

SALT LAKE VALLEY EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

JOINT BOARD OF TRUSTEES/OPERATIONS MEETING

August 17, 2016 Meeting Minutes

VECC Board Room

5360 S Ridge Village Dr, West Valley City

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Dobbins; Draper
Ms. Jan Wells; Murray
Sheriff Jim Winder; UPD; Chairman
Mr. Kyle Kershaw; South Salt Lake
Mr. Ryan Carter; Riverton
Mr. Layne Morris; West Valley City
Mr. Gary Whatcott; South Jordan
Mr. John Guildner; Alta
Mr. Carlton Christensen; SLCO
Mr. Mark Reid; Bluffdale
Mr. Warren James, UFA
Mr. Scott Harrington; Taylorsville
Mr. Brett Wood; Herriman
Mr. Marc McElreath; West Jordan
Mr. Kane Loader; Midvale
Mr. John Park; Cottonwood Heights

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ms. Gina Chamness; Holladay

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. David Church; VECC Attorney
Mr. Randy Thomas; UPD
Mr. Reed Thompson; South Jordan
Mr. John Inch Morgan, Executive Director
Mr. Jeff Monson; Human Resources Manager
Ms. Gigi Smith; Police Operations Manager
Ms. Beth Todd; Fire Operations Manager
Mr. Terry Shaw; VECC Supervisor
Ms. Chris Dunn; VECC Supervisor
Ms. Leslie Devey; VECC Supervisor
Ms. Andrea Partridge; Administrative Manager

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 15, 2016 BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

Motion –

. . . by Mr. Carlton Christensen; that the minutes of the June 15, 2016 meeting of the Board of Trustees be approved as written; the motion was seconded by Mr. Mark Reid; the motion carried unanimously.

OPERATIONS BOARD REPORT

The Board of Operations did not meet in August.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Financial Report

John Inch Morgan reported that there is currently only one month in the books so it doesn't reveal a lot, but it does show we are under-spending. There is not a whole lot to report. He does want to report that in looking at personnel, we have been and continue to recruit. We have a number of different groups coming in and being trained and we are building up capacity. Over the next few months the overtime and part time will begin to decrease and full time will increase. It is all balanced in our plan to bring more employees in and answer calls.

John showed the Boards the current 9-1-1 fees coming in, which are extremely erratic. Between last year and this year we are doing much better. The difference between the two is we are up about \$389k this year. One caveat is that in the last Legislative session was that the monies can only be sent to a PSAP. VECC currently has an Interlocal agreement where we split the funds so that the County Auditor sends 50% of the money to UPD and 50% to VECC. In meeting with the Auditor General, they have determined that this arrangement is not consistent with the law. Currently, John's proposal, inasmuch as Salt Lake County has agreed to send this money to VECC, we will enter into a new Interlocal Agreement. David Church and John will be meeting Friday to write this agreement where we continue to same revenue flows. John has always argued that Salt Lake County and UPD have been legal members of VECC and until we merge everything together, we need to keep everybody whole. John's intent is to take that same amount of money and convey that to UPD for that separate budget until everything is merged together. After they craft the new Interlocal agreement, it will be brought back to this meeting next month to be adopted and then it will be sent forward to the County Council or UPD Board to do the same. Mark Reid asked if it would affect Bluffdale as they receive their money and then forward half here and half to Utah Valley. John mentioned that a City can still receive it but they have to send it to a PSAP. John intends to keep everyone whole the way they are right now as it doesn't affect finances any different than anticipated when the budget was adopted. Carlton Christensen asked if the increase in fees were normal and sustainable or if they were catch up. John feels it is a combination of both, but he thinks it will be sustained. John has been working with the Legislative Auditor General where they have been contacting Telecoms. Some of the Telecoms have been selling their products and telling people they could be exempt from 9-1-1 fees. They are delving into that aspect because some of the packages they are selling, mostly to businesses, and they are pursuing and tracking these down. It's a constant thing that John is working on.

