<div align="center">

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
August 18, 2021 Meeting Minutes

</div>

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Mr. Dan Petersen – UFA, Chairman
	Mr. Korban Lee – West Jordan, Vice-Chairman
	Mr. David Dobbins – Draper
	Mr. Doug Hill - Murray
	Mr. Gary Whatcott – South Jordan
	Mr. Kyle Kershaw – South Salt Lake
	Mr. David Brickey - Riverton
	Mr. Nathan Cherpeski - Herriman
	Mr. Mark Reid – Bluffdale
	Ms. Lisa Hartman - SLCo
	Mr. Tim Tingey – Cottonwood Heights
	Mr. Scott Harrington - Taylorsville
	Mr. Jake Petersen – UPD
	Mr. Wayne Pyle – West Valley City
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Ms. Gina Chamness - Holladay
	Mr. Mike Morey – Alta
	Open – Midvale
OTHERS PRESENT:	Mr. Scott Ruf – Director, VECC
	Mr. Terry Addison – South Salt Lake
	Mr. Troy Carr – Herriman
	Ms. Colleen Jacobs – West Valley City
	Mr. John Evans – West Valley City
	Mr. Robbie Russo – Cottonwood Heights
	Ms. Andrea Partridge – VECC
	Mr. Jonathan Bridges - VECC
	Ms. Nicole Lopez – VECC
	Mr. Scott Young – VECC Legal Counsel
	Mr. Warren James – Bluffdale
	Mr. Jon Harris – Murray
	Mr. Dom Burchette – UFA
	Mr. Andrew Smiley – VECC
	Mr. Clint Smith – Draper
	Ms. Kylie Day - UFA

In view of the COVID-19 Pandemic, this meeting will be held at virtually via ZOOM, as authorized by the Governor's Executive Order dated March 18, 2020 and affirmed November 8, 2020.

Mr. Dan Petersen called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

APPROVAL OF JULY 21 AND JULY 29, 2021 BOARD OF TRUSTEE MEETING MINUTES

> **Motion –**
>
> **. . . by Mr. Gary Whatcott, to approve the minutes of the July 21st and July 29th 2021 Trustees meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. Scott Harrington; the motion carried unanimously.**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Dan Petersen ([00:20:11](#)): Public comment. Did you receive anything through any other source for public comments, Scott?

Scott Ruf ([00:20:23](#)): No, sir.

Dan Petersen ([00:20:24](#)): Do we have any public comment here right now? Seeing none. We'll move to item four and turn it over to you, Scott, for your performance progress report.

VECC PERFORMANCE & PROGRESS REPORT

Scott Ruf ([00:20:37](#)): Okay. Thanks chief. Give me one second here. Okay. So as many of you know, we... The new phone system went in last week, so this'll be the last... The August report will be the last full month under the old 911 phone system. And as you can see, if I can... There we go. Again, we had a little... July was better than about five percentage points, better over June. Still not a great report, but I'm about to change all that. Everything pretty much stayed consistent. Our transfer rates are still hovering between that eight and a half, 10%. And those fluctuate currently as we work on the CAD project with the wildfires and stuff like that between Utah county and Summit County and stuff and things, so we're bouncing calls back and forth with the wildfires and whatnot.

Scott Ruf ([00:21:44](#)): So that transfer rate still remains a bit high. But once the CAD project is done in Salt Lake City is fully on board and the aggregator DPS is on board, you'll see, we'll be well below the 2%... 2% threshold by 2023, July of 2023, I believe is the deadline. And then what I wanted to do was I did... So the new phone system... You want to keep going, Chief? Are there any questions? I assume you're all waiting for the next item.

Dan Petersen ([00:22:19](#)): Yeah, we are anxiously.

Scott Ruf ([00:22:21](#)): Yeah. Okay. So what I did was, we went live on August 11th, which was last Wednesday at five o'clock in the morning. And so what I did was I did a seven day look back. I did the last full seven days prior to the cut-over and then the first full seven days after the cut-over. So August 4th to August 10th, you can see that seven day average was just in the low 70s, mid 70s for the 22nd standard.

Scott Ruf ([00:22:51](#)): And then on August 11, with the activation in the new phone system, you will see a huge increase in our performance as related to, not only the standards the board had set a year ago when we thought this phone system was going to be sooner, but there were many days, not only can we hit the 22nd or less, we hit the NENA standard for the 15 seconds or less. And even today, with the storms and the flooding, for a good part of the morning we were answering 97% of our 911 calls in less than 10 seconds. So I think all the frustration I've been voicing and things about the new phone system, this really shows that that was impeding our ability to meet the standards. And now we can really focus on the staffing and the acute CAC systems and the management of the personnel and things like that.

Scott Ruf([00:23:56](#)): I'm happy that this proved out to be true, because if not, I would... I don't know what I would do. But anyway, so I think we're in a positive place where we're headed in the right direction. I think what you'll start to see, which is something that the Senate and the legislative representatives wanted to see was just consistency. They wanted us off that rollercoaster ride. I was going to be ecstatic in the mid 80s and just show a consistent number in the mid 80s, which would have been a 10% increase with the new phone system. But as you can see, day over day we're coming in above that. And then just to show you a little bit also, I did a seven day look on the abandoned 911 calls under the old system.

