

# Transcript

December 18, 2024, 4:16PM

□ **Mullaney, Emily** started transcription

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 0:05

Thank you, Emily.

And good morning.

This is Jennifer Morrison, the Commissioner of Public safety.

I am the Co chair of this public Safety Communications task force and I'm going to call this meeting meeting number.

I believe it was 41 regular meeting 41 to order at 11:17 hours, December 18th, 2024.

So the meeting has been properly called order and we will do a roll call of members.

If you could verbally acknowledge that you are here.

Vice Chair Paul White.

**PW Paul White** 0:42

I am here.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 0:44

Co chair Barb Neal is absent today.

You could make that note Emily, please.

Jim Mack.

**JM James Mack** 0:51

Here.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 0:54

On cumits.

**RK Ron Kumetz** 0:55

I'm here.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 0:57

Thank you, Sir Mike Tangas.

Michael Wright.

Hearing neither of them, they they occasionally join late, so I only if you could keep an eye on the comings and goings. Perhaps we will pick up one of them during the course of the meeting.

The next item on the agenda is to approve the agenda for today's meeting, which was distributed on Friday by Emily.

**PW** **Paul White** 1:19

Yeah, I think.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 1:26

Do we have any proposed changes to today's agenda?

Hearing none, we will move on to approval of the Minutes from December 4th regular meeting #40.

Anyone have any proposed changes or additions to the Minutes as circulated by Emily?

**JM** **James Mack** 1:56

Make a motion to accept the Minutes as written.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 1:56

None.

Thank you very much, Jim.

**RK** **Ron Kumetz** 2:00

I will second that motion.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 2:01

Thank you, Ron.

Is there any discussion about approval of the Minutes?

Bring none.

All those in favor of accepting the minutes from December 4th regular meeting #40 raise your hand or say aye.

I got Ron's hand electronically and the other three Members hands up.

So we will consider the Minutes approved.

And that brings us to an introduction of Chief Recovery Officer Doug Farnham and. We thought it would be instructive to this task force, and particularly to our consultant partners, to hear about some of the work that the recovery Office is doing in connection with response to disaster.

But working closely with local communities, and particularly around the concept of regionalization of recovery services. So I don't want to get too far into what Doug has been up to and what his team is working with.

But as we contemplate.

A future system or system of systems.

It's important to note that there are other regionalization schemes that are either. Being built or are already in flight. I think about EMS the way they're built up into districts around the state.

And other service delivery schemes that rely on a regional model.

So I thought it would be great to have Doug share what they're working on with us so that we can put that into the mix for consideration with that, Doug, the floor is yours.

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 3:37

Thank you, Commissioner Morrison.

So yes, there's a couple things at play here.

One is in the short term, things that are actively in flight, the the recovery team, primarily through Eric Phil Korn, who's on loan from BGS, is working with FEMA and engaging with different regions of the state to create regional recovery networks.

The intent there is that a regional recovery network is an advocacy channel, a way to regionally collect.

Issues and track them and and route them upwards right in order to.

You know, make sure that different different sections of the state, different regions are gonna have different problems there.

They were definitely, especially with this year's floods hit an extremely different degrees right? The northeast section of the state was hammered and southern section state really didn't have any damage.

Edges of Chittenden County actually experienced much more damage than they did last year in in last year's event.

So the the the damage overlay for every disaster is different, so no regional network

is perfect for every event in the long term.

But what we've endeavoured to do, working with FEMA, is to consider all of the various layers that are currently exist in Vermont at the regional level.

And I'm just going to and one thing before I run through that list.

Is that Eric Philpott will be available to act as a kind of an operational link.

FEMA has been producing this map for us that that we use to make decisions about how our regional recovery networks would be stood up.

And it's organic.

It's a work in progress, and that map is.

It's on federal technology, so it can be difficult to access, but it is not confidential information, right?

It's a federal resource.

But Eric can help get people access to that.

He can help but get data out of it.

And.

That you know, they've mapped a lot of layers for us.

A lot of them came from our existing data sets, but they hadn't.

We hadn't didn't have a place where this many layers were put in in one place, so we map bridges, culverts, roads, fire stations, electric transmission lines, utility service territories, building footprints, historic districts, the counties and towns of course.

