



**NOTICE OF MEETING
SALT LAKE VALLEY LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICE AREA
(SLVLESA)**

Thursday, November 19, 2015
3365 South 900 West, Room 115B
Salt Lake City, UT 84119

10:00 a.m. or Immediately following UPD Board Meeting

Reasonable accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) for individuals with disabilities may be provided upon receipt of a request with three working days' notice. For assistance, please contact Carita Lucey at clucey@slco.org or by calling (385) 468-9885. TTY users should call 711. **The Public May Attend. Motions related to any of the following agenda items, including final action, may be taken at the meeting.**

AGENDA

- SLVLESA 1: Public Comment
- SLVLESA 2: Information: Conflicts of Interest Disclosure for Trustees
Action Requested: Trustees Identify Conflicts with agenda items, if any
- SLVLESA 3: Information: Update on budget resolutions for Herriman City, Riverton City, and Salt Lake County
Action Requested: Informational
- SLVLESA 4: Information: Update on the 5-year Planning Efforts led by the University of Utah's Sorenson Policy Initiative
Action Requested: Informational
- SLVLESA 5: Motion: Set Date for Budget Hearing December 17, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. and discussion of planned revisions to the 2016 Tentative Budget
Action Requested: Adopt
- SLVLESA 6: Motion: Set Date for a Judgment Levy Hearing December 17, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. for judgments entered as of March 1, 2015 – September 15, 2015
Action Requested: Set Date
- SLVLESA 7: Motion: Set Date for a 2015 Budget Amendment Public Hearing December 17, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. and discussion of Planned amendments to the 2015 Budget
Action Requested: Set Date
- SLVLESA 8: Motion: SLVLESA Quarterly Financial Report for the period ending September 30, 2015
Action Requested: Adopt

3365 South 900 West, Suite 121 = SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84119 = ph: (385) 468-9888 = fax: (385) 468-9889 = SLVLESA.org

Jim Bradley
Chair, Salt Lake County Council Member

Michael Jensen
Salt Lake County Council Member

Ben McAdams
Salt Lake County Mayor

Trent Staggs
Riverton City Council Member

Carmen Freeman
Herriman City Mayor



SLVLESA 9: Motion: 2016 SLVLESA Board Meeting Schedule
Action Requested: Approval

SLVLESA 10: Training: GRAMA Legislative Changes
Action Requested: None

SLVLESA 11: Training: Annual Utah Open Meetings Act
Action Requested: None

SLVLESA 12: Motion: Adoption of minutes from September 24, 2015 and October 15, 2015 Board Meetings
Action Requested: Adopt

SLVLESA 12: Other Business – Next Meeting December 17, 2015

3365 South 900 West, Suite 121 • SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84119 • ph: (385) 468-9888 • fax: (385) 468-9889 • SLVLESA.org

Jim Bradley

Chair, Salt Lake County Council Member

Michael Jensen

Salt Lake County Council Member

Ben McAdams

Salt Lake County Mayor

Trent Staggs

Riverton City Council Member

Carmen Freeman

Herriman City Mayor



Board Meeting Date: November 19, 2015

**Agenda Item # SLVLESA 4
Information: SLVLESA 5 year planning process**

Background

On November 5, 2015, Sheriff Winder entered into a contract with the Policy Innovation Lab at the University of Utah to provide high level consulting services to the SLVLESA and to facilitate SLVLESA's five-year planning process. The contract and related projects are managed by SLVLESA Administrator, Andrew Keddington and SLVLESA Treasurer Scott Jurgens. This engagement provides SLVLESA access to knowledgeable staff and resources to perform analyses requested by the Board that cannot readily be provided by SLVLESA staff as part of the day-to-day workflow process. Specifically, the scope of services includes:

- **Five Year SLVLESA Planning Exercise:** Organize and conduct a five-year planning exercise (to include municipal and county legislative bodies). Included topics:
 - Budget Planning'
 - Future Resource Allocation Planning
 - Capital Facilities Planning
 - Analysis of Annexation of Other Jurisdictions into SLVLESA
 - Other areas as mutually agreed
- **Review of SLVLESA Board Materials and Participation in Staff Board Meeting Planning Meetings**
- **Government Relations: interface on behalf of SLVLESA with municipal officials and legislative bodies**
- **Participation in the Kearns Place Based Initiative on behalf of SLVLESA**

The SLVLESA staff and University of Utah project team will provide the Board monthly updates of progress at regularly scheduled Board meetings, as well as a look ahead to activities for the coming month.

