Audet, Cally started transcription

- Neal, Barbara 0:12 NB Uh, Jen.
- **Mike** 0:12 Here.
- Neal, Barbara 0:13 Thank you, Mike. Jen Morrison.
- Morrison, Jennifer 0:15 MJ Gen Morrisons here.
- NB Neal, Barbara 0:18 In Jim Mack.
- James Mack 0:20 Here.
- NB Neal, Barbara 0:22 OK.

611972A CINIS is not an official document) And that appears to be all of the task force members. At this point, what I hear somebody else coming in. OK.

- **2c545d13-3735-4141-915d-0b867896602c** 0:33 But.
- Neal, Barbara 0:33 Umm, so also joining us also joining us today is Kelly Audette as our administrative support and our project management team from Telev, Rick and Dom, welcome.

- DA Dominick Arcuri 0:47 Hello.
- Neal, Barbara 0:48

 Hi. And we have a Phil, Phil Sisk and Steve Baggio from mission critical with us as well.
- Rick Burke 0:50 Morning.
- Neal, Barbara 0:59
 I think I have all the mission critical folks.
 Umm.

So several members of the public uh are also joining us.

If you would please introduce yourself and any affiliation that you care to share when I call your name, Senator Renner, let's start with you.

- Hi, good morning.

 Senator Renner Chittenden NI serve on the Joint Information Technology Oversight committee.
- Neal, Barbara 1:26

 Nice to see you.

 Umm.

 I'll I'll note to Cali that that Ron Kummetz has joined.
- Iw Irene Wrenner 1:28 Is there?
- NB Neal, Barbara 1:31
 Good morning, Ron.

- RK Ron Kumetz 1:34 Good morning.
- NB Neal, Barbara 1:35 Morning. OK.

Uh, moving on now to Mark Anderson.

- official document) Am Anderson, Mark 1:42 Morning Mark Anderson, Windham County Sheriff.
- NB Neal, Barbara 1:45 Nice to see you and write Ryan Palmer.
- Anderson, Mark 1:46 Likewise.
- Palmer, Ryan 1:50 Right. Ryan Palmer, Windsor County Sheriff you.
- NB Neal, Barbara 1:53 Good morning. And let's see, we have one meeting guest. There's no other name identified. Steven, is that you?
- **2c545d13-3735-4141-915d-0b867896602c** 2:03 Hey, yes, it is Steven Whittaker.
- NB Neal, Barbara 2:06 Good morning. Steven, I think that I have called on everyone, so we will move on to approval of the agenda.

The agenda was distributed to Task Force members by email.

It is also available on our web page do Task force members have any changes to the agenda for today?

OK, hearing nothing will consider the agenda approved and we will move on to approval of the Minutes.

- Steve Badgio 2:33 Hello.
- Mir Mir NB Neal, Barbara 2:38 These would be the minutes from the June 5th meeting. Regular meeting #27. Are there any changes needed to these minutes?
- SB Steve Badgio 2:46 Thanks.
- NB Neal, Barbara 2:52 Alrighty, is there a motion to approve the Minutes from June 5th? E61912A
- Mike 2:56 So moved.
- RK Ron Kumetz 2:5 We'll make a motion to move.
- James Mack 2:57 Thank you. Saying.
- NB Neal, Barbara 3:00 OK.

Kelly just sort all that out.

Any discussion?

And all in favor of a all in favor of approving the minutes from June 5th.

Please raise your hand or indicate by saying aye. I see all of the task force hands are up, including Ron.

- Ron Kumetz 3:16 Ι.
- James Mack 3:18 Umm.
- **Mike** 3:19 Right.
- Neal, Barbara 3:20 Thank you.

official document The Minutes from June 5th are approved, so let's move to public comment. UM, we're going to allow about 10 minutes in total for public comment. So let me just call on our guests and see if anyone wishes to comment. Senator Renner, do you have anything to add this morning or to share?

- **Irene Wrenner** 3:43 I'm here to listen. Thank you.
- NB Neal, Barbara OK. Thank you, Mark Anderson.
- Am Anderson, Mark 3:50 All good morning. Thanks for the time.