CAD Public Safety Software Suite

There has been a lot of activity going on with the CAD recently. The final hurdle for funding comes on August 23, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. at the Miller Campus in the Karen/Gail Miller Conference Center. The UCA Board will have a meeting along with final approval. In the interim, the 9-1-1 Committee has met and they voted to approve the grant with about 5 different exceptions. This will cost anywhere between \$270k and \$300k with those exceptions. All along, one of the things John and Scott Freitag have proposed is that they are trying to hold up rules that are very out of date and standing behind those, it gives a great deal of subjectivity. One thing John discussed with David Church earlier is that the rules published under the Administrative Rules of Utah, Rule #174 says that the 9-1-1 Committee will allocate the funds. The law changed but they didn't change the rule. They don't allocate the funds, nor do they even have the legal authority to review the grants, but the 9-1-1 Division took it to them and on August 9th, they held a meeting and did not vote one way or the other. They forced an emergency meeting and forced a vote, which he will use as his recommendation to the Executive Director of UCA, which then follows the statute. John's objection to having that group look at this is that the Board now has vendors sitting on the Board. One of the vendors should be a co-chair by the state. It's an Advisory Board to look at what kinds of equipment should be had, all the minimum standards, dealing with interoperability from a strategic planning standpoint rather than an approval standpoint. The other side is they look at the CAD and they don't have the capacity to look and understand what the components of the CAD are. In their definitions, they define things such as "State" or "Board" but they don't identify what a core CAD function is. It becomes very subjective. Everyone individual that were polled on the meeting on August 9, 2016 said it was a great project and they showed support, but they had problems with some of the things included in the grant and didn't feel they were core CAD functions. John brought them National definitions of core CAD functions which included things such as Records Management, Field-Based Reporting, Mobile Data and other things, and they rejected these standards even though they haven't defined anything. This is the basis upon which they rejected some of these things. The next task is to go before the UCA Board to make a presentation and John is asking that there be as many members there as possible. They have heard John talk as to the reasons and rational but the effective thing is to have some of the users attend the meeting and have them tell Board members exactly what we need to say. John would love to see both Police and Fire there if possible. This will make a huge difference.

John showed the Board a presentation on the history of how it began 2 years ago. The purpose of the grant is to enhance public safety. The 9-1-1 committee excluded from the grant the training of Police Officers. We are all users of the CAD. He showed the Board the communities that are affected by the CAD. John identified the legislation that creates the CAD fund and explains how the funds should be used, and he was compliant with

the rules and the fund. Senator Harper wrote a letter to say that he has been kept abreast of the progress on this and that he fully supports the efforts we have and that it is congruent with the statute itself. Despite this, the 9-1-1 Committee chose to exclude certain items that they felt were non-dispatch operations things. They have drawn a line and built a wall between dispatching and the people in the field. John feels we are one continuous operation with dispatchers and field operators being the same. He really objects when the committee suggests removing the mobile function. Having the mobile data will allow the dispatchers to create a CAD record and people in the field can update that record. The project is \$13.2 million dollars, the total cost of everything they are buying. John is asking for \$6.5 million dollars. As he tries to look at the rational on a \$13.2 million dollar project to exclude another \$300K, when the match has already been met, and through negotiations, he has reduced the overall cost by almost \$5 million, he feels it is a bad time to start excluding things. All of the cities approved their budgets 30 days ago. To have to go back and have them ask for more doesn't make sense. Also, there is money in the fund that will sit there, unused. The Committee has to be carefully in allocating those funds. Recognizing they have mis-used funds in the past, they have committed to do a better job, which they must do, but they also must allocate those funds that have been allocated by the Legislature for a certain purpose. There was \$17 million dollars allocated for UCA and Public Safety backbone, and \$7 million was taken away in the last Legislative session to go to the Fair Park because there was no plan and no use. If we didn't do our project, in 3 years, there would be \$11 million sitting in this fund totally unused. No one else will be tapping into these funds in the next 3 years, but it will continue to grow. If the funds are used, there will still be \$5 million sitting there in the next 3 years, unused, with no anticipation on how it will be used. John feels he is making headway. He has Jake and some of the UCA Board members who are looking at this and making sure they are compliant. Also, the 9-1-1 Committee only makes a recommendation to UCA, and UCA will then make a final determination and take it to their Board.