University of Utah Assigned Staff

The primary staff assigned to this project from the University of Utah include:

Jeremy Keele: Prior to joining the Policy Innovation Lab, Jeremy was senior advisor to Salt Lake County Mayor Ben McAdams from 2013 to 2015. During his time at Salt Lake County, Jeremy advised Mayor McAdams on his key policy initiatives, including results based financing, transportation, homelessness, criminal justice, health, culture and the arts and economic development. Prior to joining Salt Lake County, Jeremy practiced corporate transactional law in New York, London and Los Angeles with the law firms of Cleary Gottlieb and Latham & Watkins, from 2006 to 2013. Jeremy holds an MPA from Harvard Kennedy's School of Government and a JD from New York University.

Kerri Nakamura: Prior to joining the Lab, Kerri's twenty-five year public service career included serving in the Salt Lake City Mayor's Budget Office, as the legislative fiscal and policy director for the Salt Lake City Council, as the head of fiscal policy development for the Utah League of Cities and Towns, and as a Senior Policy Advisor to a long-term Salt Lake County Council Member. Kerri specializes in criminal and social justice policy, culture and arts, and canyon/open space protection. Kerri also served as Administrator to a \$30M local law enforcement district. Kerri holds a bachelor's degree in political science from the University of Utah.

Chad Salvadore: Prior to joining the Lab, Chad worked for over nine years in a range of financial roles spanning government, non-profit and for-profit organizations. Chad possesses deep financial experience and a strong interest in social enterprise. He holds undergraduate degrees in Finance and Economics from the University of Colorado and an MBA from the University of Utah's David Eccles School of Business

Nick Fritz: Prior to joining the Lab, Nick served as an officer in the United States Marine Corps for four years where he worked in logistics operations. His service culminated with a 2014/2015 deployment to the West Pacific and Arabian Gulf during which he worked in international logistics and intermodal transportation. He holds an undergraduate degree in Mechanical Engineering from the University of Akron in Ohio, and is currently an MBA Candidate at the University of Utah's David Eccles School of Business.

Monthly Activities:

October: Developed/modified first iteration of a 5 year budget forecasting tool

October 26: Obtained time on Riverton, Herriman, and Salt Lake County Council agendas for presentation of SLVLESA 2016 budget.

October 27: Briefly met with staff to kick off engagement. Per SLVLESA staff request, symposium date was shifted from December 2015 to January 19 2016.

October 28: Met with Mayor Freeman to begin 5 year planning process

October 28: Met with Councilman Staggs to begin 5 year planning process

October 28: Phone conferenced with Councilman Bradley regarding 5 year planning process

October 29: Coordinated with Chief Steve Anjewierden regarding Kearns Place Based Initiative

November 5-6: Prepared, reviewed, and edited paperwork for SL County, Riverton & Herriman Council packets

November 6: Transmitted paperwork to SL County Council and ensured that resolution approved as to form was prepared.

November 10: Transmitted paperwork to Riverton and Herriman City Councils and ensured that resolution approved as to form was prepared.

November 10: Attended and presented SLVLESA 2016 budget at SL County Council meeting

November 10: Meeting with SLVLESA staff to review call and budget data

November 12: Reviewed and edited draft November 19 SLVLESA Board meeting agenda

November 14: Preparation of certain materials for November 19 SLVLESA Board meeting

November 17: Attended and presented SLVLESA 2016 budget at Riverton City Council meeting

November 17: Attended and presented SLVLESA 2016 budget at Herriman City Council meeting

Looking ahead

November/December: Meet with remaining SLVLESA Board members and other legislative officials from Riverton, Herriman, SL County regarding 5 year planning efforts

November/December: Expand and iterate on 5 year budget forecasting tool

November/December: Review and help place ads for public hearings

November/December: Review 2016 budget adoption and meeting materials

November 19: Kearns Place Based Initiative meeting 4-6 p.m.