I apologize that I have not been as involved in this task force as I was originally in the overall regional communications process, but I had other things to do anyways. I'm connecting back now to find out kind of what the direction or plan is and understand.

I understand there's 20 million.

For the regionalized dispatching, I'm not sure if this is.

Planning towards regional centers such as mine, or if it's the state taking it over or if it's the state establishing infrastructure, that regional centers such as mine would operate.

And I just wanna make sure that, umm, all factors are considered for what we're doing.

- Neal, Barbara 4:41 OK and.
- Am Anderson, Mark 4:41 It's kind of a question, but kind of statement.
- official document Neal, Barbara 4:44 As you as you listen in today, if you still have questions at the end, feel free to reach out to me or Jen Morrison and we can fill in any blanks that might might remain OK.
- Anderson, Mark 4:57 Great. I appreciate it.
- NB Neal, Barbara 5:00 Umm.

OK.

Ryan Plummer, would you like to share any comments this morning?

Palmer, Ryan 5:09 No, I'm just here a little bit to learn.

> I have a radio infrastructure project that I'm working on and we'd be interested in being more involved in the task force and potentially sounds like you have some guidance and expertise you could share, maybe with some integration.

I think you're researching a little bit the integration of the LTE.

Uh, and and into the radio network stuff.

So very interested, just kind of here and and talk and maybe get some guidance.



NB Neal, Barbara 5:43

OK, great.

Well, thanks for joining us.

Same offer to you if you have unanswered questions at the end.

UM, please let us know.

Kelly, I see Paul.

Whites joined us.

Good morning, Paul.

Hey, we're just at public comment, Paul, and I will move on now to Steven Whittaker.





2c545d13-3735-4141-915d-0b867896602c 6:06 ATT OFFICE PARTY OF THE PART I'm gonna again keep hammering on the points that I've made that have not been addressed, that lacking in architecture.

We have no way to credibly review whether the 9 million in congressionally directed spending is being used to support regional transition to regional statewide emergency calling, so the television to, you know, report last week, which you refused to take public comment afterwards.

Basically, rubber stamped it as all you know, foundational to regional dispatch, but absent an architecture that uh, documents and commits to, allowing regional systems to utilize the state's infrastructure, that's that's a policy the the state's infrastructure is its own and it does not have the channels or the bandwidth.

Uh to allow regional systems to cross talk over it for multiple simultaneously regional responses.

Uh, the design of whether or not we're gonna have a statewide trunk system is gonna take at least a year.

Uh, meanwhile, we've got various projects.

Brandon got a earmark.

Or congressionally directed spending earmark.

Windsor County got one.

Washington County is pursuing one, but telling me it was the contractor.

That rubber stamped that lack of a plan.

And they did no analysis of a trunk system.

So we have a sheriff in when in Washington County that also needs radio infrastructure and we have no LTE integration.

So the LTE integration is essential if anyone has paid attention to the 10 year telecom plan draft.

Despite its shortcomings, it perceives this task force as being nothing more than talking about consolidating peace apps.

It has no concept, and yet this effort, entire effort, should be a full chapter, a detailed chapter including the microwave, just including the architecture in the 10 year telecom plan, and it's missing.

So that's primarily the obligation and the negligence of the Department of Public Service, but the fact that they don't really know what you're doing.

And that it's just been perceived as a consolidation of peace apps is is very troubling. But we do need interim standards.

We need guidance.

We really need a pilot project to test the cost effectiveness of integrated planning for LTE MLR simultaneously to share towers, to share fiber backhaul to share generators.

We've got the the peak in history, the peak hurricane season coming at us.

We've got solar maximum next year, which just, you know, could reach absolute havoc with all this and we've done no planning for this.

So this idea that we're going to plan for a year out or two years out in a you know \$400 million wish list rather than do immediate resiliency planning and immediate proof of concept for integrated planning for LMR and LTE.

Leads me to, you know, continue to insist that you're off course, that you're not taking the reins of this thing.