Regional planning commissions, regional economic development.

Regions, the Vermont.

Trans maintenance districts, community actions agencies or the designated agencies hospital catchment Areas, health department districts, wastewater and solid waste facilities.

Wastewater Service areas, conservation districts and watersheds.

And of all of those layers, the primary so we we overlaid all those layers so we can see where we were starting to see rational overlap and and especially with the damage that occurred.

From the 2023 floods and from the 2024 floods, because they had different damage patterns, being inundation versus effluvial erosion event.

And the the layers that we found to be most persuasive in setting up our regional recovery networks were the V trans maintenance districts and the watersheds.

Because the way you build your roads and the way water flows tend to inform you know.

Damaged clusters.

In water based events and they also tend to inform how we're organized and where our resources are and how we can respond.

So we didn't limit ourselves to just, you know, lining those two areas up, but those definitely had the most sway, I would say.

In how we approached.

So I am going to pull up.

If I can find the right document.

Hopefully this is.

See what this is called.

And try to pull up some of the screenshots.

Document 4OK.

You'd think that the drop down would be alphabetized, but it is not.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 7:59

No.

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 8:02

Right. So is everyone seeing?

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 8:04

Yes.

**PW** **Paul White** 8:05

Yes.

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 8:05

The map OK.

So we divided the state for primarily for resource purposes and Commissioner Morrison's well familiar with this, having had three regional coordinators to cover the entire state for a number of years.

We theoretically had three resources that we're going to be able to apply to connect to these regional recovery networks.

So we had North, Central and South southern Vermont. We can see the different colored shades within north.

We we broke N Vermont up into four sections.

The Lamoille.

The Lamoille River corridor was something that doesn't line up with Lamoille County, so we regionalized Lamoille River impact. We separated.

Northern and southern Northeast Kingdom and Essex and Orleans County primarily there because when looking at the damage clusters when looking at the infrastructure.

The northern Northeast Kingdom and the southern experience those events differently.

Right. They then the southern half of of Essex County had very little in common with the northern half.

And then, of course, the Franklin Grand Isle.

The Northern Franklin Grand Isle, now in central Vermont.

There's some room for growth and differentiation here.

We primarily did because of the Winooski corridor, right?

That included with the headwaters Central Vermont is largely driven by the Winooski corridor.

But I do think that Orange County.

And the southern half of of the northeast A in the north right now.

There, there are some damage clusters and more in common there, so we're still looking at these boundaries and thinking about how to reorganize them.

The the major roadblock has been the existing artifacts, right?

The Regional Planning Commission areas, the first thing we got the first piece of feedback was well, just draw your map like along our lines. The Regional Planning commissions are set up properly.

**PW** Paul White 10:01

Mm hmm.

**FD** Farnham, Douglas 10:03

And one thing I would say is that they are not.

They're they're not set up based on a geographic risk distribution.

The RPC boundaries were formed based on a political process where towns got to choose which one they went along with.

So those those towns chose to go with those different groups, mostly for cultural

reasons, and not necessarily for practical reasons like shared risk or shared infrastructure.

So I would say the the historical county boundaries in some rare cases.

Moving on to the southern section.

The southern Vermont, Rutland County and Windham County. We are allowing those to go forward as regional recovery networks, even though this shows Windsor and Windham together and Rutland and Addison together, we learned that Rutland and Addison County. They don't want to work together.

Rutland tried to get Addison County to work with them and they had zero participation, 0 interest in a shared regional footprint with Rutland.

So for cultural reasons we are allowing.

Rutland and Wyndham to go forward because their damage patterns, they they are largely self-sufficient.

They do reflect a rational watershed and rational infrastructure layout.

They're two of our only counties that actually do that properly.

It just I think is complete coincidence.

But Rutland and Wyndham were were kind of piloting regional recovery networks in those two counties.

Because the counties just happen to have a rational boundary.

This map.

Just our.

An example of one of the layers. The combination of layers that can be displayed by the tool that Eric Philkorne can get people access to can get people information from.

And that is, you know, just a county based layer with our fire stations and our transmission lines and our main river corridors overlaid on it.

So looking at where our river corridors right risk generally radiates from those in an Indian nation event.