Scott Ruf ([00:24:47](#)): You can see where anywhere from 13, 14% to 22, 23, 24% high to well into the single digits, low double digits, 10, 11, 12%. So again, I think this just validates many of... At least by concerns, our concerns as the board and related to our technology. With the new phone system this also it's not finished yet.

There's still some configuration and some housekeeping to do, but we've segregated the 911 queue. So we're focused on that. So we're dealing with the 911s. We know they're coming in, we know how they're coming in. We have people dedicated just to that. And then we're dealing with the non-emergency queue and the other lines independently. So they're no longer co-mingled and the dispatchers don't know what they're getting.

Scott Ruf([00:25:41](#)): Some of the feedback we're getting from the dispatch, especially the call takers, is they're really happy about the new phone system. The people on the 911s are... Feel, from what I've heard, less stressed because they're not going from call to call not knowing if it's an emergency or non emergency. They're having some downtime between calls and being able to regroup. So yes, quite I think because

Korban Lee ([00:26:04](#)): Sorry, I got... Finish. I got several questions but finish, Scott.

Scott Ruf ([00:26:08](#)): That was pretty much. I'm just excited. We're going to go through a period of time here as things get massaged. But, but like I said, I think we're going to see consistent numbers probably closer to the standard, if not the standard moving forward on a regular basis. So with that-

Korban Lee ([00:26:26](#)): Scott... Sorry, Korban from west Jordan, I don't know if everyone on Zoom can tell whoever.

Korban Lee ([00:26:34](#)): So do you have, call-takers answer the 911 calls for an hour and then take the non-emergency calls for an hour or something? And you said they rotate and off. Can you help explain how that works?

Scott Ruf ([00:26:46](#)): With our priority and... What I'm deferring to the shift commanders is to run their squads based on call volume and making operational decisions on the fly. So what we're doing now, and what I understand they're doing now, is they're assigning... If we have 10 call-takers, they're taking say six or eight, depending on the time of day and say "Your job, your whole mission in life, is just do 911s. Don't worry about anything else." And then they're assigning two or three people to do the non-emergency stuff. And then are abandoned and the stuff that's not going through that automated process are being delegated to like the fire dispatchers.

Scott Ruf ([00:27:23](#)): Because they have capacity there, but they're also not stuck if they're on a fire or answering other calls. So the commanders are adjusting those numbers and responsibilities based on call volume and activity, and what's going on.

Korban Lee ([00:27:35](#)): And, with any kind of implementation of a new technology or a new system, you're bound to have some hiccups and bumps in the road. Have you had any? What have they been? Can you elaborate on those? Are they getting resolved or what remains?

Scott Ruf ([00:27:51](#)): So really our... I don't know if there are hiccups. They were known issues that we knew we were going to have to flesh out and massage and tweak a little bit. It's all on the non-emergency side. As you know, the first day we went live, our administrative non-emergency lines created havoc for us. Going from the old system to the new system, we had lines down for significant portions of the day. Many of that was carrier related. Some of it was equipment related. And to solve that we took all the non-emergency numbers and just dumped them into a single queue. So they haven't been parsed out yet to be non-emergency like those where people need police and report a crime and then agency cue. The alarm queue, which is second in priority behind the 911 queue, that's been configured.

Scott Ruf ([00:28:37](#)): So that's the kind of stuff we're doing. The housekeeping of the change in the non-emergency numbers, issuing new phone numbers to the agencies. So that's really been the... That side of the

house, if you will, has been what we've been working to finalize. And with Salt Lake City going live this morning on the new phone system, I believe the Motorola team is back here today or will be this afternoon to continue to work on those accused. So another week or so, it'll be... We hope to be in a better place. And it also brought to light we have to reevaluate or reassess our incoming non-emergency business lines in those phone lines. So the PRIs, the direct dial numbers, we went to look for historical data and stuff, and it was all over the place. Some of it was old so we're going to clean all that up and work on that.

Dan Petersen ([00:29:31](#)): Thank you, Scott.

Scott Ruf ([00:29:32](#)): Appreciate it. Any other comments, questions, concerns? I can stop sharing this.

Dan Petersen([00:29:41](#)): Okay. Wonderful. Well it's good start. Good start to see. Are you going to include those seven day charts in what you send to the... Your normal send to the Senate and House?

Scott Ruf ([00:29:57](#)): Well, I was going to ask. Do we want to slide that in as an exhibit in the progress report just to give them that first week? I think it's great information, so I don't know if we want to keep it a secret.

Dan Petersen([00:30:09](#)): I would recommend we do that. And just whether you put it into the report or embedded into the email as an example is up to you, but I think they should see the progress.

Scott Ruf ([00:30:20](#)): Okay.

Dan Petersen ([00:30:21](#)): Somewhere anybody have any objections to that?

Korban Lee ([00:30:26](#)): I would just... It's Korban again. I would just manage their expectations that-

Wayne Pyle ([00:30:30](#)): It's just a week.

Korban Lee ([00:30:31](#)): Yeah. Yeah. We're only a week in. It's a really good example. But if it dips a little bit in the next month or two, as we see longer trends that might happen.

Wayne Pyle ([00:30:44](#)): Don't freak out, yeah. You know, the earthquake or [crosstalk 00:30:48].

Korban Lee ([00:30:47](#)): But it's great. It's great news, Scott, and you should share it.