You're letting the two chairs drive the concept, and they're trying to cover for themselves, spending the 9,000,000 on the department rather than on the regional systems.

The regional systems should be using that 9,000,000 even if the state has to continue to own it.

It could be used on towers generators.

Uh, all kinds of infrastructure that the state could own, but that would strengthen and accelerate these regional systems, even LTE, a small cells to complete a canopy

and prove the economics of that concept.

So that's a lot, but I'm gonna not let you hear the end of it until you get back on course, you know.

Thanks.



NB Neal, Barbara 10:19

Thank you for your comments Steven.

Umm, just be sure I didn't miss anyone.

Is there anybody else wishing to make public comment?

OK.

I think we're good then and we'll move on to project updates.

I'll hand it over to Dom from Tel Aviv.



Dominick Arcuri 10:41

Thank you, Barb, and good morning everyone.

an official document Over the last couple of weeks, we've been busy primarily working on the data collection piece, which is our primary activity for for this month here.

And if you saw the status report, you'll see that the where we stand on that, we're going to plan on updating that on a regular basis.

There are, I believe it's 43, maybe 44 dispatch centers that we sent the data collection questionnaire to.

Of those we, MCP has reached out specifically to eighteen of those.

And and those are strictly, they've reached out to those where they hadn't received any type of confirmation. No.

Of the receipt of the questionnaire previously.

So they did reach out to them.

There were other additional centers and other six that were contacted via via phone and a message left, and as of Friday and I'll all these numbers were as of last Friday, we had received one questionnaire, one returned completed questionnaire from Red Phones, Mad River.

So they get the they get the award for being the first one to uh to provide a completed questionnaire.

So so that activity is still ongoing.

We have set a week from Friday or June 28th or the date to return the questionnaires, so we'll be continuing to focus on that and assisting dispatch centers as best we can.

Ohh now once once I'm done, if I don't know if Phil has any updates on those I'm numbers but I'll I'll let him chime in at at if he does.

Also, we did provide our television recommendations of the cropped grants proposed projects last the last time we were together and since then we had have provided the recommendations specifically to DPS and there were some of those recommendations that good potentially affect the.

Ongoing system planning project.

We specifically forwarded those to MCP as well so that they can document the projects, focus on dispatch improvements to see if they are potentially applicable statewide and ranch.

And I have had those discussions.

Also, we completed the July or I'm sorry, the June stakeholder update and that was distributed.

We also reviewed and updated our dispatch agency and contact list, specifically focused on the Sheriff's Department.

And I notice we have a couple of sheriffs on the phone today.

Glad you could join us, but we notice in our dispatch center list and not all 14 sheriff's offices were no.

We're listed as to how they were dispatched, so we did review those and updated that as best we can, and that'll be a an item certainly to coordinate and to update as MCP as they're on site meetings and does their interviews.

Uh, speak.

Speaking of that, that is an ongoing activity that another activity MCP is focusing on developing their schedule for the on site meetings with the dispatch centers and also on the wireless systems side, I did get a chance to speak with Scott Neil with MCP earlier this week.

They are also putting together their plans and schedule for being on site and collecting infrastructure data regarding the wireless systems and facilities etcetera. So things are going along to plan and remain on schedule.

And so for next, you know, for next time we hope to be to have all our data questionnaires back and begin, you know, the initial analysis and identifying of gaps in those areas.

That's what I have.

Thank you.

NB Neal, Barbara 15:25

Thank you, Dom.

And did you wanna pass it over to Phil?

Do you have anything to to add?

Phillip Sisk 15:30

No, I was just gonna say the update that uh, Dom you received on Fridays, the same update I received.

rid.

Gifficial

Gifficial

Gifficial So I have not gotten any additional information from Rant since Friday afternoon.

DA Dominick Arcuri 15:37

OK, alright.

OK. Thanks.

NB Neal, Barbara 15:42

OK.

Uh, Rick Berke, anything to add?

RB Rick Burke 15:48

I know I'm.

I'm. I'm good.

Thank you.

OK.

Mm-hmm.

