

The Meeting of the Utah Communications Authority's PSAP Advisory Committee
Thursday, June 11, 2020 1:00 P.M
Meeting Location: Telephone Conference Bridge

Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 11, 2020

BOARD PRESENT-FROM ROLL CALL

Justin Grenier
Neil Johnson
Karl Kuehn
Beth Todd
Jack Walkenhorst
Alicia Gleave
Travis Trotta
Kevin Rose
Shelley Peterson

BOARD ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

Babbi Hill, Administrative Assistant
Melanie Crittenden

OTHERS PRESENT

Kordine Nelson
Megan Ramsay
Joe Faiola
Kathy Quarnberg
Bryan Low
Regina Nelson

1. WELCOME

Meeting was started by Chairman Justin Grenier

2. ROLL CALL

Shelley Peterson-Present

Justin Grenier-Present

Neil Johnson-Present

Karl Kuehn-Present

Beth Todd-Present

Jack Walkenhorst-Present

Alicia Gleave-Present

Kevin Rose-Present

Travis Trotta-Present

3. MOTION TO ACCEPT MINUTES FROM MAY 5TH, 2020 PSAP ADVISORY

BOARD MEETING NOTES

Motion: Neil Johnson moved to accept the minutes

Second: Beth Todd

Vote: The motion passed with all in favor.

4. UTAH STATE 911 CALL TRANSFER PROTOCOL

Justin Grenier: We were directed to come up with the Utah State 911 Call Transfer Protocol. Karl took on the effort and collected recommendations and created a draft. The draft was approved in the last meeting. I was later contacted by Tina Mathieu and Scott Ruff with some concerns that they already had defined protocols and felt that the proposed protocol would force them to change their procedures. They felt it would be better to have less specificity. Whatever we end up recommending to the board, we need to ensure we are reducing the number of 911 transfers.

Scott Ruff: My biggest concern is that those of us who have protocols in place, this may not be necessary. Can we shorten in up and bring it in line with what was required by the statute and allow for more flexibility for the PSAPs. I was concerned that we were digging too far into the weeds. Let's leave flexibility for PSAPs to decide how they are going to do this.

Tina Mathieu: I apologize I was late in providing feedback on this. I sent out an email to PSAP managers explaining out concerns and suggestions. It

would allow PSAPs to have their own caller interrogation policy and let them work with the neighbors to reduce transfers.

Justin Grenier: I think more weight should be given to those PSAPs who are having issues with transfers. Does anyone have any thoughts or comments?

Neil Johnson: We did vote in our last meeting to accept the call transfer protocol. What do we need to do to reverse that? I do like this new draft.

Travis Trotta: The state PSAPs are open to this. We like the new version it has a lot of flexibility. I don't think we should move forward with the original version and look at what needs to be put into it.

Justin Grenier: I think we just need to get our call transfers down.

Shelley Peterson: I do like the streamline of the new version and think it is less complicated and support it.

Alicia Gleave: I think there is a possibility to make a version with parts of both. The issue I have with the new version is that it says "immediately transferred".

Scott Ruff: That was a non-contiguous part of the protocol because they may not know the street addresses and it would be quicker for the non-contiguous jurisdiction to just transfer the call. We're not going to completely stop transferring calls.

Alicia Gleave: I appreciate that but with that being said, if we start differentiating between contiguous and non-contiguous then we would need to define what that means.

Scott Ruff: This is a twofold issue and it will start getting muddy if you get too in the weeds.

Tina Mathieu: I don't believe there is a legislator who cares how we do, just that we reduce out transfer rates.

Karl Kuehn: There are somethings in the new version that I feel are missing. There is no option for doing a radio relay which appears to take away an option to work with their neighbors. It's either you have a CAD to CAD or you transfer the call. Pre-arrival requirements were taken out and I have a concern with that. If I am taking a call for another jurisdiction I should be giving pre-arrival instructions as a minimum standard.

The receipt requirement for CAD to CAD which I think is dangerous. I think that since this is a minimum standard, I don't know how it would restrict an agency who is going above that with their own policy. I don't think the first option would replace their own policy if it exceeds the minimum requirement. I don't like etcetera at the end of the standard.

Tina Mathieu: Could we talk about these issues now? Statute says that we have to adopt and use this protocol.

Karl Kuehn: Both of them are written with the word minimum. It doesn't say anything about order or prohibit other questions being asked. We could specify that if necessary.

Tina Mathieu: Let's say I have a call taker who takes the call and didn't follow the protocol. How could this call taker be written up for violating one policy but not another?

Karl Kuehn: You say that your interrogation standards are more robust than this. If that is the case, how would it supersede your policy?

Tina Mathieu: If I adopt it then I have two policies that cover the same thing but are different. The statutes doesn't say anything about caller interrogation, just call transfers and CAD to CAD. I think we are too far into the weeds. We're adding more to it then is required. Perhaps minimum caller interrogation standards should be in the minimum standards.

Karl Kuehn: I strongly disagree that the two would conflict.

Shelley Peterson: Do you see that just the existence of two different procedures would cause confusion.

Karl Kuehn: I disagree, this is a minimum.

Shelley Peterson: But call processing is much more intricate. It leaves holes.

Karl Kuehn: There is nothing saying you can't add additional questions.

Scott Ruff: I think we're way into the weeds. We are micromanaging this to a problem that is related to call taking procedures. If we are requiring POST and BEMS certifications, why are we having this discussion? I'm going to defer to the committee. I feel like we're getting set up to fail.

Tina Mathieu: The statute says "have adopted and be using the 911 transfer and CAD to CAD protocol".

Justin Grenier: The impression I'm getting is we need to get an agreement on what the final protocol looks like. Is there anyone else that wants to speak on this?

Not hearing any, here is my idea. Starting with option 2, Beth would you be OK with taking some of the elements of Karl's concerns and put it into the second version and bring it back? Anyone opposed to that?

Karl Kuehn: I would not be opposed to that.

Beth Todd: It puts me in a hot seat when Scott says VECC is out of it until we get a final version. I am not opposed to it as long as I am allowed to.

Neil Johnson: Perhaps we set a work meeting and do it as a group and work through it.

Motion: Table the previous motion on the Utah State 911 Call Transfer Protocol/Procedure and have a new motion to consider the VECC/SLC/Weber "Option 2" proposal or an amalgamation of "Option 1" and "Option 2" which will be managed by board member Beth Rodd with VECC.

Made by: Travis Trotta.

Second: Neil Johnson

Motion passed with the following vote:

Shelley Peterson- Yea
Justin Grenier- Yea
Neil Johnson- Yea
Karl Kuehn- Not Present
Beth Todd- Yea
Jack Walkenhorst- Yea
Alicia Gleave- Yea
Kevin Rose- Not Present
Travis Trotta- Yea

5. NEXT MEETING

Next meeting on July 16th at 1300 hours

6. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment

7. MOTION TO ADJOURN

Motion: Beth Todd
Second: Travis Trotta
Vote: No vote taken
Meeting Adjourned