Wayne Pyle ([00:30:51](#)): Yeah.

Dan Petersen ([00:30:52](#)): If you wanted to, Scott, you might even think about just embed into your piece that after the first week we're seeing scores from the high 80s, low 90s and just leave it at that, instead of giving them a specific number that they'll never forget.

Scott Ruf ([00:31:09](#)): Okay. And that's a fair-

Dan Petersen ([00:31:12](#)): And then you give yourself a chance to see a full month because if you tell them 94 and then you produce an 87, they're going to be upset.

Scott Ruf ([00:31:22](#)): Yeah. I agree.

Dan (00:31:29): Okay. Very good. And any other piece of the other phone system, or you covered that enough for us?

Scott Ruf (00:31:37): I think the transition, with the team here, the technical services folks here, even the administrative staff in the front were all back and some of these positions probably haven't been this clean in 20 years. But getting the place pulled together, pulling equipment out, getting all being clean. I mean, we turned, just to give you an idea that, how this time versus last time, we turned the entire center in about 18 hours and 10 years ago when they did in Toronto, it took three days without the UPD position. So a third less positions and it took three days going around the clock. So everyone did a... All the VECC employees, TS, admin, the employees themselves all did a great job in getting that done in and had a successful launch and turnover.

Dan Peterson (00:32:27): Great. Thank you. Well, if you're ready then move on to agenda item five on the consulting project update.

UCA VECC CONSULTING PROJECT UPDATE

Scott Ruf (00:32:34): Yeah. So I just wanted to let you know, they were here two weeks ago for about three days. I met with them for about two hours and then let them loose to meet with all of my divisions and folks. I didn't have a lot of control over outside of here, who they spoke to or where they reached out to. They were given all the contact information, but it was driven by this is that consultant that UCA wanted to bring in and help us out. I think the positive is, the feedback I got from them anyway was they were able to witness firsthand all of the challenges we were having with the old equipment and the old phones. They sat a lot of time on the floor as both the people and we're able to capture all that and will be able to address that in their report.

Scott Ruf (00:33:24): There was a comment at one point, they weren't even sure why they were here and they felt everything we've done in a year and a half was well accelerated beyond what some expectations would be in peace apps of similar size, everything the board has done, I've been trying to do, the staff here and people like that. So I'm expecting good report. I think what I'm hoping is talking to them is it was a third party, independent assessment that is going to further validate everything we've been saying and doing over the last year, year and a half since I've gotten here. And the decision the board has made with staffing and budgets and compensation and things like that. So I don't have a lot, I haven't heard anything back. I did get a commitment from Director Edmunds from UCA that when he does get the report, and I think it's due in September, that he will contact the board chair, Chief Petersen and myself first, that he has promised not to release that before we have a sit-down. So but again, I don't anticipate it being another brutal assessment of VECC's operation.

Dan Petersen (00:34:41): It'll be a recap of the brutality with the work that's been done to fix it.

Scott Ruf (00:34:45): Yes, that's what I anticipate. Yes.

Dan Petersen (00:34:47): Okay. Good. Any other comments on that consulting project?

Korban Lee (00:34:55): When is that wrapping up? What's the timeframe on it?

Scott Ruf (00:34:59): Well, it's done. So they were here for three days and then they have third-

Korban Lee (00:35:02): That's it, that's all they're coming.

Scott Ruf (00:35:03): Yeah. Because it wasn't a true deep dive, it was a quick look at a technology, our operations, staffing policies, what we're doing. So I think it's due in, was in 30 or 60 days from July. Sometimes I'm expecting it probably in a couple of weeks.

Korban Lee ([00:35:21](#)): Thank you.

Dan Petersen ([00:35:25](#)): Okay. Move on to item six, CAD project.

CAD PROJECT UPDATE

Scott Ruf ([00:35:32](#)): Still moving along. We are maintain, like I said, we are South Salt Lake and West Valley are still on track. Versaterm will be here, I think, later today or tomorrow to meet with West Valley. There was some concern, some questions and some stuff they wanted some assistance on. So as the valley project team, which is everybody in the Valley, Salt Lake City, those folks are working diligently with South Salt Lake because of the size of West Valley and their call volume and things like that. There were some stuff that that team wanted to go over and get a head start on. So Kim Vachon our project manager at Versaterm will be here this week and meeting with the West Valley team, I believe, tomorrow or at least Friday morning. But anyway, in the next day or so everyone's still slated to go live later in the fall and be fully converted over July, July... January 1 of 2022. And then we'll bring on a university sometime in the first half of 2022.

Scott Ruf ([00:36:41](#)): And then we have a meeting tomorrow to review the CAT aggregator for DPS-UHP. Where the status is at, is that any kind of final work we need to do now that the phone project and stuff is out of the way, we can refocus on some of those ancillary projects tied to the bigger CAD project.

Dan Petersen ([00:37:00](#)): Okay. Very good. Thank you. Any questions on the CAD project update?

