



CAD Meeting Minutes

August 2nd, 2016

Valley Emergency Communications Center



Committee Members	Representing	P/BR/E/A
Melanie Crittenden	Mountainland Association	BR
Scott Freitag	Salt Lake County	P
Justin Grenier	Five County Association	BR
Karl Kuehn	Davis County Layton PD	BR
Peter Kuhlmann	Washington County	BR
Deborah Mecham	Utah County	BR
Barry Horsley	South East Association	A
Regina Nelson	Wasatch Front Regional Council	BR
Shelley Peterson	Bear River Association	BR
Kathy Quarnberg	Six County Association of Governments	BR
Laonna Davis	Uintah Basin Association	A
Kevin Rose	Weber County	BR
Doug McCleve	Urban DPS	BR

Staff Members	Representing	Y/BR/E/A
Kevin Bolander	Attorney General's Office	A
Gordon Coles	Statewide Interoperability Coordinator	A
Jake Hunt	UCA	P
Shawn Messinger	UCA	E
Eric Parry	UCA	P
Andrew Pollock	UCA/HEB Solutions	P

<u>General Attendees</u>	<u>Representing</u>
John Inch Morgan	VECC
Mark Whetsel	VECC

<u>General Attendees on Bridge</u>	<u>Representing</u>
David Church	VECC

1. Grant Applications

1.1 VECC/Salt Lake City – CAD Funding Presentation – John Inch Morgan and Scot Freitag

took questions concerning their CAD Grant Application from the Advisory Committee members. The questions and responses are summarized as follows:

- 1.1.1 **Deb Mecham** had requested more detail concerning the quote from Hexagon. After a brief discussion, it was determined that the numbers from the Hexagon quote were those used in the grant application. **John** went on to indicate that there were three columns added on the right hand side of the quote spreadsheet to who ineligible items.
- 1.1.2 **Justin Grenier** raised concerns about the Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) that was distributed prior to this meeting. The issue was with regard to what should not be disclosed as most of our documents have already been discussed at our open meeting as well as posted to the UCA and Public Notice websites. The advice provided by **John** was that until negotiations with Hexagon have been finalized, details of the application should not be discussed outside of the Committee.
- 1.1.3 **Karl Kuehn** referred to the table on page two of the Grant Application. He noted that he had gone through the application and found a discrepancy in the costs of eligible items and what was shown in the table. The amounts shown for Software were higher in the table than the applicable amounts in the application. **John** explained that the number shown in the table also included the first year warranty and covers the first year of CAD

software. He also stated that Hexagon refers to software support in year one as warranty, and years two and three as maintenance. **Karl** requested a breakdown of warranty versus maintenance. **Karl** also asked for clarification on the 20% grant match which is shown in the table as \$1.34M. The Rule says that a flat 20% across the board grant is required. After a brief discussion, it was suggested that the CAD Rules have areas that are subjective and need to be revised. **John** has this matter noted and will respond at the meeting on the 9th.

Karl had another question concerning the Mobile Public Safety (MPS) training, and who would be eligible for attending this training. **John** reported that everyone will be taking this training as it is part of the core CAD.

Karl had a question with regard to I/Dispatcher and I/Calltaker licenses. He noted that this is a large line item at 111 workstation licenses and asked if the licenses were concurrent users, or is it hardware, and how the numbers were determined. **John** responded that they are concurrent licenses, and were determined by a worst-case scenario where they would need 140 call takers and dispatchers on duty at the same time. **John** to verify the numbers for the meeting on the 9th.

- 1.1.4 Peter Kuhlman** wished to make an observation concerning that we should be issuing grants on a first-come, first served basis, and that we set a grant request period which would allow us to competitively review what PSAPs were going to ask for. We should be looking at multiple agency requests at the same time, and not on a one at a time basis. **John** commented that the statute allows the Division to be doing this as part of their long range strategic plan. It was noted that the processes are being further developed to ensure that PSAPs understand how the grant application process works. **John** also pointed out that the draw for their CAD project will not drain the account every year, that there will be funds left over for other CAD related projects.
- 1.1.5 Deb Mecham** asked about the Interface/Communications Server section on page 12 of the application, and the interfaces to the state Pawn database as well as other systems. **Mark Whetsel** explained that I/Informer is the Hexagon equivalent of the Spillman State Link interface. I/Informer handles all interfaces between the CAD and all other databases through the I/Informer server. This allows dispatchers to query the various databases to determine if items are stolen, etc. **Deb** also had a question regarding the Edge Frontier interfaces shown on page 13 of the application. She thought that they may not be related to a dispatch function. **Scott** commented that if the information is being drawn from CAD for a specific purpose, then it could be looked at as the interface is necessary for the respective reporting tools. She pointed out that any fire or EMS agency associated to her PSAP that wants this kind of interface is responsible for covering its costs as it is not necessarily a dispatch function. **John** pointed out that in the current rules, these types of interfaces are eligible for funding. **Deb** had another question concerning Professional services on page 21 of the application, and in particular, why certain project management services were included and others were not included. **John** responded that this was another example of where the Rules become subjective and open to interpretation, and should be reviewed. **Deb** asked about the Technology sections on pages 24 and 25, and whether or not all hardware costs such as servers are included in the grant. **John** explained that it is important to understand that servers may be running and supporting more than one function. **Mark** added that things will be running in a virtual environment, and that have tried to separate the RMS functionality from the other functions.
- 1.1.6 Regina Nelson** had a question regarding the core CAD components and interfaces similar to **Deb's** question. Two years ago North Tooele FD wanted to interface Firehouse to her Spillman CAD. She got an interface quote from Spillman, and it never crossed her mind that that cost could be reimbursed. She also indicated that the exact same information could be provided to them in a daily report, but that they wanted additional CAD information that the interface provides. She did the same thing for her ambulance service. Her concern is that she has 13 fire agencies that could come before us with interface funding requests. **Scott** responded that in their case, they went out for two bids –