Save the Date: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 – 5 year planning symposium



Board Meeting Date: November 19, 2015

Agenda Item # SLVLESA 8
2015 3rd Quarter Financial Report

Attached is the 3rd Quarter Budget Report for 2015.

Expenses

At the end of the 3rd quarter, SLVLESA's operating expenditure budget is 73.7% expended with a total expenditure budget expended at 44.6%. The percentage difference is the repayment of the of the \$16M for Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes that will be repaid in December of this year when property tax revenues are recognized.

For the full year, SLVLESA's operating expenditure budget is projected to spend at 99.3% with a total expenditure budget expended of 90.2%. The difference is the result of borrowing \$16M of Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes rather than the \$21M that was budgeted thus creating less repayment and interest expense.

Revenue

At the end of 3rd quarter, SLVLESA's operating revenues are 11.2% of the amount budgeted. This is because SLVLESA is exclusively funded by property tax and that revenue is expected during the 4th quarter. Revenue to date is \$19.5M with \$16M in Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes that were issued and are scheduled to be repaid when property tax revenues are realized.

For the full year, SLVLESA's operating revenues are fully recognized with a minimal increased revenue amount for Public Safety Fee and Interest Revenue. There is a potential that fee in lieu will be greater than the 2015 projection by \$100K based on comparable annual revenue received in 2014. Through the 3rd quarter, fee in lieu is tracking similar to 2014 but at this time unable to accurately estimate the 4th quarter. The total revenue is projected to be 90.4% of recognized revenue compared to budget. The difference is a result of borrowing less Tax and Revenue Anticipation Notes.

Fund Balance

If the 2015 budget projections hold, SLVLESA will decrease fund balance by \$343,461 by 2015 year end compared to the budgeted decrease of \$1,078,665. SLVLESA ended 2014 with an unrestricted fund balance of \$6,750,478 and is projected to end 2015 with \$6,407,017. The 2015 year end fund balance represents 19.8% of SLVLESA's 2015 budgeted operating expenses, this is a decrease from 2014 which was 21.8%.

2015 SLVIESA Quarterly Financial Review
 For Expenses and Revenue as of September 30, 2015

	9/30/2015					
Expenses	YTD Actual	Full Year Projection	Full Year Budget	Variance	Variance %	
Service Fee to UPD	23,621,756	31,680,608	31,680,608	-	0.0%	
Professional Fees	139,710	226,185	250,000	23,815	9.5%	
Riverton Bond	42,613	85,225	85,225	-	0.0%	
Note Interest	-	68,933	250,000	181,067	72.4%	
Total Operating Expenditures	23,804,078	32,060,951	32,265,833	204,882	0.6%	
Short Term Debt Payment	-	16,000,000	21,000,000	5,000,000	23.8%	
Grand Total Expenses	23,804,078	48,060,951	53,265,833	5,204,882	9.8%	

	YTD Actual	Full Year Projection	Full Year Budget	Variance	Variance %
Property Taxes	2,278,002	29,692,168	29,692,168	-	0.0%
Prior Year Property Tax Collections	-	500,000	-	500,000	0.0%
Fee in Lieu	1,162,083	1,450,000	1,450,000	-	0.0%
Public Safety Fee	13,680	15,180	-	15,180	0.0%
Interest	58,992	60,142	45,000	15,142	33.6%
Total Operating Revenues	3,512,757	31,717,490	31,187,168	530,322	1.7%

Short Term Debt Proceeds	16,000,000	16,000,000	21,000,000	(5,000,000)	-23.8%
Grand Total Revenues	19,512,757	47,717,490	52,187,168	(4,469,678)	-8.6%

Operating Expenses (Over) / Under Operating Revenues	(20,291,321)	(343,461)	(1,078,665)	735,204	-68.2%
Total Expenses (Over) / Under Total Revenues	(4,291,321)	(343,461)	(1,078,665)	735,204	-68.2%

	YTD Actual	Full Year Projection	Full Year Budget	Variance	Variance %
Fund Balance					
Beginning of Year Fund Balance	6,750,478	6,750,478	6,750,478	-	0.0%
End of Year Fund Balance	2,459,157	6,407,017	5,671,813	735,204	13.0%



