and remained level-headed and immediate action for that call.

Devin Bohannon, during a pursuit, set up a CAD map that mapped containment corners at hotspots and termination points that assisted not only the responders but the dispatcher as well so she could clearly see those. Makaila Carter was recognized for a vehicle pursuit and a crash where she was able to research history and identify the suspect prior to responders identifying that suspect. Amy Johnson researched suspect information on a high priority call where she was able to locate the suspects and provide that information to responders.

Austin Jessup was recognized on his third day of training on South Salt Lake law enforcement channel. He handled an auto pedestrian involving a UTA bus, dispatched units appropriately and made all notifications. He was recognized for an excellent performance on a third day of training. Brittany Durant was recognized for remaining calm and steady during a call that had significant bleeding in providing those instructions. Gratitude was passed along by responding units on that call.

Shawn Hauenstein was recognized for identifying a house fire that was sent to the wrong channel and quickly moving all units to the proper channel. Tiffany Twohill was recognized for investigative skills on a deceased person and finding a next of kin so that those notifications could be made.

Ambir Widdison:

I also want to recognize Cory Christensen as our employee of the month. Cory Christensen works a lot of hours. He fills in a lot of holes for operations and does it routinely. He is also a source of positivity out on the floor and demonstrates a commitment to not only the responders that he works diligently with, but is a source of knowledge and support from his coworkers and his fellow dispatchers and supervisors. He was recognized for employee of the month by Chief of Operations Haggerty.

Scott Harrington:

All right, great. Great work. Thank you.

Ivan Whitaker:

Tyson, can you put up that document really quickly? You had it up, but you took it down.

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, one second.

Scott Harrington:

Are there any quick questions on the report from Chief Widdison?

Ivan Whitaker:

I'll go ahead and speak to it. We had a slide, but we'd like to recognize Herriman for recognizing two of our dispatchers last week during their award ceremony. Very appreciative. I attended that event. It was a class event. Thank you so much. We're doing the same thing with West Valley City next week to where a couple of our dispatchers were invited to be recognized at that. Thanks for continuing to think of us in these ceremonies. Thank you. We appreciate it.

Tyson Montoya:

Can you see the screen now, Ivan?

Ivan Whitaker:

I can. Can you go to the slide below that? I did want to let the Board know that a couple of weeks ago we had a softball game against Salt Lake City 911. It ended in a tie, 14 to 14. Just an excellent event, had a bunch of family members out there. A representative from NENA was there, representative from CARFAX was there. Just a very competitive event. These are some of the things that we're doing to continue to foster camaraderie. Thanks for your support in this as well.

Scott Harrington:

Good, good.

UCA RADIO PROJECT UPDATE

Scott Harrington:

UCA radio project, Commander Widdison?

Brice Rawlings:

I'll take this one. At the beginning of this week, they did Region 10 and Region 30 updates to the cores which the maintenance was done on the North and South Salt Lake simulcast. I believe it was for two hours, but we didn't notice any hiccups when they did any of that stuff. So that's good on that.

Scott Harrington:

When will they implement the rest then?

Brice Rawlings:

I don't know. On the Region 20, I haven't heard anything, but what effects VECC is Region 10 mostly and then as a backup Region 30. We've just been putting in tickets when we've had a couple consoles that unexpectedly shut down. There were five of them. Not at the same time, but at different times, so we put in tickets for that. They've closed those tickets. I haven't seen what the repair or the fix was, but they closed them out, meaning they fixed it.

Scott Harrington:

It's going good then?

Brice Rawlings:

It's going good. We're in the getting used to it phase now.

Scott Harrington:

What is left for the implementation then?

Brice Rawlings:

Right now we're in the honeymoon phase of it all. It's already been implemented. They've switched back to phase one, so they're going to keep everything until I think 2029. They're trying to phase out all phase one after that and then they'll switch everything back to phase two.

Scott Harrington:

All right. Thank you. Will everybody make sure their mics are muted? We're getting a lot of different conversations in the meeting, so please check your mics and make sure you're muted. AVL project, Ambir Widdison?

AVL PILOT PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

Ambir Widdison:

We are moving right along with this project. We have some testing. We have GovWorks flying in next week. We're going to really dive into the functionality of that and make sure that the guide cards are accurate and that what we expected is how we're functioning within their system. We've got approval from our medical director on the guide cards, and so now it's really just working to make sure that the functionality is working the way we want it to. As far as the AVL project, we have the traffic patterns or the traffic here platform that Versaterm is bringing forward. Quarter three is what we're looking forward to for that. We haven't seen any pricing or any testing done on that, but we're looking forward to it in quarter three.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you. Just realized that I skipped one item, so the performance report. Let's go back to 6.1.