Alright, do task force members have any questions for Dom?

Morrison, Jennifer 16:03

Barb, I don't have any questions, but I think we should probably.

Umm.

If we have a two week gap, we should probably put a placeholder to check in on the survey. Returns.

Uh to see where we are before we get into that July 1st week, where nobody's

appears to be attentive.

I would really like to to see how how much we can get back before July 1st, so if we need to make some calls or or whatever.

- Neal, Barbara 16:23 Yes.
- **Dominick Arcuri** 16:27 Agreed.
- Morrison, Jennifer 16:32 So I'm looking at the calendar.

ial document I'm thinking that that means like on Monday we need to have a pretty good sense of 61992A CThis is not an of how many were waiting on.

DA Dominick Arcuri 16:39

Right.

Alright.

Yeah, I should.

I certainly agree.

- Neal, Barbara 16:43 But.
- Dominick Arcuri Yeah.

And rants and I plan to touch base on Friday to see where we stand and get an update as well.

Morrison, Jennifer 16:51 OK.

Yeah, that seems to make sense.

Dominick Arcuri 16:51 So I can I can.

I can get.

I can forward on that update once once we get that and then we can touch base on Monday and see where we stand.

Morrison, Jennifer 17:02

Sounds good.

ers? is not an official document.

The official document. Thanks and let us know if I need to make calls or if we need to make calls or you know assist in any way.

- Dominick Arcuri 17:11 Certainly. Thank you.
- NB Neal, Barbara 17:17 OK. Excellent. Anything else from task force members?
- jeanette white 17:19 Can you?
- RB Rick Burke 17:23 Hey.
- Morrison, Jennifer 17:23 Senator White, can you?
- RB Rick Burke 17:23 Hey, Barb, I I do have a.
- Morrison, Jennifer 17:24 You have two at wait.
- jeanette white 17:25 You.

- Morrison, Jennifer 17:25
 Hang on a SEC, Senator White.
- Jeanette White 17:26 Yeah, yeah.
- jeanette white 17:26 Yeah, yeah.
- Morrison, Jennifer 17:26

 You have two people here here, and it's gonna create reverb.
- Jeanette White 17:29

 I I was waiting for 20 minutes and no one would let me in, so I rejoined so.
- jeanette white 17:29

 I I was waiting for 20 minutes and no one would let me in, so I rejoined so.
- Morrison, Jennifer 17:32
 We'll quick.
 OK, alright.
 Callie, can you jump?
 Can you kick out the one that does not have her face on it?
- Jw Jeanette White 17:40 Yeah, J.m.
- jeanette white 17:40
 Yeah. I'm.
 I'm I'm not sure how to do that, I'll.
- Jeanette White 17:42
 I'm not sure how to do that.
 I'll try.

- Morrison, Jennifer 17:45 Now she did it.
- NB Neal, Barbara 17:45 There we go. Yep.
- Morrison, Jennifer 17:46 Callie did it.
- Jeanette White 17:46 No.
- Morrison, Jennifer 17:47 We're we're good. You're covered.
- Jeanette White 17:48 OK.

This is not an official document All right, now it says I've been removed from the meeting.

Morrison, Jennifer Perfect. Good morning.

No, ma'am. You're here.

We can see your face and hear you, and we're delighted to see you.

- NB Neal, Barbara 17:53 You're here.
- **Jeanette White** 17:55 OK, OK.

Yeah, I didn't.

I I apologize.

I was waiting for 20 minutes to get let in.

- Morrison, Jennifer 18:05 Oh, that's highly unusual.
- Neal, Barbara 18:06 OK.
- Morrison, Jennifer 18:07 OK, well sorry.
- **Jeanette White** 18:09 That's OK.
- Morrison, Jennifer 18:10 All right, carry-on bar.
- nis is not all official documents NB Neal, Barbara 18:10 Sorry about that, senator. Yep, Senator white, you did miss public comment. Did you want to add any comments for us to it this morning?
- **Jeanette White** 18:17 I did. I did. That's why. Yeah
- Neal, Barbara Alrighty, we will open it back up for for your comments certainly.
- **Jeanette White** 18:23 So do you want me to do it now? All right, so my name is Jeanette White.

