PSAP Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Federal Engineering Console Allocation Study | November 13, 2026 | Virtual meeting (recorded) | Recording duration: 1 hour, 36 minutes, 25 seconds

DRAFT — Subject to committee review.

Meeting leadership and participants

- Chair: Lisa Kehoe, SLC911. Federal Engineering representatives: Tracy Ward, Courtney Doberstein, and project manager Donald Doepke.
- Additional participants identified in the transcript: Kevin Rose — Executive Director, Weber 911; Amie MacArt — invited nominee for fifth/sixth class representation; Walter "Wally" Perschon; Kordine Nelson — Price Communication Center; Becky Lougee; and Ivan Whitaker.
- Melanie Crittenden confirmed that recording/transcription was operating and stated she would not participate in the meeting.

Opening and procedural matters

- Quorum and Committee Business: A quorum was not established. Approval of the October 20, 2026, meeting minutes was deferred. The meeting proceeded as an informational discussion with Federal Engineering regarding the statewide console allocation study. No formal committee motions or votes were recorded.
- Federal Engineering explained its engagement to develop a consistent, data-driven, transparent and defensible methodology for determining console allocations across Utah PSAPs. The consultants stressed that operational context must complement quantitative data.

Current allocation process and transparency

- Participants described uncertainty regarding how console utilization, workload, staffing, growth, technical feasibility, system capacity, and funding are weighted in allocation decisions. Several requested a published framework that PSAPs can apply before submitting requests.
- The 2020 console replacement baseline was discussed as a potentially uneven starting point. Participants cited differences in historical allocation and unclear explanations for some reductions.
- Members cited Bountiful, Springville, and Richfield as examples of allocation requests or concerns that highlighted the need for clearer criteria and communication. The accounts presented were participant descriptions, not independent findings.

Operational need versus average utilization

- Speakers emphasized that low average console use does not establish lack of operational need. Examples included active assailant incidents, major protests, isolated radio channels, training positions used for surge capacity, supervisory/QA positions, and other uncommon but high-impact events.

- The methodology should reflect work performed after calls are answered, CAD-to-CAD transfers, dispatch responsibilities, busy-hour conditions, simultaneous events, and periods when personnel make do with insufficient positions.
- The committee discussed establishing a reasonable minimum and surge/contingency capacity that may differ across centers. Geographic isolation and access to backup facilities were particularly relevant for rural PSAPs.

Primary, secondary, and specialized dispatch centers

- Participants urged consideration of secondary dispatch centers, including airport, university, and state dispatch operations, whose responsibilities may not be reflected by primary 911 call counts.
- The discussion distinguished the operational need to allocate console capacity from the separate legal or financial question of which positions UCA may fund. Legislative constraints were raised but not resolved.

Funding, system capacity, and future growth

- Members discussed finite UCA funding and statewide radio-system core capacity. They distinguished UCA-funded essential positions from locally funded supplemental positions, while noting that both can affect core capacity.
- Participants requested forward-looking capacity thresholds, projected population and workload growth, periodic re-baselining, and consideration of consolidation and lifecycle replacement.
- The group supported retaining statewide coordination, standardization, and predictable infrastructure planning while accommodating justified local differences.

Fairness, exceptions, and advisory committee role

- Participants generally favored objective, transparent criteria with an avenue to explain unusual circumstances or appeal formula outcomes.
- Views differed on the committee's routine role: some favored limiting its involvement when a clear formula resolves ordinary requests; others emphasized maintaining meaningful PSAP representation, especially for exceptions and contested cases. No formal decision was recorded.
- The importance of explaining the reasoning for decisions, particularly when UCA Board action differs from advisory committee recommendations, was emphasized.

Data quality and proposed methodology

- Concerns included limitations of average utilization, busy-hour and session data, and differing data sources and reporting capabilities. Participants discussed whether a practical calculation tool could let centers evaluate requests before applying.
- Federal Engineering stated that it had collected baseline data from one PSAP to help test a prospective formula, rather than undertaking a full statewide staffing study. The consultants cautioned that no single formula would capture every operational difference and anticipated a need for exceptions and later review.

Stakeholder engagement and study scope

- Chair Kehoe urged Federal Engineering to hear directly from a broader range of PSAPs and, where feasible, police, fire, and emergency management leadership. Others supported regional or individual conversations to allow candid input and reduce the risk of quieter centers being overlooked.
- Federal Engineering said it had not initially anticipated additional PSAP meetings. Tracy Ward and Courtney Doberstein agreed to discuss broader engagement internally, noting project-hour constraints and that additional work could extend the study timeline. No specific outreach plan or deadline was committed to during the meeting.

Follow-up items and status

- Federal Engineering: review discussion themes, baseline data, and possible formula approaches; consider how to obtain broader PSAP input. These were described as intended next steps, not a formally adopted action schedule.
- Federal Engineering: discuss internally whether additional individual or regional engagement can be accommodated within project scope; no due date stated.
- PSAP Advisory Committee: consider the proposed methodology and any future recommendations when Federal Engineering provides further material.
- October 20 minutes: approval deferred pending a meeting at which quorum can be established.

Adjournment

- Conclusion: Following the discussion and identification of follow-up items, the meeting concluded without a formal motion to adjourn.