OPERATIONS REPORT

Elyse Haggerty:

It's always exciting to report good stats. So, 93.51 for our 15 seconds or less and 95.51% for 20 seconds or less. That is not meeting the same marks we have been. We've had a lot of good turnover. We've got seven new trainees in the building and five additional that should be wrapping up by the end of June. We're still on track to keep getting people in. It's definitely one of the most difficult jobs I think anywhere to take calls all day and listen to the... You heard all the commendations and they're listening to those things day after day after day, so our call taking turnover tends to be a little bit higher.

Scott Harrington:

So how many employees are we down right now?

Elyse Haggerty:

Eight. Yes, so we've already started the process, and we'll be bringing the new group in July 13th.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you. Any questions?

Elyse Haggerty:

And then we've got the transfer rate is still well below the 2% at 0.57. Our abandoned is still very low, 4.18 so far. Our call volume went down. I did want to briefly speak about that. ECATS, which is the system I used to pull the numbers, had an outage for about 10 days. They've slowly put information back in, but they're having to do it all manually, so we don't know if that's missing calls or not. We put a ticket in as soon as we noticed it. It just was a longer than normal outage. So, if they change much, I'll bring them back next month. We had 500 less 911s, which is why I think there's a possibility that we're missing calls. As it gets warmer, it gets busier.

Scott Harrington:

Okay. Thank you. Any questions?

Ivan Whitaker:

We have a message from Korban that the numbers in the packet are a bit different than what was emailed, and so we need to make sure that everyone has the right data.

Elyse Haggerty:

This is the most current. Are you looking at the... You're not. Sorry, you have the previous one. We updated that sheet. So, if you look at your board packet that was received Monday from Rachel, that has the correct performance standards on it. Thanks.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Scott Harrington:

Thank you. Executive Director Report, Ivan.

Ivan Whitaker:

Can you go down to number, I believe it's three or four, Tyson? We'll start there on Reverse 911. All right, so I'm going to do a couple of these and then we're going to switch over to a presentation. The Reverse 911, we're not there yet. We're still in a holding pattern. County Emergency Management, they're working through the possible migration to a new tool. At that point when a decision is made, they'll reach back out to us and do some mitigation on how we're going to move forward with that new tool. I just want to make sure that everybody understands that we will still be heavily involved in the process. We will still push the button if that transition occurs, but we just want to make sure that who's ever responsible for the tool, there's calibration, there's responsibility for the tool, and making sure that the right stuff is in there. So again, that's just in a holding pattern right now. You can't hear me?

Scott Harrington:

Yeah, we can hear you. It's low. If you can talk a little bit more directly into the microphone, it'd be helpful.

Ivan Whitaker:

Let me try something different.

Scott Harrington:

That's better.

Ivan Whitaker:

Okay. All right. We have our data dashboard initiative. Can you still hear me?

Scott Harrington:

Yes. You're starting to fade a little though.

Ivan Whitaker:

The data dashboard initiative, that will be in place by end of July. Again, we'll reach out to all of you to receive a license. I'm looking at you, I'm trying to make sure that you all can hear me and it seems like some of you can't.

Tyson Montoya:

I can hear you.

Ivan Whitaker:

Okay. Let me try something different.

Okay, can you hear me now?

Scott Harrington:

You're a little bit light.

Ivan Whitaker:

Tyson, what about now?

Scott Harrington:

That's much better.

Ivan Whitaker:

Okay. Number five, a very important initiative that we have is the Data Dashboard Analytics. For the first time, we'll be able to provide the board, the police chiefs, the fire chiefs with data analytics. All of you will have a license. We have a small group who will be working on what goes into that data dashboard. We're very excited about that. Tyson, can you pull up the presentation?

Ivan Whitaker:

All right, everyone. I'd like to kind of slow down a bit because I need to make sure that the board has a good understanding of the initiatives that we're about to walk through in FY27. The first initiative that we want to talk through is the tow services program to where the tow committee that's been a part of this has been great. We all understand the legislation by now, SB242. The actual tow RFP has been posted. It's been posted for about a week and a half now. I thought that we would only have a couple of vendors respond to that RFP. Right now, it looks like there's about five or six vendors that are responding to the RFP. I was just notified that one of the biggest 911 vendors in the country may be responding to this RFP. So that's good to have that mix in there so that we can look at a variety of different vendors with this.

But what you're seeing is the forecast of what we can end up getting as a part of this RFP where you see the 385K of potential or estimated revenue. You'll see that the call per tow, and that will include PPIs and field initiated will be about $7 per tow, 55,000 calls. And the biggest piece, the one that I'm happy about, is that we've gotten 100% of the city municipalities to agree to go to the tow app where we only have three agencies using it right now. So that's all the work that's been done. We know that this is going to be a very visible RFP. We do what we normally do in RFPs and so we're very confident in the process, but it is moving forward. We should have a selection by the end of July. Any questions on the RFP?