Kyle Kershaw ([00:37:05](#)): Yeah, chief, this is Kyle. Scott, can you just give me a little more information? If my memory serves me, is on August 6th, Salt Lake City was doing some maintenance to their systems, and basically, they tried to put a round peg into a square hole that took down Versaterm for a few hours. And I know that got resolved in Salt... It was a Salt Lake City maintenance issue and all that, but it just, when I heard about it, can you just tell me in a minute or two and from a 30,000 foot level, what is our redundancy plan? This kind of brought to light that if something ever did happen up at Salt Lake City and their servers weren't available, what is our long-term plan on keeping Versaterm up and running and having some sort of redundancy?

Scott Ruf ([00:38:05](#)): Yeah. Thanks, Mr. Kershaw. So yeah, so you are correct. How's that for short, you're right, how's that? No, they did a patch and their server team failed to notify the stakeholders, not only for this network, but other city networks. And it caused chaos in the virtual environment. Right now, there is no formal redundancy or backup, we are... But we had known that this wasn't a surprise. If you recall, during the project, after I got here, there was a lot of debate before I got here about the funding and the CAD project and available funds and bringing people on. And then the discussion of do we spend a few hundred thousand dollars to build out a local failover system when the plan was always to move to the cloud-based solution and the redundancy in the cloud and that high availability failover.

Scott Ruf ([00:39:10](#)): So that's where we're expediting that request now. We do own the equipment here, I found out, as part of the project, but it was never finalized and configured for a number of reasons. And again, some of this was prior to my arrival, but we're weighing the cost benefit of spending all the time and money to do that now, to possibly have to come back and ask for additional funds on both Salt Lake City and the VECC side to move to the cloud. Versaterm has expedited that request for us in Salt Lake City. We were told we were going to have it this week and then the various IT personnel will review the solution. And we'll be better positioned to make a decision. There is no easy short-term fix. I mean, if it was $50,000, $80,000, we would have pulled the trigger, but it's significantly greater than that. So that's where it's at. It's not a great answer, but it is what it is right now.

Kyle Kershaw ([00:40:26](#)): So if I understand, basically, we're trained to decide whether the cloud-based solution is preferable to utilizing some additional equipment at VECC and running it on those servers there, the tech people still are trying to make a decision, what's the best option is that?

Scott Ruf ([00:40:51](#)): No, I'm sorry, if I wasn't... So I'm sorry. The conclusion of the team is we have to move to the cloud. It makes sense. It's easier to manage. It puts to bed some of these other issues that some of your agencies have had with having to go to Salt Lake City when there's issues. So I think the consensus is we have to move to the cloud. That was always the plan, is to move in that direction. The concern was we're having a hard time coming to both the city and to this board and saying we need X hundreds of thousands of dollars for a short-term fix when we're trying to move to the cloud. So we're trying to move the cloud project up without spending any unnecessary funds in the short-term. That's what we're trying to weigh is, I mean, if this was three years out, it's a different conversation. But before we go ask for $200,000 or $300,000 or $400,000 and then another say, and I don't even know what the number is for the cloud, another 500 later, would it be better just to come back one time, get one final global solution that everyone supports and move forward?

Kyle Kershaw ([00:42:02](#)): Okay, thanks. So right now the preference is the cloud solution and you're going to try to find out what all that entails as far as cost and all the other factors. Is that fair enough?

Scott Ruf ([00:42:17](#)): Yes, sir. And like I said, we'll have the initial budgetary of the proposal this week is what I was told by Versaterm.

Kyle Kershaw ([00:42:24](#)): Okay, great. Thanks Scott.

Scott Ruf ([00:42:25](#)): Okay.

Dan Petersen ([00:42:28](#)): Any other questions on the CAD? Okay. Moving into the operations report. We'll start with the fire ops briefing with Chief Maxfield.

OPERATIONS BOARDS

Derek Maxfield ([00:42:40](#)): All right. Let me get my notes back up. We met last week and much of what we discussed has already been covered by Scott as it relates to the CAT update and the phone system and even just the recent conversation about redundancy in the cloud. Other things that we did discuss were some of the issues with Versaterm customer service and how we go about each agency getting fixes for things and discussed making sure we keep Scott in the loop with all of that. He can be a common point of contact and can determine whether some of the issues are related to just one agency or whether he's getting feedback from multiple agencies that there are problems. We discussed working incident notifications and voted to approve those changes, which basically delineate what will we send out on a working fire notification and a working incident notification and who will receive those notifications.

Derek Maxfield ([00:43:47](#)): The users will continue to work on some of the response consolidations as to what gets sent on initial alarm and some of the others, depending on the call. There's still some little things that need to be worked out as far as a structure fire versus a house fire versus a garage fire. And so they want to consolidate some of those things so that we're all on the same page. The only other thing we just talked about possibly changing, [Bett 00:44:14] talked about changing or removing the obvious death moniker for one of the dispatches just so that, oftentimes somebody calls and somebody has obvious signs of death. They've been dead for a long time, but rather than take the chance, we're going to use that as a priority one and send the response as if that's not the case. And then just use the obvious death more as public safety use only, like if we were on a call and we called the dispatch and said, "Yeah, this is and obvious death." Kind of thing, but just some clarification to make sure that we're responding appropriately to those emergencies. And that's it. Any questions?

Dan Petersen ([00:44:59](#)): Okay. Move to the police ops and Chief Carr.