And I I do apologize for not having been more involved in this all along as the X Chair of Government Operations Dispatch has been important to me for the last 18 years and it's an issue that I've been working on.

Over that time I've seen Task Force Committee consultant reports by the dozen come in and they all acknowledge that dispatch is really a local or regional issue and should be handled there.

So and this is seems to have been agreed on by everybody in the in the field. So now we have the opportunity with \$20 million to put a robust regional system in place, one that we'll use the same standards for inter operability and redundancy and

So two years ago, I believe everybody seemed to agree that that was where we were going, yet we seem now to have taken a turn somewhere and abandoned that idea.

Mike 19:32 Ohh.

have certain governance standards.

- an official doc **Jeanette White** 19:41 And I if I understand this right, it is now. It now looks like we are using the money to build out the state police dispatch uil sis system and capabilities.
- **Mike** 19:47 They have.

Jeanette White

I have a lot of respect for state police and have worked with them on many issues over the last years, but this is a switch from where I thought we were.

Had all agreed to go as far as I can tell, there is no mention of how this built out system will support or even relate to regional systems and how it will impact them. It leaves no funding for those regional systems and there is no mention of regional governance or governance standards.

We seem to have reversed our position on the importance of regional dispatch. Again, I apologize for not being more involved all along, but I am saddened if we use this opportunity.

This funded opportunity to not support our regional approach to dispatch and instead built out an extensive state system which in the past no one seemed to support.

So I if if that's the direction that we seem to be going, I'm saddened by it.

And I think that the over the past years as that has not been the preferred direction.

So thank you.

Morrison, Jennifer 21:07

So I Barb is a permissible to provide some context here and I'm happy to go offline with you ma'am.

- NB Neal, Barbara 21:13
 Sure.
- Morrison, Jennifer 21:13

 And and any member of the task force is happy to, you know, to catch up a little bit.
- Jeanette White 21:15
 Sure.

Morrison, Jennifer 21:20

As you know, the path of Department of Public Safety was on was exactly to provide a pass through for.

Uh read would be regional operators who were willing partners in this work.

Jw Jeanette White 21:325 Mm-hmm.

Morrison Jennifer 21:32

That is how we applied for the \$9 million earmark.

That is how the narrative was written.

That is what we wanted to do.

Jw Jeanette White 21:38 Umm.

Morrison, Jennifer 21:40

Uh, approximately the same time that we became notified that we had received the

9,000,000 from Senator Leahy earmark.

We also became aware that Senator Hardy and DevOps was taking up the issue of this through legislation.

So two things happened.

We received the earmark funds in the COPS technology funding stream, which specifically disallows subgrants.

Jw Jeanette White 22:03 Mm-hmm.

Morrison, Jennifer 22:07

The money has to be if we accepted the money, it has to be spent on items that are owned and maintained by the state of Vermont, because we are the the grantee. So it disallowed the ability to build infrastructure or pass through money for startup expenses.

It was exactly not what we had asked for, to be candid.

Uh.

And so the the constraints of the COP technology funding stream completely changed the path that we were on regarding the \$9 million.

But the option is to not use it at all and turn it back because it came through a funding stream that doesn't allow us to meet the original intent, or to use it in a manner that best positions the entire state for whatever the future construct is.

That there's also a timing issue here, to be candid.

The the performance period of spending that \$9 million precedes the end of this project and the public engagement.

And then going back to the legislature and determining what the answer is amongst the options that mission critical partners will present to us at the end of this work. So there's a bunch of things that make it screwed up for lack of a better word, and amongst the options of not spending the money at all. That was not one that I thought was most reasonable or in the best interest of first responders or the general public.

Uh versus using it in a way that can update, modernize and create the backbone of whatever the future system is going to be.

So when we say that we're just up upgrading the state police system, well, that is not true, because many agencies already use our infrastructure and the state police, as

people recall, and I'm sure you remember this from your DevOps stays, is the primary law enforcement agency for 50% of the people of the population and 90% of the land mass in the state of Vermont.