2016
SALT LAKE VALLEY LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICE AREA
(SLVLESA)
Meeting schedule

January 21, 2016
February 18, 2016
March 17, 2016
April 21, 2016
May 19, 2016
June 16, 2016
No meeting in July
August 18, 2016
September 22, 2016
October 20, 2016
November 17, 2016
December 15, 2016

**Unless otherwise posted, all meetings begin at
10:00 a.m. or immediately following the
Unified Police Department Board meeting
and held at the Sheriff's Office Building
3365 South 900 West Salt Lake City, UT 84119**

***Additional meetings may be held at the discretion of the
Salt Lake Valley Law Enforcement Service Area Board of Trustees**

SALT LAKE VALLEY LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICE AREA

2015 GRAMA TRAINING--LEGISLATIVE CHANGES

H.B. 338--RESOLVING GOVERNMENT RECORD DISPUTES.

The State Auditor is authorized to audit state agencies, agencies receiving federal and state funds and may "initiate audits or investigations of any political sub division" under certain circumstances. Generally, under UCA §67-3-1, audits in progress and certain audit records and work papers are protected records under GRAMA (UCA §63G-2-305). The State Auditor may choose to release, as part of the final audit, records related to the audit if (s)he believes them to be public records.

In the event of a dispute between the State Auditor and the subject of the audit as to whether the State Auditor may release a record, the State Auditor is authorized to submit the issue to the State Records Committee for a determination as to whether the record may be lawfully released. Either party may seek judicial review of the State Records Committee determination.

S.B. 157--GOVERNMENT RECORDS AMENDMENTS.

A. Appeal Rights--Requesters and Interested Persons.

While the majority of the bill deals with the classification of consumer complaints received by the state Division of Consumer Protection, it contains important revisions to local government appeal procedures and a differentiation of appeal rights for "requesters" and "interested parties". "Interested Persons" are persons or entities that may not necessarily be seeking access but may be opposing access or classification decisions of a governmental entity. Requesters may appeal access denials and the reasonableness of determinations of extraordinary circumstances with delayed release. Interested parties may appeal classification and access decisions but not issues related to the reasonableness of extraordinary circumstances with delayed release.

B. Local Government Appeal Processes.

1. Chief Administrative Officer. Political subdivisions are required to include in the appeals process a process for both requesters and interested parties to appeal an access denial to the chief administrative officer of the political subdivision.

2. Local Appeals Board. The creation of a local appeals board for appeals from the chief administrative officer is optional. If it is created, it must be composed of three members. One must be an employee of the political subdivision and the other two must be members of the public one of which has professional experience with requesting or managing records.

Appeals from the decisions of the chief administrative officer (in entities with no appeals board) are to the state records committee.

Appeals from the decisions of a local appeals board are to either the records committee or by filing a petition for judicial review.

C. State Records Committee Composition.

The local government representative on the records committee is now recommended solely by the Utah League of Cities and Towns.

D. State Records Committee Appeal Timeframes.

The 30 and 45 day time frames for appealing to the records committee remain unchanged from current law. The records committee is now allowed 7 days (increased from 5 days) to schedule a hearing for the records committee to consider the appeal. The hearing date must be no less than 16 days after the date of filing of the appeal and not more than 64 days after the filing date (increased from 14 and 52 days). The executive secretary of the records committee is allowed to exceed the 64 day limit if the meeting date is the first regularly scheduled records committee meeting at which there are fewer than 10 appeals scheduled to be heard.

E. Records Committee Standard of Review.

1. De Novo. The records committee review will be de novo if the appeal is from a chief administrative officer under UCA §63G-2-401 or from a decision of a chief administrative officer in a jurisdiction that does not have a local appeals board.

2. Review of local decision and record. For an appeal of the decision of a local appeals board, the records committee shall review and consider the decision of the local appeals board. This is a review of the decision and not a completely new evidentiary hearing.

OPEN MEETINGS ACT TRAINING-2015

SALT LAKE VALLEY LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICE AREA

I. 2015 Legislative Changes.

2015 legislative changes were limited to provisions affecting small governmental entities (those with annual budgets less than \$1,000,000). The exemption for small governmental entities from the requirement of posting agendas and meeting notices on the state public notice website was repealed.