Troy Carr ([00:45:03](#)): Thank you, Mr. Chair. This last month, we had a meeting a little early, we met on August 5th before the users group. The reason we did that is we needed to hammer out some items with the upcoming Vesta switch over that we wanted to get with Scott on, are there some questions the chiefs had and I'll go through those real quick. Number one on the Vesta, we talked about the abandoned automated callbacks. So the chiefs were concerned about a computer calling back on a 911 hang up. We came to a consensus that ultimately technology got us into this problem. We have an extensive amount of 911 hang up calls. And to that end, we need technology to help us fix that. I think there was some comfort with how that was going to happen. Let me give you a for instance, if somebody were to hang up once, the question was posed, if it were to come in as a call again to a 911 center, would that then get pushed over to the live queue and the answer to that was yes. Scott walked us through what that would look like. And I think that was a lot of it, was we hadn't had much of a walkthrough on... We understood what it should be, but we hadn't had a walkthrough on what it was really going to be. So that we reached a comfort level with that. Also, we talked about if we get that automated 911 call back, will that lessen our response times related to the dispatch of calls, not the response, but the dispatch calls. And that too was agreed upon that it should certainly help. And I think as we've seen reported here today, that it does. Excuse me. So we talked about the phone trees. There was some concern about what number if a person were to call in and just need an information report, but there wasn't an in-progress call or crime being reported. What number in the phone tree does fall to? And originally, the thought was if we put it at number one, everybody's going to call into the dispatch center and we're going to have a repeat of that situation.

Troy Carr ([00:46:53](#)): So we wanted to move that down. And ultimately the chiefs were concerned about moving that away for a customer service standpoint. It was moved back up to the number one on the order of the tree. And Scott talked about all the other fine points to all of the best already. So I won't go back over that. Lastly, we ended with an issue we're having, if an incident crosses borders in the VECC agencies, it's automatically patched so that those agencies can talk that is not true with Sandy and Salt Lake City. When you enter borders into that area, it takes a command level officer from that department to allow dispatch to patch channels. And you can see how that becomes a little cumbersome and quite frankly, as an officer safety issue. We decided that item would be best pushed to the Valley Police Alliance meeting that was pushed to that meeting this month. And there was conversation about it. We're waiting for Salt Lake City to come back the following month and see what they can do to update their procedures to help us with that. That was about it. If you have any questions. Thank you

OPS BOARD RULES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Dan Petersen ([00:47:58](#)): Thank you very much, chief, appreciate that. Item eight is on the ops board roles and responsibilities. I'm keeping this as a standing item. I just haven't set the date yet. As a reminder, this is myself, Korban Lee, Scott Ruf, and Chiefs' Maxfield and Carr are just going to go through the existing ops board roles and responsibility. And if any changes would be proposed, we would bring them back to the board for consideration on process. I know we have a few things that we're doing slightly different and it's just a good chance to review, but I haven't set the date yet. Next item, item nine, directors report, Scott.

DIRECTORS REPORT

Scott Ruf ([00:48:43](#)): Thanks, chief. I think I hit all the highlights, the CAD project. I mean, the phone project has been long in the making and has finally arrived. And we're starting to, preliminarily anyway, things looking positive there. We continue to, now with the phone project and the model proving out that's going to enhance our efficiencies and performance. We can start to focus a lot of our attention on the people, the training, policies and procedures, working with the agencies and other expectations and deliverables of that. And we'll continue to do so. Unless you object, I'm just going to keep going through point one and point two.

Dan Petersen ([00:49:27]): Please.

Scott Ruf ([00:49:29]): Point one, Clint is at the APCO Conference this week, we felt it would be good for him to attend and get a good insight into the public safety communications, meet the vendors, go to some trainings and just network a little bit, get him that background. So unless you have the financial report in the packet and a memo from Deputy Director Jensen, if there's a question I can try to answer it, I know the basics. He's prepared in September to give you a... We're just waiting for the August 911 tax money to hit. And that is actually the June 2021 money. So he'll be able to close out the fiscal year and give you an update on that. So if there's a specific question about his memo and the financial report, I can try to answer the question or take a note and then get that answer back to you. The auditor's were here working with Clint for the annual audit. As you know, we changed firms for that process. There were a couple of things that popped up as part of that process.

Scott Ruf ([00:50:43]): As far as the way things were previously done and recorded, Clint will also be able to speak on that, but it did cause the need to go back to the previous auditors and get clarifications and requests to amend previous audit reports if they're willing to do so. I don't understand that process, but that is all in process. Clint will be able to comment on that or report on that next month at the September meeting. And it has to do with liabilities that are on the books that shouldn't be on the books and things like that. So we're actually a better financial shape than we thought. So that's more positive news, but things are looking better. It only took a year and a half. But anyway, so any questions on the financial report, any questions you need me to find answers to for you? And I can answer back online, but like I said, I think Clint provided a decent summary in a snapshot in the packet for you.

REVIEW & RECOMMENDATION TO PROCEED WITH PURCHASE OF CASELLE ERP SOFTWARE PACKAGE

Scott Ruf ([00:51:50]): And then right into item 10, as you know, we were using Great Plain. It was a very cumbersome, it was a lot of system for what we do here, had a lot of old, bad data and things like that. So Clint, as part of the budget process for fiscal 22, if you recall, this was an item that he was going to pursue. He included his memo and his findings in the packet. He put out an RFI, did about, I believe, four demos for systems. He's reviewed, he's recommended to proceed with to sell ERP software package and solution. He did reach out to CFOs and others and, I believe, West Valley and some of the other member agencies to review some of that. It's within budget. It is a budgeted expense.