Craig Burnett:

No.

Ivan Whitaker:

All right. Next slide. One of the things I do believe in is manifesting, making sure that we have a plan of action. And that's what we did a couple of years ago, didn't know how we were going to get to some of the things that I'm going to talk about, but would like to walk through it. Last week we went live with a system called Motorola Assist. Motorola Assist is an enhancement to our phone system to where now citizens can send live video. They can also send live media. And one of the biggest pieces as to what we're very happy about is the translation transcription. So, if the person is speaking Vietnamese or if they're speaking Spanish, we're able to see that live translation in real time. That allows us to get the call-out quicker, know what's going on quicker. That's about a value of $100,000 and the good thing about this is the state is completely paying for this upgrade.

One of the things I do want to tell you is that I think us having a seat at the table, because a lot of what I'm about to show you, VECC was responsible for recommending as a part of a group of individuals. If we had not met the state mandates, I'm sure we wouldn't have had a seat at the table. So meeting the state mandates, the folks that are in the room with VECC, just a wonderful job because again, as I go through this, this is about our performance and being recognized by the state, not only just receiving money from the state, so good job all around.

I just talked about the tow services. The next thing I'll talk about, number three, is our Mindbase implementation. What that is, we will now have a data source that sits on top of our CAD. It will let us know based on the number of call types the individuals on the floor have that we should be reaching out to in our peer support program. So, if Becky took eight high priority calls in the last two months, it will notify us that we need to reach out. It's an app that will be provided to every one of our emergency dispatchers to where they can self-initiate peer support, EAP, a psychologist. There's just a plethora of resources that will be in that app that we're very proud of as well. We negotiated a price point down to about $10,000.

Number four, I think is the biggest thing that we can be doing moving forward over the next couple of years, and that is the non-emergency AI. Quick story on this. We were working with the state and that group. The state decided to go with a different direction and a different vendor. We did not go with the state. The state came back about three weeks ago and said that the vendor that they were working with didn't go through, it failed in a couple of implementations and VECC was correct. The vendor bought out one of the top two non-emergency vendors in the nation and the state asked would we go with this vendor? And of course, we said yes, so we're going to get the non-emergency AI. The company is called Hyper. The state is paying for it. It's a five-year contract and that will be no cost to us. And then the last thing... Before I move forward, any questions about the non-emergency AI?

Scott Harrington:

That's great news. Thanks, Ivan.

Korban Lee:

Ivan, who's responsible for the implementation and what's that implementation timeline look like?

Ivan Whitaker:

Good questions, Korban. So Hyper is responsible for the implementation. I've been in contact with their CEO and co-founder. They're going to move it forward instead of Motorola. That's what we want because they have a great reputation for implementations. The timeline is we're seeking to be live by September. They said that they would have no problem meeting that timeline. This is about a three-month implementation.

Korban Lee:

Sorry, but I meant us or the state who's leading out or who's working with Hyper on it?

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes, they work directly with us. So, Melanie at UCA, she has eyes on it. She's a contact if we need anyone at the state level, but we're responsible direct to the vendor.

And the last item on the list is our AI-integrated EMD, EFD, and EPD protocols. Those are the enhancements that I talked about in the last meeting where AI will sit on the top of those protocols. It will advise us if we're going in the wrong direction, it will help us select chief complaints. Quality assurance sits on the top of it. If we select the wrong answer choice, it will tell us that based upon what it heard the caller state. Just a variety of things that it will do. It even types the notes for us as the caller is talking and there's auto translation in it as well. Again, we're getting that for free.

We were an early adopter with the vendor and because we're an early adopter, they're including this at no additional cost. So, everything that you're seeing here is about a value of about 1.56 million over five years. That's about 10 million. And I think on the board we have about $10,000 that we're paying. So again, to be able to have those connections, to be able to have those partnerships have been critical to moving things forward when we originally thought that some of these things would be a challenge. So bravo to everyone.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you. Any other questions? Ivan, do you have anything else?

Ivan Whitaker:

No, that's it.

FINANCIAL REPORT FOR APRIL

Scott Harrington:

All right. Financial Reporting items.

Tyson Montoya:

Can you guys see the finance P&L online?

Rachel Nipper:

We can see that, yes.

Tyson Montoya:

You can see we should be at 83% of budget through the end of April. You can see our revenues are at 92%. We're doing very well in terms of overall revenue and expense. In fact, this is one of VECC's or is VECC's best financial year financially speaking. I'll talk a little bit more about that a little bit later in the meeting. Our personnel expense is at 80% of budgetary estimate. You can see our wages is low. A lot of this is due to us being understaffed by eight FTEs right now. We've had pretty much at least that throughout most of the fiscal year.