II. Old Law That We Need to Remember.

A. What is a "Public Body"?

"Public body" means any administrative, advisory, executive, or legislative body of the state or its political subdivisions that:

1. (i) is created by the Utah Constitution, statute, rule, ordinance, or resolution;
- (ii) consists of two or more persons;
- (iii) expends, disburses, or is supported in whole or in part by tax revenue; and
- (iv) is vested with the authority to make decisions regarding the public's business." UCA §52-4-103(8)

B. What is a "Meeting"?

"Meeting" means the convening of a public body, with a quorum present, including a workshop or an executive session whether the meeting is held in person or by means of electronic communications, for the purpose of discussing, receiving comments from the public about, or acting upon a matter over which the public body has jurisdiction or advisory power." UCA §52-4-103(5)

C. Why can a Meeting be Closed?

Meetings are presumed to be Open unless the meeting fits within one of the legislatively authorized reasons for closing it (UCA §52-4-205(1)). The most common reasons that justify

closing of a meeting of a local entity are the following:

1. Discussion of the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual (this may not be used for discussion of candidates to fill a mid-term vacancy or temporary vacancy on a public body).

2. Strategy Sessions involving:

a. Collective Bargaining

b. Pending or Reasonably Imminent Litigation.

c. Purchase, Exchange or Lease of Real Property (includes water rights/shares) if public discussion would:

I. Disclose the appraisal or estimated value of the property;

ii. Prevent the completion of the transaction on the best possible terms;

d. The Sale of Real Property (including water rights/shares) if public discussion would:

I. Disclose the appraisal or estimated value of the property;

ii. Prevent the completion of the transaction on the best possible terms;

HOWEVER

iii. The public body must have previously given notice that the property would be offered for sale; and

iv. The terms of the sale are publicly disclosed before the public body approves the sale.

3. Discussion of the Deployment of Security Personnel, Devices, or Systems.

4. Investigative Proceedings Regarding Allegations of Criminal Misconduct.

N.B. An ordinance, resolution, rule, contract, or appointment may not be approved at a closed meeting.

D. What Are The Procedures for Closing a Meeting?

1. A quorum is present at a duly called and noticed Open Meeting.

2. Two-thirds of the public body present at the Open Meeting vote to approve closing the meeting.

E. What Must be Announced and Entered on the Minutes of the Open Meeting at Which the Closed Meeting was Approved?

1. The reason or reasons for holding the closed meeting;
2. The location where the closed meeting will be held; and
3. The vote by name, of each member of the public body, either for or against the motion to hold the closed meeting.

F. What Minutes and Recordings Must be Kept?

1. There must be a complete and unedited recording of the closed portion of the meeting

from commencement to adjournment. The exception to this requirement is for closed meetings called to discuss the character, fitness, mental health or competence of an individual or the deployment of security personnel, devices and systems. An affidavit executed by the Chair that these were the sole subjects discussed may be substituted for the recording.

2. There may be detailed written minutes of the closed portion of the meeting.
3. The minutes or recordings of the closed meeting must include:
 - I. The date, time and place of the meeting;
 - ii. The names of the members present and absent;
 - iii. The names of all others present except where the disclosure would infringe on the confidentiality necessary to fulfill the original purpose of closing the meeting

PENDING BOARD APPROVAL – SUBJECT TO CHANGE UNTIL APPROVED

DATE: Sept 24, 2015

THE SALT LAKE VALLEY LAW ENFORCEMENT BOARD MET ON THURSDAY, SEPT 24, 2015 AT THE HOUR OF 10:00 A.M. AT THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE BUILDING, 3365 SOUTH 900 WEST ROOM 115B, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

TRUSTEES PRESENT:
CHAIRMEN BRADLEY
TRUSTEE MICHAEL JENSEN
TRUSTEE CARMEN FREEMAN

ALSO PRESENT:
SCOTT JURGES, TREASURER
ANDREW KEDDINGTON, FINANCE MANAGER
MIRIAH GRIFFITH, GRANTS ADMINISTRATOR
CHIEF DWAYNE ANJEWIERDEN, HERRIMAN
CHIEF TONY MASON, MIDVALE
CHIEF TRACY WYANT, TAYLORSVILLE
CHIEF DEPUTY SHANE HUDSON
CHIEF STEVE DEBRY, MILLCREEK
KARL HENDRICKSON, SLVLESA LEGAL COUNSEL
BRETT WOOD, HERRIMAN CITY MANAGER

EXCUSED:
TRUSTEE TRENT STAGGS
TRUSTEE BEN MCADAMS

<> <> <> <> <> <> <> <> <> <>

Chairman Bradley opened the meeting and welcomed everyone.