So it really is a benefit to the entire state and we are the upgrades that are proposed in the \$9 million spend are two poise and whatever the future system is to be an easier on ramp and to allow regional entities to use our assets as part of their failover or redundancy, whatever it is that the scheme is that we decide on that we will have already modernized and upgraded and it will create less of an expense in the final response.

So that's the answer to the \$9 million, the \$11 million appropriation still remains. Obviously we we have some, we will have expenses related to consulting and building the list of options that we will then in engage in a in the public feedback and and listening and trying to determine with the assistance of the legislature what the plan will be and we have we have made it very clear in both our RFP and in our work with mission critical partners that we expect a list of options, not one path forward at the end of this process.

So that we can then work through that with with the feedback we get. So I hope that helps helps a little bit it's it's a very different place than we were two years ago when Mike Shirley initially wrote this grant.

Jeanette White 25:25
It's looks good.
So if I might, Barbara?

NB Neal, Barbara 25:39
Yes, go ahead.

Jw Jeanette White 25:39

So thank you, Commissioner.

I do understand that I've always been.

I'm nervous about designing programs to meet funding requirements and instead of and letting the funding Dr the options that we think are the best options.

So I've always been a little bit nervous about that and I would only hope that.

This build out this \$9 million UMM infrastructure build out does not preclude.

Umm.

Real regional dispatch, which I believe is what most people thought was the best. All the reports that have come back say that that is where it is and and so I'm, I guess the the regional dispatch people will just have to sit on their thumbs and wait until you figure out how you're gonna do the 11 million and how that's going to impact. Regional dispatch systems, and meanwhile, they're trying to get themselves up and running and there's no no standards for them to assure redundancy in interoperability.

And there's no governance standards that have been adopted.

So I I don't know when that comes as part of this plan and when when that gets on ial doc the docket.

Neal, Barbara 27:15

It it, it might be useful, senator, for us to set up a meeting for John and I to set up a meeting with you and kind of fill in some of these details that have been discussed all along.

Jen did a really good summary there, but we would be a maybe a better opportunity on Chis answer some of your more specific questions.

Jeanette White 27:30

Umm.

Here.

Neal, Barbara 27:35 We can.

We can work on that.

- Jeanette White 27:37 Sure, that would be great.
- Neal, Barbara 27:39 Oh, OK.
- **Jeanette White** 27:39 Umm, I can umm.

I assume I don't know your is your email. Barbaraneil@vermont.gov.

- NB Neal, Barbara 27:49 Yes, barbara.neil@vermont.gov, yeah.
- Jeanette White 27:50

- NB Neal, Barbara 27:58
- Jeanette White 27:59
- Yeah.

 OK, I'll send you a note and then you'll get my email and we can do that.

 Neal, Barbara 27:58

 That sounds good. OK.

 Jeanette White 27:59

 OK.

 Thank you.

 Jeal, Barbara 28:02

 righty.

 n, Commissioner, anything. NB Neal, Barbara 28:02
- **Jeanette White** And I apologize again.
- NB Neal, Barbara 28:06 It's OK. We're glad you're here.
- Morrison, Jennifer 28:07 We're happy to have you.
- NB Neal, Barbara 28:07 Nice to see you, yeah.

- Jeanette White 28:08 OK bye. I gotta go to work.
- to this is not an official document)
 he NB Neal, Barbara 28:12 OK. Bye bye, commissioner. Anything else to add before we move on?
- Morrison, Jennifer 28:18 Now.
- NB Neal, Barbara 28:19 OK. So UM that, yes, certainly.
- Rick Burke 28:22 Hey. Hey, bar, may I bar? May I ask a question?

Sheriff Palmer.

Surf Palmer mentioned that he had a radio project going and I wanted to be sure that that Sheriff Palmer knows that we're very interested in and and seeking insight into ongoing upgrades throughout the state.

So we'll, you know, we love the, you know, for for the sheriff to let us know about what his project is so that we can be sure that it's captured as part of our ongoing information gathering. Yep.