Our total admin and operations is at 90%. That's because we put the debt covenant that we had in there that we normally apply in June. We paid that early. Our overall expense is at 82% or 19.59 million, and our operating revenues are at 2.2 million. We finished our cash count at $314,000. Our fund balance account, our PTIF account was at 5.5 million and we're sitting at 5.87 million through the end of April. Here is the list of all our payables. There's nothing in here that I need to call out or that's out of the ordinary. Do you guys have any questions on the financials before we move on?

Scott Harrington:
See no questions. We'll move on.

FRAUD ASSESSMENT REVIEW

Tyson Montoya:

As part of the audit process, we need to review the fraud assessment. We came in at 365 this year, which is exactly where we were last year, so there's no change. I just wanted to make you guys aware of that.

Scott Harrington:

Does anybody have any questions on the fraud risk assessment?

Scott Harrington:

Thank you for doing that guys. All right, Capital Improvement Plan.

FY 26 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT

Tyson Montoya:

Back in fiscal year ‘22, as many of you know, you guys did a needs assessment of the overall facility and the ongoing needs and capital improvements that are going to be needed. There was a plan that was outlaid for going out to fiscal year ‘29, really is to ensure the sustainability of the building. A lot of the infrastructure that we have is original from when the building was originally built so we had a long-range strategy to make several large capital improvements throughout each fiscal year. These items that are marked completed are the ones that we have completed from that overall list. If you guys recall, this is included in the annual budget. There's a few pages that talk about this.

We've completed the roof replacement, the hot water heater replacement. This year we completed the fire alarm, panel upgrade replacement, and the control panel this year. Given that we are under budget this year and that we received additional revenues from the UCA from the operations side, we want to propose that we complete five different projects this year instead of moving them out into fiscal year ‘28 and ‘29.

One of them would be the exterior parking fixtures, replacing the fixtures with LEDs, and then putting an exterior light on the far west parking lot. The other is the RTU replacement, which is a big one. We use the original Freon that's super expensive for this right now. It's just modernizing our current infrastructure. We have a parking lot patching and concrete flatwork that we want to complete in both the front and the side of the building, the sidewalk and entryway concrete repairs, and then reinforcing the admin and front entrance with ballistic reinforcement.

These are all part of the overall improvement plan, and given that we are under budget and given that we have the resolution that said that we need to be in the 6 to 10% fund balance range at the end of each year, we would like the board to allow us to spend this money to complete these projects this year instead of in ‘28 and ‘29.

Scott Harrington:

Would you need a budget adjustment for that?

Tyson Montoya:

No, we're under budget and we've already got estimates and bids and we're ready to go. We just need the go ahead from the board.

Scott Harrington:

What are the comments from the board on this?

Sheriff Rivera:

This is Sheriff Rivera. I think I would support it if it's needed since they're under budget right now rather than bringing it next year.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you, Sheriff. Go ahead, Korban.

Korban Lee:

There's only like, what, 40 days left in fiscal year ‘26.

Tyson Montoya:

Right.

Korban Lee:

I'm not clear why you can't consider them for a budget amendment in fiscal year '27. Any underspending in the current budget will just drop to fund balance, is that correct?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, it would, but it would put us over that 10% threshold so we're wanting to do this to reduce that so we stay within those guidelines.

Korban Lee:

Do these projects realistically get done in the next 40 days?

Tyson Montoya:

No. Some of them will. They're going to bleed into fiscal year '27, but we'll accrue the dollars into next year.

Korban Lee:

If they're done next year, they'll get expensed to next year then anyways.

Tyson Montoya:

We'll accrue it this year. We'll set the dollars aside and we won't use any fiscal year ‘27 dollars for it.

Korban Lee:

I don't quite understand that.

Tyson Montoya:

We'll have purchase orders for these. It'll be an encumbrance that we will pay in ‘27, but it'll be booked financially in ‘26.

Korban Lee:

I thought you could only do that if the work was completed in FY26.

Tyson Montoya:

It would go into a work in progress account or an encumbrance account based on where it was in the project. I think that the big one is probably the RTUs that would probably be the longer of the five. We would just make an accrual for the 345 or whatever we didn't spend or whatever wasn't completed and move that into ‘27. So, it wouldn't use any of ‘27's dollars.

Scott Harrington:

Any other comments, or Korban, did that answer your question?

Korban Lee:

Sort of. I don't want to dig into the weeds of accounting right now, but can you elaborate a little more on the ballistic? Go back one slide if you would. Elaborate a little more on the ballistic reinforcement. It says admin building and front entrance. I'm not clear what we mean by that.

Brice Rawlings:

Korban, so it's a ballistic film that's going to cover the entrance to the building, the front office windows, any of the unsecured areas that are on the east, south, and west side of the building. It's a ballistic film. It's rated up to I think a nine-millimeter. It's riot proof. We went to a demo on it. It took them probably 60 minutes with a rock and a bat and also shooting at it to punch a hole through that film to get inside. And it's a one-way film. You can shoot out of it, but you can't shoot into it. And so the reason we went with the film on that is because to get a higher rating with ballistic windows, we'd have to change out the framing on the windows and the framing on the doors.