Scott Ruf ([00:52:44]): So that's in the packet as well, if there's any questions, but again, we have not entered into anything yet. We're just advising you. Or if there's questions you want us to hold off, we will. But again, it's in budget to blow the threshold. He did the RFI and you have the memo before you. So our intent is to move forward with that system.

Tim Tingey ([00:53:07]): Chief Petersen.

Dan Petersen ([00:53:08]): Yes.

Tim Tingey ([00:53:09]): May I ask a question a couple of questions on that?

Dan Petersen ([00:53:11]): Please.

Tim Tingey ([00:53:13]): So on this, with the Great Plains, is there a savings at all, were we paying a yearly expense for that? I know we've had it for 20 years based on what it said in the memo. I was just curious if there's a savings that will occur because we're not using that anymore.

Scott Ruf (00:53:30): Yeah. and I don't have that in front of me. I do know that Great Plains Knew we were looking at making some changes and adjustments and Clint had led the support on that lapse. So we stopped paying those fees and we had somebody in-house that was able to support and maintain it until we make the full transition. I just, I don't know what that number is.

Tim Tingey (00:53:53): Okay. And then just my second question, the process for implementation, obviously, it takes a year based on the memo. And my question is how will operations be affected with that? Because sometimes those are pretty extensive processes. I know you have to do it, but have you given much thought to that?

Scott Ruf (00:54:17): Yeah. So Clint and I have talked and he has a... Once we presented it here, absence of any objections, we will begin engaging with [Cassell 00:54:30] and then formulate a formal implementation plan and a phasing plan of which areas we can start to migrate and the impact of the operations and then phase it in over the coming months and stuff like that. We know it's not going to be an over the night hot switch. So but yeah, we have had those conversations, but we wanted to make sure we were okay to, there were no major objections moving forward before we engaged and formulated that formal implementation plan and benchmarks and things like that. And then Clint will make sure he includes this project in his monthly financial reports as how it's going, what we're doing, what the impacts are.

Tim Tingey (00:55:14): Thank you.

Dan Petersen (00:55:17): Scott, is this item a courtesy review or do you have it within your power to authorize the purchase?

Scott Ruf (00:55:30): I put it on for information and transparency. We did the RFI, we did, we did all the demos of due diligence. They're all listed on the Utah procurement services website, not as contracts, but as approved vendors for government entities. It was a budgeted item in the fiscal '22 budget. So it was more for information and transparency of what we're doing. I would have to defer to you or I don't... I think we're good. But again, I'm a little gun shy recently. Yeah.

Dan Petersen (00:56:06): Oh, no, I don't remember off the top of my head what your limits are, whether we need to approve this or whether you have the power to approve it.

Scott Ruf (00:56:18): It's below the $25,000 a year contract threshold. So I believe it falls under the administration operations of VECC.

Dan Petersen (00:56:24): Okay.

Korban Lee (00:56:24): And that's within your appropriated budget.

Scott Ruf (00:56:28): And it's within the budget. Yeah.

Dan Petersen (00:56:29): Great. So we don't need to take action. Is there anybody that wants to make comment or object to allowing Scott to move forward?

Korban Lee (00:56:40): Scott, given what we've just gone through or are in the middle of going through with the procurement challenges, the RFI process. Can you elaborate a little bit on the RFI process you went through on this?

Scott Ruf (00:56:52): Yeah. So Clint worked with a West Valley person.

Wayne Pyle (00:56:56): Jim.

Scott Ruf (00:56:57): Yeah. Jim Welch at West Valley came up with the needs of a system for an agency like ours, drafted an RFI and disseminated it, I believe, to six or eight qualified firms or companies. These were the four that responded. He did demos with my payroll person, HR, Deputy Director Jensen did full demos in a couple of cases, did multiple demos with the vendors, vetted it and then applied those results to the really what VECC is looking to do and the needs of that. That's how that process went.

Dan Petersen (00:57:34): Any other questions?

Scott Harrington (00:57:39): How many, how many years of data are you going to convert? And what systems are you getting, payroll, accounts payable and [crosstalk 00:57:48] or...

Scott Ruf (00:57:48): We're getting the full suite Mr. Harrington. So the intent was for the full suite of Cassell and the full suite of services. And like I said earlier, we haven't finalized the implementation and really the look back. But we are planning on because of the way the current system is and it's housed, we can archive it in its current environment. And we did have a conversation of, is it worth doing a full data conversion or whatever we're statutorily or legally required to maintain? Just make sure we preserve that information. And then at some point it'll just go away because there's a lot of data in there that just is not good data.

Scott Harrington (00:58:40): Okay. Thank you.

Kyle Kershaw (00:58:43): Chief, this is Kyle. I can just, we use Cassell at our place. And I think the thing that VECC will find helpful is because they're a local company, they've already accommodated a lot of the required state of Utah reporting. And it's pretty seamless as far as transparency reports, Utah retirement system, file uploads, things like that have already been tried and tested and they work. And I think the VECC people will find it pretty easy to interface with outside agencies, particularly the state by going to this product.

Dan Petersen (00:59:33): Pretty good. Okay. Looks like you have the okay to move forward as you proposed, Scott. There's item number 9.2. Did you give us an overview?