one for individual agency interfaces, and another for interfaces to common police, fire, and EMS RMS systems. Any agency that wants their own interface to their own system pays for it.

- 1.1.7 **Shelley Peterson** commented that the cost of the overall project appears to be disproportionate to the actual CAD part of it as the application includes other items such as interfaces and training costs. She went on to state that they do not have their dispatchers trained on the mobile device, or the officers trained on the CAD system. **Scott** responded at for their PSAP, those components were needed and that is why they were included. John also commented that San Diego paid \$6M for their Hexagon CAD system, but that it was only for a police function.
- 1.1.8 **Kathy Quarnberg** asked if each PSAP paid the 20% match or just one. **John** responded that collectively they are paying 20%. She also asked about the three-year commitment to fund this project, and the fact that there is no guarantee that the money will come in, and how that would affect bonding. **John** responded that if the UCA decides not to bond, that they would have to get a backup plan or the project could not go forward.
- 1.1.9 **Kevin Rose** commented that the Polaris interface is going away. John to check into that and report back to the meeting on the 9th.
- 1.1.10 **Doug McCleve** commented that his knowledge on some of the issues addressed at this meeting is limited. He went on to state that this is an amazing project and that **John** and **Scott** have done a great job in pulling this all together. He also commented that this is bigger than anything else that has come before us, and that he wondered if this might prohibit other projects that may come before the Committee. **John** assured him that it would not. **Doug** also pointed out that others will look at this project and conclude that if Salt Lake County could do this, perhaps it can be done in other parts of the state. He also commented that, like law enforcement, there are opportunities to exercise discretion in the application of polices, rules, and laws, and that what we are attempting to do should be no different.
- 1.1.11 **Melanie Crittenden** expressed her appreciation for all that has been done so far, and all the comments and questions that have been raised. She went on to state that it is important for all of us to do our due diligence in thoroughly reviewing the grant application against our current Rules, and deciding if they need to be changed. It will set a precedent and will open doors for others to come along with similar requests.

2. Committee Business

N/A

3. Round Table

Justin reiterated his concerns over the interpretation of the Rules and the comments relating to the subjectivity of certain elements of the Rules, and the precedents that could be set.

Karl thanked **John** and **Scott** in their efforts and for answering our questions.

Regina thanked everyone for the hard work.

Kathy Quarnberg wished to echo Melanie's comments and kudos to John and Scott for all the hard work they put into it.

4. Public Comment

N/A

5. Next Scheduled Regular Meeting: Tuesday, August 9th, 2016 @1300 MDT, Valley Emergency Communications Center, 5360 S Ridge Village Drive, West Valley City, Utah 84118-4100.

6. Motion to Adjourn - A motion to adjourn the meeting was made at 11:04 MDT by **Melanie Crittenden**, seconded by **Deb Mecham**. The motion carried with voting recorded as follows:

		Present		Vote		
Member	Representing	In Person	Bridge	Yea	Nay	Abst

Melanie Crittenden	Mountainland Association		X	X		
Scott Freitag	Salt Lake County	X		X		
Justin Grenier	Five County Association		X	X		
Karl Kuehn	Davis County Layton PD		X	X		
Peter Kuhlmann	Washington County		X	X		
Deborah Mecham	Utah County		X	X		
Barry Horsley	South East Association					
Regina Nelson	Wasatch Front Regional Council		X	X		
Shelley Peterson	Bear River Association		X	X		
Kathy Quarnberg	Six County Association of Governments		X	X		
Laonna Davis	Uintah Basin Association					
Kevin Rose	Weber County		X	X		
Doug McCleve	Urban DPS		X	X		