So it's going to cover the whole south side windows, doors. It'll cover the lobby entrance window to the reception area. It'll cover the front entrance into the hallway. And then we're also doing the east and north exit doors with that, and then the employee entrance door with that.

Korban Lee:

Okay but it's all at VECC? The way it was phrased, admin building and front end, it made it sound like there was another building.

Brice Rawlings:

No, it's just the main building.

Korban Lee:

That wasn't clear to me. Okay. And it's the film on all the glass, the film on all the windows.

Brice Rawlings:

Yes.

Korban Lee:

Thank you.

Dom Burchett:

I have a couple questions. This is Chief Burchett. Tyson, you mentioned that there's some money from vacancy savings. Is there any other area that was under expended to come up with this amount or is it mostly in vacancies?

Tyson Montoya:

There was a little bit in software. We did away with one contract in particular that was about $60,000 a year and then through various contract negotiations that we've had in fiscal year ‘26, we saved about another $40,000. About $100,000 is from non-personnel.

Dom Burchett:

Okay. I think I'm with Korban. I'm not super comfortable with trying to squeeze this in at the last of the year and encumbering it for '26 but completing it in '27. I don't personally see an issue with going above the 10% fund balance and doing these projects through a budget amendment in '27. It would be my suggestion. I'm supportive of doing this, I just want to make sure that it's all done appropriately from the financial side of things, and it seems like we're trying to squeeze these in at the end of the year. I guess I'm just with Korban on those questions.

Tyson Montoya:

If you guys are okay with us exceeding the 10%, then we can certainly do that.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes.

Dom Burchett:

I thought the 10% was a target, not a cap where we couldn't go above it. I thought it was a target to try to get between 6 and 10%, but I thought that was the intent a number of years ago.

Korban Lee:

I think it was very intentional the word should was in there, not shall or must. I think it's okay if we exceed a little bit and take care of it. I like all these projects. I would prefer to take care of it with a budget amendment and pull it out of fund balance at the start of FY27.

Scott Harrington:

Why don't we just go ahead then and just schedule these to be done, but in fiscal year '27, knowing that we'll make a budget adjustment at mid-year to include these costs and have the ability to go ahead and proceed. Is everybody good with that?

Sheriff Rivera:

I support it.

Jared Gerber:

I'm good with it.

Scott Harrington:

Okay. You got your marching orders, Tyson.

Tyson Montoya:

Okay.

Scott Harrington:

All right, thank you. Resolution to approve capital improvement. So, we'll table resolution to approve the capital improvements, correct? We no longer need that.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CONTINUATION OF TECHNICAL LEASE AGREEMENT

Scott Harrington:

All right. Resolution to Approve Continuation of Technical Lease Agreement, Tyson.

Tyson Montoya:

This is a continuation of the agreement that I believe started back in 2016. It is the Cisco lease agreement where we lease equipment for technical services on a three-year contract. The three-year contract amount is $379,000. The annual amount is $126,437. This was in the fiscal year ‘27 budget as a line item, so this is just a continuation of this contract and asking the board to okay that.

Scott Harrington:

Was it also in this current budget as well?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, it just happened to end in this fiscal year, so we did a new three-year agreement.

Scott Harrington:

So, we're just approving the agreement for the next three years, which is what we've done in the past.

Tyson Montoya:

Correct.

Scott Harrington:

Questions or comments on the agreement? All right, seeing none, I'll take a motion to approve the resolution.

Dwayne Anjewierden:

I'll make that motion.

Scott Harrington:

Do I have a second?

Korban Lee:

One of the things I'm wondering is if this is operational, it's an operational lease agreement, why are you coming to the board on it? You've got it within your appropriations. It's something we've been doing. Do we need to approve it? Are you asking for the board's approval because it's multi-year and it combines future boards?

Scott Harrington:

Correct.

Korban Lee:

Okay. The motion on the table is to just approve the technical lease agreement as described by Tyson in this meeting?

Scott Harrington:

Correct.

Korban Lee:

I'll second it.

Scott Harrington:

Okay. We'll need a roll call vote on this one.

Rachel Nipper:

I can do that. Mr. Harrington, Taylorsville?

Scott Harrington:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Carter, Riverton?

Ryan Carter:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Lee, West Jordan?

Korban Lee:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Barker, Draper?

Mike Barker:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Chief Burnett, Murray?

Craig Burnett:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Rasmussen, South Jordan. Is he there in the boardroom? Mr. Rasmussen, South Jordan?

Scott Harrington:
Yes, he is.

Jason Rasmussen:

It's a positive.