- Morrison, Jennifer 28:55 Inventory, yeah.
- Neal, Barbara 29:02 Do you want to share details now?

- Palmer, Ryan 29:03 Do you want me to jump?
- NB Neal, Barbara 29:04 Share or.
- Morrison, Jennifer 29:05 It if just point of order point of order.
- PR Palmer, Ryan 29:07 Yeah.
- official document) Morrison, Jennifer 29:07 an she at. In this is not a she with the property of the prope I don't know where we are on the agenda, which should come under new business if we if we're going to talk about a new project.
- James Mack 29:07 Good.
- RB Rick Burke 29:11 Yeah.
- NB Neal, Barbara Yeah, what? OK
- James Mack 29:12
- Morrison, Jennifer 29:13 So I don't know where we are actually on the agenda.
- James Mack 29:16 Yes.

NB Neal, Barbara 29:16

We were.

We had gone back to public comment.

We were about to move on to new business, so we can do that now.

- Morrison, Jennifer 29:21 Fair.
- NB Neal, Barbara 29:26 And see.
- Escial document) Morrison, Jennifer 29:26 And and on only if the sheriff wants to, because, like, we're kind of putting him on
- non the spot, Yep.

 Rick Burke 29:33

 And sorry about that, Sir.

 Palmer, Ryan 29:35

 eah.

 2, ** NB Neal, Barbara 29:30

No, that's all.

That's all good if you guys are ready for me to run my mouth for a little bit.

- NB Neal, Barbara 29:43 Yep, go right ahead.
- Palmer, Ryan 29:44 Ah so.

I inherited an agency that was from a technology standpoint was kind of stuck in the past and you know I a guys making car stops with no radio signal.

No.

Uh telephone signal?

Nothing.

And they were.

There's no communication with dispatch whatsoever, and it's some of our towns that we were spending a lot of time in.

So I saw the emergency communication stuff as a real high priority, was able to it's in congressionally directed spending from Center Welch's office to talk total 1.24 million.

We came to that number based off of Motorola, uh contractor.

So where we are now is that that infrastructure, I'm finishing up the the cops grant, as the Commissioner talked about the COPS technology.

Office is.

Is who's gonna actually administer the money, so I've just finished up.

It looks like we're gonna.

There's two parts.

One is an infrastructure, part of it and the other part is the like mobile radios, portable radios upgrade but.

We're deciding between A5 and six.

Tower simulcast system that should cover my county.

Sounds good as I I can with the amount of money that we have to spend, but it'll be simulcast all connected through microwave as it that's how you do that.

Yeah, that's the short version.

Of what I've got going on, we're gonna have in car repeaters as well as new portables for everybody and new mobiles and cars on top of of five, five to six tower system.

Umm.

And we're hoping maybe, depending on what's leftover, to actually have a a dispatch console in my office, just for some redundancy for us.

We're currently dispatched the Woodstock Dispatch Center.

Uh, in that's that's OK.

But I would actually like to have my own dispatch center regional.

I'd like to stand up a regional center in the next several years, so I'm gonna game plan that out a little bit, but I think there's a market for it.

Uh, so anyways, that is my spiel.

NB Neal, Barbara 32:15

OK.

Thank you.

UM, there may be other questions.

I'm curious what your timeline is on that initial project that you were mentioning.

DA Dominick Arcuri 32:20 Yeah, that's it.

Palmer, Ryan 32:27

So if all goes well, money should drop in the fall.

I'm hoping to have it sounds like if if we're on this timeline that we'll be able this time next year to have this thing stood up.

We're using.

You know we're we're we're not building new towers or anything like that.

We're just popping on to existing towers.

Is the goal so beltronics out New Hampshire and Burlington communication are partnering on the the sales and and build outs side of this for me.

So I'm I'm hoping and it might be a little optimistic, but I'm hoping this time next year we're able to get this thing up and running.

NB Neal, Barbara 33:15 OK.

Thank you, Dom.

DA Dominick Arcuri 33:18

Yes

Thanks, Barb, and I'm sorry, sheriff.