FOLLOW-UP ON APPROVED WAGE ADJUSTMENT
Scott Ruf (00:59:49): Oh, no. I'm sorry, I just jumped over that. I apologize.

Dan Petersen (00:59:51): That's all right.

Scott Ruf (00:59:54): So I just want to give an update from your decision and your support to the July 29th wage adjustments and compensation changes. We've gone through, we've identified the phase and the rollout. The first phase on the front end will take effect Sunday, September 5th. That's the first day of the payroll in September. We reworked some of the job descriptions advertising at the new rates. We actually, because of the what we're seeing with the new phone system and some of the challenges we're having with entry-level folks, especially the younger ones and the stress of the job, we've created a call taker your position. That'll be introduced to the center as non-emergency, they're going to do alarms, animal control, agency non-emergency stuff and then be introduced to the 911 side of the house. And then those hours will be a little different.

Scott Ruf (01:01:05): And then if they choose to, we'll be able to promote them up into 911 calls they can ultimately dispatch in. That approach, we've seen a 56% increase in the number of applications and out of that, in just the last three weeks by making that change. And then we're getting interest about... Because you have

to apply for the call taker and a communications officer wanting call taker, some people have applied for both, which is common, but we've seen an uptake of about 56% on that call taker position and about a 42% or 43% increase in the communications officer one position. The early feedback we're getting is the work and the salary. We hired a couple of people and someone in my office just the other day was like this is the most money they've made in their life.

Scott Ruf ([01:02:03](#)): Now, they're a younger person so I guess that's all relative. But I think it's going to start to show fruition, but I think our approach, our marketing approach and our approach to this is, especially with these newer people and there is to ease them into it instead of just bringing them in and dropping the hammer, is bring them in, let's deal with this stuff I know the chiefs are worried about, their customer service to their citizens and non-emergency. And in this model, we were going to put those newer people on this business hour shift and then head the four squads with 10 to 12, 911 dedicated call takers. So you guys, you can see what the numbers we'll be able to manage that call volume and things like that. So, and I think [Mr. Pyle 01:02:48] had requested last time we do a 30, 60 and 90 day check-in with the new people, how things are going, any challenges and things like that.

Scott Ruf ([01:03:00](#)): And then we went ahead and did. Our HR coordinator had issued a, these are always fun to do, a survey of people in that one to three years, three to five, 10 plus. And we're going to report back on in September, although I can tell you they're pretty interesting because when they're anonymous they always become entertaining. So, but it's giving you some good feedback. We're getting a lot of feedback if you recall. I think there was a survey done in 2018 and 2019. Let's just say it's significantly different in a lot of areas, but in some areas it's the same. So we're still trying to work through, are people still just upset from stuff from years ago? So that's what HR is trying to filter through of where we were to where we are to where we're headed. And again, when they're anonymous, it makes it too easy for people to just to launch hand grenades. So, but it will be fully published. I told my people when it's done, we'll publish it and let everyone-

Scott Ruf ([01:04:00](#)): He fully published... I told my people when it's done, we'll publish it and let everyone see it. But it give us a good snapshot, the good, the bad, the ugly, as they say. But I think that's where we're at. We anticipate at the end of the month to serve notice to CenturyLink and Lumen. So that'll, as you remember, as part of the wage conversation, we will start to see that 60 to $70000 a month savings, we hope, in September, so that all feeds into this. But so far it's been positive. We see again on the communications officer one, which is a true public safety side, about a 40 to 43% increase in applications and 53% overall with the addition of this new call taker, non-emergency type position. So I think we're... Under the circumstances and Utah's, low unemployment rate and other things, I think we're moving in the right direction. So I can only stay positive and that's pretty difficult sometimes for me.

Korban Lee ([01:05:00](#)): Scott, how many vacancies do you have the center right now?

Scott Ruf ([01:05:04](#)): So we have one, two, four, five dispatch positions, and then probably about 14 call taker positions. We have, was it seven? I believe in training right now in the call taker position. So that give us if they all make it, that would give us 10 dedicated 911 call-takers across all four shifts, and then we can supplement with that. So we're hoping to get a higher of this of eight to 10 people here, after labor day at that entry-level call taker. And then I'm hoping about 30 or 40% of those 10 want to take the next step to 911 and things like that. And then we're going to phase in probably after the summer look at a lateral. That seems to be the new thing in this business is everyone's going to start stealing from each other. So do a lateral.

Scott Ruf ([01:05:57](#)): And not so much a lateral program and kind of rob from our neighbors, but with Utah being such a bit of incoming from other places around the country, specifically California and stuff, I think there might be an opportunity there to poach some emergency communications personnel from other 911 centers around the California, Nevada, Arizona, and things like that. So again, I appreciate the board support, I

think we're starting to see some positive outcomes for a change. We're finally, I think rounding the corner, if you will.

Dan Petersen ([01:06:35](#)): Any other questions for Scott on that? I've asked him to keep this as a standing agenda item for a couple of months so that we can hear the progress on what we agreed to. Seeing none, we do have a closed session. Look for someone to potentially make a motion as shown on item 11.