Rachel Nipper:

Okay. Mr. Collins, South Salt Lake?

Josh Collins:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Cherpeski, Herriman?

Nathan Cherpeski:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Chief Evans, Bluffdale?

Chief Matt Evans:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Mr. Gerber, Cottonwood Heights?

Jared Gerber:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Chief Burchett, UFA?

Dom Burchett:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Sheriff Rivera, Salt Lake County?

Sheriff Rivera:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Chief Evans, West Valley City?

Chief John Evans:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Chief Anjewierden, UPD?

Chief Andrew:

Yes.

Rachel Nipper:

Okay, thank you.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you.

Motion –
. . . by Mr. Dwayne Anjewierden, to approve Resolution 2026-08, A resolution authorizing the Executive Director to execute a renewal of the 2016 Cisco municipal equipment lease for technical services, the motion was seconded by Mr. Korban Lee; the motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CONTRACT AGREEMENT

Scott Harrington:

All right, next one is the Resolution to Approve the Executive Director Contract Agreement but before we jump into that, we did the salary survey, which Dustin has been so kind to lend us Jason and Corinne. They are here in the boardroom, so let's go ahead and let them talk about the salary range that they've come up with. After we get that, we'll go into approving the contract. The floor is yours.

Corinne:

Okay. It sounds good. I was asked to provide the board with a salary range recommendation for the CEO position. I have a detailed report, and I won't make you guys go through the entire thing, but you can review that whenever you would like. I'll just go over some of the main points. As part of this review, I evaluated the overall scope of the position along with using the job description and some budget information provided on VECC's website. From my understanding, the role combines both executive leadership functions along with public safety operations and supporting emergency operations that serve multiple agencies across the Salt Lake Valley.

However, there's not really a great direct comparison within the state of Utah and so because of that, I used a blended market benchmark comparison with a few different positions. One of the first positions I looked at was the city manager position along the state of Utah for those city managers that oversee cities that either have similar-sized employees, sized groups, or operating budgets and that helps give me a similar comparison for the executive responsibilities that they oversee.

In addition to that, I also included fire chief and police chief positions within the Salt Lake Valley to give a better idea of the market rates for the public leadership, public safety operations within the Salt Lake Valley. Plus, Salt Lake Valley tends to have higher compensation levels than some municipalities across the whole state of Utah.

Scott Harrington:

Correct.

Corinne:

Yes. So, I wanted to capture that as well. With using that information, the salary range recommendation that I would recommend for this position begins at $156,000 and goes up to $240,000. This salary range includes a 3% COLA adjustment anticipating what an average COLA would be across the state for July.

Scott Harrington:

So would you do that COLA every year?

Corinne:

Not necessarily every year. It depends on the cost of living and inflation and things like that. So that's just setting the range for this year in July when the contract renews. The salary range doesn't necessarily need to be reviewed every single year, but maybe every couple, depending on the market, inflation, and things like that. This range would put the VECC CEO position about 10% below the salary range for city managers within the Salt Lake Valley and that is intentional because these city managers within the valley tend to have larger responsibilities, more complex staffing structures and budgets, along with other municipal functions that they oversee.

In addition to that, I've also provided some range placement guidance to help the board decide where in the range the incumbent should be placed as far as their actual compensation. For this, when you're looking at a salary range, midpoint is considered market value of the position so anything below midpoint would suggest that the person is still developing in their role or that they are new to the organization. Anything above midpoint would suggest that the person in the role is exceeding your expectations as far as performance, has extensive knowledge, and is of value to the organization as far as completing strategic priorities and things of that nature. I wasn't asked to provide a direct compensation suggestion; I just wanted to provide that information for your guys' consideration.

Jason Rasmussen:

Scroll down just a little bit more, same page. Yeah, that matches up with that graph that's on there that shows what these ranges are.

Scott Harrington:

All right. That's a lot of work that you've done for us, so thank you.

Jason Rasmussen:

Thank you.

Scott Harrington:

Does anybody have questions on this or need time to digest? What's everybody's thoughts?

Dom Burchett:

This is Chief Burchett, I just want to say thanks for all the work. This is fantastic to see in a short amount of time, so thanks too. Was it South Jordan?

Scott Harrington:

Yes. Any other questions or comments? It looks like we're right there, right where we need to be, I guess, or unless anybody else has any different thoughts or suggestions.

Korban Lee:

Scott, will you remind us? We met about the contract. I can't remember. Are we trying to have this just for the board to keep in mind or was the salary range to be set and put into the contract or to just be set and documented? I can't remember. I think this is great information. What's that, Josh?

Josh Collins:

The salary is in the contract in paragraph five.

Korban Lee:

Right, but the range. But what about the range?

Josh Collins:

The range isn't there. It's just the amount.