What county did you say was that Windsor County?

Palmer, Ryan 33:27 Windsor, Sir.

DA Dominick Arcuri 33:28

OK, great.

On to make sure I got that.

Thank you.

Palmer, Ryan 33:30

Well, where Windsor slash southern Orange County.

Neal, Barbara 33:40

OK.

Well, that's a lot of good information.

Any other questions?

For the sheriff.

Right.

Is there any other new business for today?

Hey I am hearing nothing.

an official document So we will move on to next meeting date and adjourn.

So our our next regularly scheduled meeting is for July 3rd and I know I'm not available, I suspect others may not be available.

Umm yeah, my suggestion would be that we move the July 3rd meeting to July 10, especially now that we have a check in next week on the questionnaire responses. So what do what do task force members think of of that idea, we could move it to July 10 and then start the every other week cadence from there.

For reestablish that kings,

Morrison, Jennifer 34:52

I think it's fine to move the regular meeting to there, but acknowledging that we might need a special meeting depending on how the survey responses and any information that we are or are not getting from the surveys come in. So I think we should just not go to sleep.

Neal, Barbara 35:08 Right.

Morrison, Jennifer 35:09

But I don't think it's prudent to schedule the meeting on July 3rd.

- NB Neal, Barbara 35:15 Everybody agree. I seem like nodding. How?
- Journal of the first of the fir WP White, Paul 35:17 Ah, I I agree that July 3rd is not a good date. However, for just not that you need to schedule around me, but for quorum purposes I will not be able to attend on the 10th.
- NB Neal, Barbara 35:28 OK.
- Ron Kumetz 35:32 Either option is fine with me.
- NB Neal, Barbara 35:37 OK, Jim. OK.
- James Mack 35:38 Either one works for me. Either one works.
- Doenges, Mike Flexible as well
- Neal, Barbara 35:43 OK. OK.

Then I think we will then moved the regular meeting to July 10, keeping in the back of my our minds, we might need a special meeting somewhere in there.

So Kelly, could you rearrange the the calendars and move the regular meeting to July 10 and then start that every other week?

Cadence from there?

- Ac Audet, Cally 36:05 From then I can do that, yeah.
- NB Neal, Barbara 36:07 Yeah. OK. Alright, so it yes.
- Question Barb, I assume we would adjust our biweekly status then to be Compatible with that.

 Neal, Barbara 36:23

 Yes, that would make sense.

 Dominick Arcuri 36:24

 So we've we've been putting out the status would be one of the status with the status we've been putting out the status with the status
- NB Neal, Barbara 36:23
- DA Dominick Arcuri 36:24 before meeting it gets distributed on the Monday before. So I assume we would adjust that schedule as well, correct?
- Neal, Barbara 36:36 That would be great. That's doable, I assume
- Dominick Arcuri Certainly.
- NB Neal, Barbara 36:41 Yep, OK. Anything else on this? OK then umm.

If there is nothing further, I believe we are done for today. Is there a motion to adjourn?

- RK Ron Kumetz 37:00 I we'll make a motion to adjourn.
- Doenges, Mike 37:00 Billy, I will second.
- All in favor of adjourning?
 Please raise your hand or indicate by saying aye.

 Ron Kumetz 37:13

 eal, Barbara
 ee. NB Neal, Barbara 37:04

Jaye,

- RK
- NB Neal, Barbara 37:13 I see. Thank you, Ron.

Uh.

The only hand didn't see go up was Mike.

Who?

Alright, it's and verified by.

- Morrison, Jennifer 37:23 MJ Unverified Mike.
- Doenges, Mike 37:25 Yeah, I switched to being verified.
- Morrison, Jennifer 37:25

Oh, no, wait.

He's my thunderous now.

Ohh OK.

NB Neal, Barbara 37:29

It's unanimous.

.veryone.

.eal, Barbara 37:43
OK.

Ron Kumetz 37:43 The Like.

Neal, Barbara Bye bye.

James Mack 37:44 Thanks.

Audet, Cally stopped transcription