CLOSED SESSION

> **Motion –**

> **. . . by Mr. Kyle Kershaw, to go into closed session for the purpose of the discussion of the character, professional competence or physical or mental health of an individual and a strategy session to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation; the motion was seconded by Mr. Tim Tingey; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

The meeting went into a closed session at 2:47 p.m.

> **Motion –**

> **. . . by Mr. Kyle Kershaw, to reopen the public meeting; the motion was seconded by Mr. Korban Lee; the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

The public meeting reopened at 3:45 p.m.

Korban Lee ([02:02:33](#)): We're done with closed session. We're back in open session.

Dan Petersen ([02:02:41](#)): Scott, you can go ahead and invite everybody back in.

Wayne Pyle ([02:02:58](#)): The waiting room is empty Chief.

Dan Petersen ([02:03:01](#)): And we're back in open session. Let me throw out the 24th at three o'clock. That's a starting point. I see no by Tim.

Tim Tingey ([02:03:19](#)): It doesn't work for me, but that's just me.

Wayne Pyle ([02:03:24](#)): I could do Tuesday a little earlier, say between 11:00 and 3:00, but I can't do it at 3: 00

Dam Petersen ([02:03:31](#)): Can you do earlier on the 22nd? Like at 9:00 or 10:00?

Wayne Pyle ([02:03:36](#)): Yes.

Mark Reid ([02:03:37](#)): I can't do the 22nd.

Scott Young ([02:03:38](#)): On the 24th you mean, Chief?

Dan Petersen ([02:03:41](#)): 24th.

Nathan Cherpeski ([02:03:44](#)): The 24th is no good for me, but I wasn't able to participate in that first part, so like Mr. Carter, I'm either going to have to catch up or just not participate.

Tim Tingey ([02:03:55](#)): Chief is there-

Lisa Hartman ([02:03:56](#)): I can do the 24th til 11:00. Sorry, Tim.

Tim Tingey (02:04:00): Is there any way we could do the Wednesday at the same time we do this meeting? I'm just throwing that out. Tuesday doesn't work for me, but like I said, that's just me.

Dan Petersen (02:04:11): Wednesday, I could do a 2:30. Works.

Gary Whatcott (02:04:19): That works for me.

Ryan Carter (02:04:21): Works for me.

Nathan Cherpeski (02:04:23): I just have to be done by 4:00. I have an audit committee at 4:00, that I have to attend.

Dan Petersen (02:04:29): I like the idea of being done by 4:00. I'm not so sure we could be, but I'd like that idea.

Scott Young (02:04:34): 2:30 to 4:00 next Wednesday?

Dan Petersen (02:04:37): Yeah. Scott does that work?

Scott Young (02:04:38): Yeah, that'll work for me.

Dan Petersen (02:04:40): Anybody cannot make that?

Wayne Pyle (02:04:42): At 2:30 or at 4:00?

Dan Petersen (02:04:44): 2:30.

Wayne Pyle (02:04:45): I can make it at 2:30, but only half an hour. I could try to move my three o'clock.

Dan Petersen (02:04:52): I think that'd be healthy, Wayne, if you could.

Wayne Pyle (02:04:54): Okay. I'll give it a shot.

Dan Petersen (02:04:57): I think you're in charge of West Valley. Okay. Is there any better proposal or are we good at Wednesday 2:30? Okay.

Dan Petersen (02:05:13): So Scott, if you could publish a draft agenda for me to take a peak at, with a schedule of Wednesday at 2:30 for a closed session.

Mark Reid (02:05:29): And will Andrea send us a calendar item?

Dan Petersen (02:05:31): Yeah, we'll get that. Once we get the agenda cleared with Scott and Corbin and I, then we'll push it out the same as a regular meeting, with the attachment. And then Scott on Friday, you should have everything by Friday. As soon as you get those, then Scott Young, you can push those to us, correct? The arguments?

Scott Young (02:05:51): That's correct. As soon as I get it, I'll send it off. Yep.

Scott Ruf (02:05:56): Chief Petersen?

Dan Petersen ([02:05:57]): Yes.

Scott Ruf ([02:05:58]): Do you want to have your City coordinate the meet, because I would imagine I'm not going to the meeting on the 26th, right?

Dan Petersen ([02:06:07]): That's probably true.

Scott Ruf ([02:06:11]): Not that I don't enjoy spending time with you all.

Wayne Pyle ([02:06:12]): But you don't love it.

Scott Ruf ([02:06:16]): If you can send me the link, I can forward everything out. I just figured this way you can control the meeting and everything.

Dan Petersen ([02:06:22]): All right. I can do that. Okay. With that-

Gary Whatcott ([02:06:28]): Chief?

Dan Petersen ([02:06:29]): Yes.

Gary Whatcott ([02:06:31]): Scott, this is Gary. I wasn't able to make the last on the meeting. I was out of town. Can you make the recording available to those of us that still want to participate?

Scott Young ([02:06:44]): Yeah. I have the recording and we have a transcript already. From last Thursday Mr. Whatcott?

Gary Whatcott ([02:06:49]): Yeah. I'd like to just listen to it, whichever one's convenient to send.

Scott Young ([02:06:55]): I'll just send it to everybody and I'll include Mr. Carter.

Dan Petersen ([02:06:58]): And include the transcript as well. That can be really helpful.

Gary Whatcott ([02:07:05]): Thank you.

There was nothing else to discuss at this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:49 p.m.