Item #1 – Public Comment:

None

**Item #2 – Motion: 2016 Budget Development Calendar
Action Requested: adopt**

Discussion:

Andrew Keddington made board aware that SLVLESA is currently showing a 2% revenue increase rate, but expenses are increasing at about 4% annually, increasing the gap between revenue and expenses every year. Mr. Keddington said in October two projection budgets will be presented, one with status quo revenue and service levels, and one with a tax increase for comparison.

Chairman Bradley stated that the obvious question then is whether or not to do a tax increase this year. He asked Mr. Scott Jurgens, UPD's CFO, if it is possible to continue

PENDING BOARD APPROVAL – SUBJECT TO CHANGE UNTIL APPROVED

this year without a tax increase. Mr. Jurges responded that if there are no services or very few services added, the budget would support the year without a tax increase.

Trustee Freeman asked for a 5 year projection plan to be able to make informed decisions about budget increases.

Mr. Jurges said the standard measure determined to be fairly accurate for UPD budget and operation projections is a 4% increase in expenses annually.

Chairman Bradley stated that it is the consensus of the SLVLESA Board that they are not putting the population at risk by not increasing services for 2016.

Mr. Jurges clarified that today it is the calendar that is being adopted, the actual decision for whether or not to do a tax increase will be voted on in October.

Trustee Freeman requested a more in depth discussion and 5 year plan for future tax increases. He noted that the October vote will come before the 5 year projection, which won't be completed until November. Trustee Jensen noted that in order to meet tax increase notifications requirement, the board would have to vote affirmatively in the next meeting, or within two weeks of the October 15th meeting, and each city council would have to vote affirmatively. He noted that without a five year plan, he does not anticipate city councils would support the tax increase.

Discussion about the need for more information before proposing tax increases to the city councils ensued. Karl Hendrickson, SLVLESA Legal Counsel, clarified posting and mailing requirements for a tax increases.

The difference between revenues from UPD precincts and SLVLESA precincts was clarified by Mr. Jensen and Mr. Jurges: UPD municipalities outside of SLVLESA pay UPD for police services from whichever revenues they choose (i.e. Utility franchise, fees, sales tax, property taxes). SLVLESA chooses to pay all UPD services via property tax.

Trustee Jensen moved to adopt the budget development calendar to discuss potential tax increase impacts to the budget in October's meeting.

Trustee Freeman seconded.

All voted Aye; motion passed.

Trustee Freeman asked what the impact would be of a tax increase on the average family. Mr. Jurges said he would get that projection for the October meeting. Trustee Jensen brought up the need for the Board to decide if the strategy will be a small annual increase, or the traditional model of doing a larger increase once every 5-8 years.

Item #3 -- Herriman Business Center CDA Agreement
Action Requested: Adopt

PENDING BOARD APPROVAL – SUBJECT TO CHANGE UNTIL APPROVED

Discussion:

Mr. Keddington reviewed the CDA agreement; 70/40 revenue sharing, adding new officers as they can be afforded based on actual revenue years into the agreement.

Mr. Freeman brought up a previously stated concern about the need for wording that would provide some sort of safeguard against municipalities pulling out of UPD as soon as growth and development via CDA agreements comes to fruition.

Mr. Hendrickson said he can add such wording to the agreement in the form of a capture provision, stating that if a municipality leaves within a certain period of time, not only does the agency obligation stop, but there will be some pay back of funds required.

ACTION: Trustee Freeman moved to approve the resolution with the provision of the added language discussed.

Trustee Freeman asked if he had a conflict by being Mayor of Herriman. Trustee Jensen asked if he had a personal financial gain from the CDA. Freeman answered no. It was determined that no conflict exists, and Trustee Freeman can vote on this issue.

Trustee Jensen seconded.

All voted Aye and motion passed.

Chairman Bradley complimented Mr. Keddington on the negotiations and process of establishing this CDA agreement, especially breaking out of the traditional 75/25 split.