The other thing the Committee is trying to do is apportion the cost of certain things. In the rules, it does say that core-cad functions will be fully reimbursed but the other add-ons such as RMS or Palentier, should be apportioned out based on cost. They don't define whether that cost is the total cost of the project or the marginal or increased cost for bringing someone in. The consultant that they are hiring costs \$330k, where this individual is basically living here 1/2 time. The increased cost of having officers in the same training and the dispatchers is negligible, or zero. The training materials are electronic, so there are no books and things to purchase. It's ridiculous to assume that will be apportioned out, with money sitting in the account that our citizens have paid into. John doesn't know how the UCA will deal with it, but he has asked for a heads up on anything they are doing so he has a chance to prepare a rebuttal. The UCA Board will make their final determination at the 25th meeting. This is why John would like everyone there to show that this is monumental for us and that the grant should be approved. The fact that they are standing behind flawed rules that are subjective and ambiguous, should not prevent us from moving ahead with our project. John has asked them to tell him which rule allows them to exclude certain things, and it is a nebulous subjective kind of things. At the 9-1-1 Committee meeting everyone said it was a great project and needed to move ahead, but people were uncomfortable or they felt it might be a violation of the interpretation of the rule. Even the strongest statement was yes, the rules are bad and they need to be re-written, but they need to stand behind them as they are right now. There is nothing in violation in this grant and as it was written, they were very cognizant of the fact that there would be some subjective interpretation, but very strict in complying with the rule itself.

The 9-1-1 Committee failed to make a recommendation in their meeting on the 9th, so they scheduled an emergency meeting on the 15th so they could take a vote and make a recommendations, and in listening to the transcripts, it sounds highly scripted and everybody voted the exact same way. The first vote was to approve it as written, and everyone voted no. The second vote was to approve it with the exceptions of the integration of things like Palentier and Polaris, which are very integral to the CAD. They disallowed Firehouse but they allowed other connections, which don't make any sense, and they excluded police from the training. They didn't put a dollar figure on this; they wanted the UCA Board to make a determination. John included the voting tally which is included in the Dropbox.

One thing we need to move forward on is the Project Implementation Team. John would like to either have volunteers or forced volunteers from people in our cities to sit on these teams. He has identified the tasks and roles, but he feels it's very important to have individuals represented from each department participating in the implementation. He doesn't anticipate that it will be very time consuming. It will be an orientation, making

sure that as we do the kick off, there are people assigned to help identify what the agencies and departments' needs are. The first four to six months will be an analysis of how we do business. John asked that within the next 2 weeks each agency send him a list of names. If everything looks well, we are looking at kicking everything off just after Labor Day, to bring the Hexagon people in and start to get things going.

John mentioned that Hexagon is looking for some upfront payment as they begin a task. He is saying that he will pay them as soon as they complete a task. He'll pay for the software and shipping up front, but he wants to see it implemented and tested and then if it's accepted, he'll pay. They have tentatively agreed to this but he doesn't have it in writing quite yet. Because this is off the shelf, they will bring it to us but they will allow us to customize it based on what we believe are priorities.

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

There was no new business to discuss or add to the next meeting.

Roundtable Discussion

Kyle Kershaw mentioned an email that went out regarding the audit. He wanted to make sure that John was not waiting for any responses. John sent it to everyone because they will be the recipient of the audit. If there is any knowledge of anything, they should be able to communicate with the auditor and reveal anything they may have become aware of.

John would like to hold a Budget Committee meeting sometime in September. It's a little early but he believes there are some financial things to deal with, such as the Interlocal Agreement to look at the E9-1-1 funds; he would like to get on this early. If there are suggestions from anyone not on the committee who would like to be, or a suggested date, please get with John. He will send out a few dates and times and confirm this.

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 7, at 11:00 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at 2:36 p.m.