Scott Harrington:

I believe we had a maximum in there, I think. We were worried about it going on perpetuity, so we wanted to put a maximum contract, which would be the $240,463.

Korban Lee:

And then adjusted per COLA. I like it. I would support that. I think this is very well done. Thank you.

Scott Harrington:

Any other comments?

Nathan Cherpeski:

I would just say I think this is what we were asking for, so thank you, Jason, and your staff there.

Jason Rasmussen:

No, Corinne, not me.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Oh, Corinne. Thank her.

Corinne:

You welcome.

Scott Harrington:

Yeah. Thank you so much. With that, let's jump to the Executive Director contract. Go to that spot where we actually call it out, Tyson. So right there in item five is where we have the annual salary. So, in here we would plan on putting the maximum salary in there and then just with the agreement, we suggested that he would get the annual cost of livings consistent with the administration employees and so if we just put the maximum annual salary in there, everything else would flow. I know that we had-

Nathan Cherpeski:

Excuse me. Is that how it's written? I thought it said we approved the raises each year.

Tyson Montoya:

Yes. The way that this was originally written was we had the range in there with the current salary that he's at now and then the max of 248 and I think you guys wanted to pull that out and then do annual raises with staff and also his evaluation, so we pulled that out.

Josh Collins:

Tyson, if you scroll just a little bit, just a tiny bit, you can see the last... That's what you're referring to, Nathan, right?

Nathan Cherpeski:

I think so. I'm sorry, I'm driving, so I can't read it. I'm just trying to go from memory.

Josh Collins:

It says we can adjust the base salary based on COLA and merit, but it doesn't give a cap on the range, which is what I think, Scott, what you're referring to and what I think Korban just said he supported.

Scott Harrington:

Correct.

Josh Collins:

So, this doesn't include that cap. Is that something that we want to put in there, is the open question right now for me?

Nathan Cherpeski:

I guess I say, as long as we have a range, we know what the cap is. As a board, we're going to set that. It's just to give some expectations, I think. I hesitate to put ranges into contracts because everything changes. I think if we're going to amend it, if we commit to doing an evaluation every year by March 31st as in the contract, we should address increase at that point every year.

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, and that's why I wouldn't suggest putting a range in there, but-

Nathan Cherpeski:

But I would also remove the auto COLA. I think the board would approve a raise every year for the Executive.

Josh Collins:

It's not automatic. It says it's our discretion right now.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Okay, and I would support that.

Korban Lee:

Tyson, do you have a document of some sort at VECC that lists the salary range for every position with VECC?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes.

Korban Lee:

Can this range that's been presented to us be added to that document, so the expectation is set but it's not in the contract?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes. The range I had was, I think 248 was the max, so I think our current schedule is within the parameters of what you guys were objectively trying to see.

Nathan Cherpeski:

I would use the range that was just presented. I would replace your range with this range. That's my suggestion because we have back up for this one.

Scott Harrington:

Right, and I would support that as well. What are everybody else's thoughts?

Korban Lee:

I agree.

Dom Burchett:

I support that.

Craig Burnett:

Me too.

Scott Harrington:

Okay. So right now I believe the contract would work as presented. Does everybody agree with that?

Dom Burchett:

Scott, I have a couple questions not related to... In the contract, just I think more for clarification. When we're looking at sick leave, does that rollover from year to year? That was a question of mine and then his vacation is paid out, but it doesn't specify what rate it's paid out. Being an at-will exempt employee, I'm just curious what rate that is. I think it should be clarified in the document. Then my third question was on the Empower savings plan, the 6.2 that goes in lieu of social security, is that something that all employees have or is it just for the Director?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, all employees get 6.2%. We don't participate in SSI, so all staff get that.

Scott Harrington:

So is that a match or just an automatic-

Tyson Montoya:

Just a 6.2%.

Scott Harrington:

So, it's automatic contribution.

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, we don't match anything on that. In terms of the maximum PTO, in our handbook, it's 576 hours. He accrues 160 per year. I can put something in here saying that upon termination he would get whatever his current PTO balance was as long as it wasn't over the 576. We didn't call it out in this. We have a handbook that we would reference, but I'm happy to add that into this if you need it.

Josh Collins:

Does this match what your current policy is for sick and vacation? Do you separate it like this?

Tyson Montoya:

Yes.

Josh Collins:

Okay.

Dom Burchett:

If it's in your handbook, I think that's okay. I just felt like there was a lack of clarity on those two pieces.

Scott Harrington:

I'm not sure if you heard though there's a maximum carryover of 576 hours and is that combined or-

Tyson Montoya:

No, it's just for vacation.

Scott Harrington:

Just for vacation.

Dom Burchett:

So does sick leave roll over year to year or does that go away?

Tyson Montoya:

Sick year, there is no max right now. So that would just continue.

Scott Harrington:

What do you pay out on separation?