**Item # 4 – Training: Annual Utah Open Meetings Act Training
2015 UASD Annual Convention Nov 4-6, 2015
November 4th from 1 PM-5PM**

Action Requested: Informational

Discussion: It was determined that if the training was taken for another group, such as CUP, that is sufficient for SLVLESA purposes as well. Mr. Keddington said he will review certificates and notify if anyone is missing the annual training. It was agreed upon that November 19th the training can be provided during the SLVLESA meeting if needed.

Item #5 – Herriman Precinct Intent to Occupy

Discussion:

Mr. Keddington presented there is a need for a letter of intent to occupy the new space in Herriman City's new office building. He reviewed potential trickle down financial implications to SLVLESA if the Herriman precinct moves in early, as there are still nearly 3 years left on the lease signed for the current location in the strip mall. This means potentially that SLVLESA will be paying rent on the old space the precinct moves out of, AND the new space, for a period of time.

PENDING BOARD APPROVAL – SUBJECT TO CHANGE UNTIL APPROVED

Trustee Jensen expressed concern that the current lease expires March 1, 2018. If the intent is for the Herriman Precinct to occupy the new space in July of 2017, that leaves 9 months of \$6,000/month in rent costs for a building not being used. Asked what the space will be used for if we can't get out of the lease.

Chief Anjewierden said one option is to not move out until the lease is up, and have the council hold the new space for 9 months for them.

Trustee Freeman offered that the city would likely be willing to allow the precinct to occupy the new building and not charge rent until the old lease expires, or simply hold the space until their current lease expires to avoid double charges.

Mr. Keddington clarified that the letter of intent to occupy will come from UPD. However the financial commitment is from SLVLESA.

Action: Trustee Jensen moved to have legal draft a letter of intent to occupy and in light of the discrepancy of when it can be occupied-- SLVSA will not be making double payments.

Trustee Freeman seconded.

All voted Aye, motion passed.

Item #6 – Motion: Adoption of minutes from August 20, 2015 Board Meeting

Action Requested: Adopt

Trustee Jensen moved to approve minutes

Trustee Freeman Seconded

All voted aye, motion passed.

Item #7 – Other Business

Action Requested: Informational

None

Adjourned at 11:00 A.M.

PENDING BOARD APPROVAL – SUBJECT TO CHANGE UNTIL APPROVED

MINUTES APPROVED:

By _____
CHAIR, SALT LAKE VALLEY LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICE AREA

CLERK

BOARD APPROVED: _____

DRAFT

PENDING BOARD APPROVAL – SUBJECT TO CHANGE UNTIL APPROVED

DATE: October 15, 2015

THE SALT LAKE VALLEY LAW ENFORCEMENT BOARD MET ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2015 AT THE HOUR OF 10:00 A.M. AT THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE BUILDING, 3365 SOUTH 900 WEST ROOM 115B, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

TRUSTEES PRESENT:
CHAIRMAN JIM BRADLEY
TRUSTEE FREEMAN
TRUSTEE MICHAEL JENSEN

ALSO PRESENT:
SCOTT CARVER, UNDERSHERIFF
SCOTT JURGES, TREASURER
CHIEF ROSA RIVERA, RIVERTON
CHIEF DWAYNE ANJEWIERDEN, HERRIMAN
CHIEF TONY MASON, MIDVALE
CHIEF STEVE DEBRY, MILLCREEK
SGT JASON ASHMENT, KEARNS/MAGNA
LT TROY CARR, HERRIMAN
JODY BUCKALEW
KERRI NAKAMURA
MIRIAH GRIFFITH

EXCUSED:
TRUSTEE BEN MCADAMS
TRUSTEE TRENT STAGGS

Chairman Bradley opened the meeting and welcomed everyone.

Item #1 – Public Comment:

Chairman Bradley asked if anyone was present who wished to address the Board.

**Item #2 – Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest
Action Requested: Identify Conflicts, if any**

Discussion:

Chairman Bradley asked if there were any conflicts of interest from Trustees regarding any of the items on the agenda. There were none.

