



---

**State of Vermont**  
**Department of Public Safety**  
45 State Drive  
Waterbury, Vermont 05671-1300  
<http://dps.vermont.gov/>

Regional Dispatch Working Group Agenda

Date: August 17, 2022

Time: 8:30-10:00 EST (Recorded)

NOTE: These are summarized notes as the meeting was recorded and can be reviewed by interest parties for specific information.

1. Call to Order - 8:32 am

Regional Dispatch Working Group Members present:

- Paul White
- Brian Peete
- Lance Burnham
- Anthony Cambridge
- Robert Schalacher
- Mark Anderson
- Barbara Neal
- Jack Helm
- Karen Karr
- Trevor Whipple

Admin Support/Invited Speakers present:

- Terry LaValley

Members of the Public present:

- Stephen Whitaker

Regional Dispatch Working Group Members absent:

- George Merkel

2. Approval of Agenda

8/03/2022 & 8/10/2022 Agendas approved by the group.

Motion to approve previous minutes: Lance Burnham, Second by Peete. Approved.

3. Internal Reminder to Group: Review of documents provided by Barb Neal: Documents have been uploaded to the website under resources: <https://dps.vermont.gov/committees-boards/dispatch/resources>
4. Terry LaValley was invited to provide input and information to the working group: Discussed State Communication systems capabilities (weak points and strong points) Several questions by both members and Mr. Whitaker were asked of Mr. LaValley.



## 5. Next steps

Captain Burnham informed the group that he met w/ Grafton County Sheriff Jeff Steigler and discussed communications centers in New Hampshire: whether they happened organically or legislatively. He was informed they occurred organically as it all landed in laps of sheriffs (legislation was not involved, it was a community push). Standard level of service: They do what VT does (training is same using APCO standard). They also have recommended staffing levels and are not short dispatchers. Pay is standard to what we have, but they have a lot of Senior Dispatchers: brand new from 1-3 years and others upwards to 30years. Funding mechanisms were through taxation: each center 10 of 12 have regionalized centers has governance board three people elected in counties (meet annually to review data, calls for service and come up with recommended funding costs). This appears consistent throughout the years and decide what costs per call are (these people are called commissioners). Lance does not know if it will work here. Sheriff believed it was a good way for VT to go based on continuity of service. Asked an approximate value, Littleton NH pays total of approx. 200k annual for all services: only funding is municipal appropriations with no state funding.

Barbara Neal: Still owes group a map of layers for dispatch, hopefully for next meeting.

Mark Anderson has Hanover NH formula and can share. The formula is similar to Lamoille but does three-year call volume. The funding can be potentially projected to allow for future planning.

Paul proposed a list of things to discuss in event Terry's discussion didn't last the entire meeting. Barbara Neal stated she could Invite Clay Pervus (director of Communication at public service department). Clay can come next week, and Paul agreed: he will be invited for next week. Paul prosed/asked several questions to the group regarding thoughts on next step and discussion points to consider.

Other topics raised by Paul were: Group was in agreement with having uniform protocols: Recommended conversation for a future study due to complex nature..

Level of service should be same for all agencies dispatched for. Same priority and quality of service. and a standard of professionalism.

Regional centers should all utilize same hardware/equipment. It was recommended to have a review of current existing infrastructure to make sure needs are correct and that should be a goal for discussion as regional centers begin standing up.

Agencies should not supplement their budgets with monies from other locales. Funding formulas should be the same. It was discussed to consider developing a formula that is based on factors, and emphasized that however the formula is decided, it should be the same across the state to ensure fairness and equity.

It was discussed whether Dispatch communications services are best serviced by agencies which are closer to the locales they dispatch for.

Grant funds should not be awarded until there is a knowing of what is needed statewide, and that any projects that begin have capability to meet anticipated growth in volume, redundancy, and technology. There was discussion that an extension of current state grant deadline would help in making sure the grant applicants can meet any unknowns that will be addressed by this committee. There was discussion of giving out money prior to working group writing its report.



It was discussed that some existing dispatch centers are working fine, and what (if any) recommendation from this group should be made to those centers: will the group provide recommendations only to new regional centers, or to all. There are unknown needs around the state, some working fine or appear to be on the surface.

It was discussed that the report be written at a “high-level writing”: Which priorities must be addressed by the state, and having those (potentially consultants) provide technical expertise to assist the state in accomplishing those priorities.

It was discussed that there are handful of agencies not on people’s list (e.g., Capitol PD, UVM, several Sheriff Departments, and some parttime police department and constables, etc.) and that the group not to forget about them.

#### 6. Solicit for public comment

Stephen Whitaker discussed capital costs, LMR and LTE, and statewide inventory. Opined the group does not have time for a consultant.

#### 7. Adjourned:0957. Motion by Peete, seconded by Lance.