Tyson Montoya:

We don't pay that out.

Dom Burchett:

So sick leave carries over, but then there's no payout.

Tyson Montoya:

Right.

Dom Burchett:

That's, what was that, 96 hours a year? Was that what that sick leave was?

Tyson Montoya:

Correct.

Korban Lee:

Listen, I like everything you're saying. I just feel like the contract ought to reference then per the handbook. Because right now, the way I read the contract, it appears the vacation can accrue indefinitely without the vacation cap that you have in the handbook.

Scott Harrington:

Okay. So, let's call that out and put it in the contract. Would you like us to bring it back or do you want to do it today as amended?

Dom Burchett:

This is Chief Burchett. I'm okay doing it with those amendments in there and just getting it done today.

Scott Harrington:

Everybody else good with that?

Korban Lee:

Yeah, you're going to say some language in the salary section referencing the salary range or the top of the salary range is a topped out level. I expect Ivan's salary to grow within the range to a point of being topped out. I also expect the range to grow with COLA. If we set that salary range in the handbook or the employment documents, does it need to be referenced by language in the contract here?

Tyson Montoya:

Can you clarify? So, the problem I see by us putting a min and a max is that we're going to have to go through this every couple of years and update that max as he gets to that point.

Scott Harrington:

That's why he wants to reference the range so you don't have to do that. So, if it's VECC range number 16 or VECC range pay range number 18, it would grow consistent with the contract.

Jason Rasmussen:

I think the range would probably need to be looked at every few years just to make sure it's in line with market and then that would be updated so that there's not a hard cap at 240, say, in 5, 8, 10 years.

Tyson Montoya:

Right, and that's what I'm saying is that we'd have to go through this every couple of years.

Scott Harrington:

No, not if we reference the range. If you reference the pay range, 16 or whatever one it is. So as that grows, you stay within that range.

Tyson Montoya:

So, he would be at that max within a couple of years, and we'd have to go through this.

Nathan Cherpeski:

But we're not going to put the max in the contract. All we're going to say is it's this range. Every budget year when you come, if you adjust it, we'll adjust the range. We should be adopting that range. As the board, we should be looking, "Yeah, those ranges are correct." And so, we should be keeping up with it. I don't want to overcomplicate this. I think Korban's right; it can just reference whatever the range is. We can put the cap in on the sick leave or vacation, whichever one it was and I think we could approve it today, but if it's going to be complicated, maybe it needs to come back.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yeah. So, Tyson, I agree with Korban on this. The salary sheet that we have for all positions when we update it for COLA, we update those ranges and so they just want us to refer to that document. That's all.

Korban Lee:

We're proposing changes to this contract, but contracts are two-way. I feel like as a board, we've talked through what we want to see as our changes, but I feel a little bit like we need to give Ivan an opportunity to respond to those proposed changes on our part or see if Ivan will accept them. Although Chief Burchett, I'm kind of with you wanting to get this done, I think it'd be better to ask the chair or vice chair to finalize the language and consult with the Executive Director and then bring back a proposed final at the next meeting.

Dom Burchett:

Yeah, I'm good with that, Korban.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Is this a July one start, this contract? When does this contract go into effect?

Tyson Montoya:

It should have been April.

Nathan Cherpeski:

Okay. So as long as we're all comfortable, it'll be in arrears. We need to do it soon enough and make sure that we have adequate in the budget to cover it. But if it was April, that's on us for not doing it earlier.

Scott Harrington:

Let's just go ahead and bring it back. Let Ivan know that we will basically be good on the contract, do the increase as of April, the contract date, and bring it back to the next board meeting with the changes. I will circulate the contract once we have it with the changes made so you guys have plenty of time to review it. If you have questions or changes, please email the whole group and then that way we can do a lot of this before we get to the meeting. Anybody have concerns with that?

Korban Lee:

Scott, thanks for taking that on.

Scott Harrington:

No problem. I'd like to get this done and off the plate, so no problem. And thanks to Kevin and thanks to Jason and Corrine for all their hard work.

Tyson Montoya:

Yes, thank you.

Scott Harrington:

I know that that was a lot of work and we really appreciate it.

Ivan Whitaker:

Yes. Tyson as well. Tyson has done a lot of work on this, so thanks, Ty.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you, Tyson.

Tyson Montoya:

You're welcome.

Scott Harrington:

Okay, so we will table this item. Any other business that we need to talk about? Okay.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Scott Harrington:

Motion to adjourn? Anybody?

Korban Lee:

So moved.

Josh Collins:

Second.

Scott Harrington:

Who was it?

Korban Lee:

Motion to adjourn from Korban.

Josh Collins:

Second from Josh.

Scott Harrington:

Thank you, guys.

Motion –
. . . by Mr. Korban Lee, to adjourn the meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. Josh Collins; the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:12 p.m.