**Item #3 – Motion: 2016 Tentative Budget
Action Requested: Adopt**

Discussion:

PENDING BOARD APPROVAL -- SUBJECT TO CHANGE UNTIL APPROVED

Mr. Jurges, CFO, presented budget projections to actuals. Added \$500,000 estimate for prior year collections on property taxes, and recommends budgeting for prior year collections from this point going forward to make budget more accurate.

Trustee Freeman: Asked about initial projection of \$18 million for TRANS, vs the \$21 million put into the budget. Mr. Jurges explained that it is budgeted at \$21 million so that SLVLESA can borrow UP TO \$21 million, should it need to do so. He clarified only the needed amount will be borrowed, which is projected to be closer to \$18 million.

Trustee Jensen compared this practice to what is done with parameters resolutions, which are usually set as higher than needed as a "just in case", and is a traditional measure.

Mr. Jurges clarified that the borrowed amount must be spent within 6 months, so "over-borrowing" wouldn't be feasible.

Trustee Freeman asked if the higher budgeted amount would result in higher interest costs.

Ms. Nakamura clarified interest won't be charged on the budgeted amount, only on the amount borrowed. She also noted that SLVLESA started building a fund balance so that only one issuance per year is needed instead of the two issuances per year that were done previously, and in so doing both interest costs and issuance costs are lower.

Mr. Jurges presented budget projections at current tax rates, midpoint tax rates and maximum tax rate projections. He noted that at the current tax rate, SLVLESA is budgeted to spend \$1.2 million of fund balance, with no added services, etc. Which would decrease fund balance from \$6.37 million to \$5.17 million. At the mid point tax rate, with a slight tax increase, there would be \$1.9 million of new revenue, which would allow \$625,000 of new service (i.e. building upgrades, new FTEs, etc). At this rate, with new services, \$85,000 would be added to the fund balance, which essentially "balances the fund".

Mr. Jurges noted that from the "balanced" point forward, the options SLVLESA needs to look at include smaller annual tax increases, or larger tax increases once every 5 or 6 years.

The projected maximum tax increases would add \$3.8 million of new revenue to the budget and allow about \$1 million in new services, while adding \$1.6 million to fund balance. The amount added to the fund balance would be about equal to the 4% increase anticipated for UPD's 2017 budget.

Trustee Freeman asked if there was time at this point in the year to do the required notifications for a tax increase. Ms. Nakamura and Mr. Jurges answered that it would have to be voted on today, in the October meeting, in order to post all the required notices.

Trustee Jensen said one of the big topics in the individual communities that comprise SLVLESA is community preservation and a current issue being discussed is whether the County is overbearing and has too much control. Trustee Jensen expressed concern

PENDING BOARD APPROVAL – SUBJECT TO CHANGE UNTIL APPROVED

that this would negatively affect, long-term, some townships and whether they stay with SLVLESA, particularly Millcreek. He agreed that at some point there is a need to get comfortable with the idea of essentially “cost of living” tax increases for long-term sustainability. He also expressed concern about trying to explain 22% fund balance to the general public. Trustee Jensen recommended next year or possibly the year after move toward a small 3-4% tax increase annually.

Trustee Freeman mentioned that in addition to this issue, the growth issue also needs to be looked at for long-term sustainability in terms of police-service coverage for the new growth in communities. For the reasons Trustee Jensen outlined, and due to the need for a growth plan, Freeman said he is not in favor of a tax increase this year.

Chairman Bradley agreed with both points and said he is in support of a budget with no tax increase this year, but acknowledged this means new growth will only have current service coverage available to them. He mentioned there is a need for a plan to increase coverage to keep pace with growth, and a budget that sustains it over time. He noted this will mean tax increases in some fashion in the future.

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the budget projected with no tax increase for 2016.

ACTION: Trustee Jensen moved to approve tentative budget projected at no tax increase. Trustee Freeman seconded. All present voted aye. Motion passed.

**Item #4 – Other Business
Action Requested: Informational**

Ms. Nakamura mentioned that she will be meeting with Trustees individually to discuss a 5 year plan.

Adjourned at 10:30 A.M.

MINUTES APPROVED:

By _____
CHAIR, SALT LAKE VALLEY LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICE AREA

CLERK

PENDING BOARD APPROVAL – SUBJECT TO CHANGE UNTIL APPROVED

BOARD APPROVED: _____

DRAFT