And of course.

Orange County not having Maine river corridors, but having a high risk of a fluvial erosion.

That's that's related more to those headwaters.

That's where it gets trickier and probably needs more nuance, but.

I think that the tool that Eric's been working with FEMA to develop is helpful for make informing decisions.

But one thing I definitely learned through this process was that regardless of your data or rationality, we are going to run into cultural issues where some sections of the state just are not going to have any interest in, in working with another area. So that's a practical reality. I would say that should be considered, Commissioner.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 12:57

Any of those did any of your layers when you were thinking about, you know, your geography, did you did any of them show mountaintops or topography in any way because the river corridors are important, but when we think about telecommunication, you know land, mobile radios, we need to. Think about topography and how to communicate around the mountains.

**FD Farnham, Douglas** 13:19

Right. I I think there was a topo layer built in there. Eric had a conflict today where he's actually at a meeting to launch the recovery website. But I think if the layer's not in there now, I do think that's something we could build in pretty easily, because I know Vcgi has that. And and FEMA could help us build that into the tool. So that could be certainly an option.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 13:48

Thank you.

**FD Farnham, Douglas** 13:50

Right. And I think that topo layer informally played a role in some of our decisions about. Where county boundaries make sense and where they don't make sense because there are some counties in Vermont where you literally cannot get to the eastern side of that county from the western side of that county, you have to go out, travel around through other counties in order to. Access that and so as a group discussing your shared risks, your shared issues. That makes zero sense, right to have. Essentially, landlocked elements within the same discussion group. They're just not gonna have anything in common.



They're gonna have much more in common with that happened.

Mostly in Windsor County, Windsor, in Rutland.

The overlap between those two was a big one, and of course in again in Bennington and Windham. But it was worse, I think, in Windsor and Rutland, and Addison's overlap.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 14:53

Did you when you started your work around the recovery groups, was there ever a conversation around just sticking with county lines?

**FD Farnham, Douglas** 15:02

Yes, yes, there was definitely a discussion of that.

I think the the the, the main reason we moved away from that was the agreed like I think Lamoille County is the most egregious example of somewhere where, like Hardwick, has a huge amount of risk from the Lamoille River, right?

But it's not part of Lamoille County.

And then the towns to the West of Lamoille County that along that until you get to that lake again, that's that same problem.

Where they don't have a.

Well, they have some topographic issues, some you know elevation issues, but it their major risk comes from that river basin, right?

For for ease of administration, yes, going to the county levels would be.

Would get you most of the way there as long as you had a way to to encourage those counties to be communicating more actively.

But we we've just seen that breakdown so much in the past that even when we have a region, they don't necessarily talk like this last fall was one of the first times Hardwick had been invited to a Lamoille River Basin Planning Commission conversation.

They just they were never aware of them.

They were never invited and they have a huge element of shared risk. Everything people do upriver of them. Town river, sorry.

**PW Paul White** 16:25

Play.

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 16:34

And then.

Yeah, and that's one reason with with the county boundaries and then the main detractor from the AOT maintenance districts is that a OT because of their mission tends to try to ignore those topographical boundaries like they're the ones that have to maintain.

The passes and the stretches between.

So they can't have.

They can't have one group leaving off at the edge of a high, high risk spot for them, and another group picking it up.

They have to have the same district span that high risk area whereas.

For most people, they don't care about that, right?

But because it's transportation, they have to span that high risk connector.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 17:19

Got it.

Yeah, that makes sense.

Are you able to take questions from the task force or our consultants?

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 17:27

Yeah, absolutely.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 17:30

What you got guys and gals, miss? Bonnie's on.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 17:39

I don't have anything right at the at the moment.

Other than.

Is is there public access to the to this information the the maps or?

The data layer for example.

Certainly would be something to be interested in in looking further into we have developed some similar maps looking at various regions.

Because you know, as as alluded to, we're looking at.

Communication potential communication zones.

For.

Public safety communications throughout this throughout the state and we're looking at what makes the most sense to have to develop a boundary layers or or or boundaries for.

Wireless systems, you know, we we're more efficient, more efficient way.

Of communicating with public safety agencies than what's being done today would be to have regional systems that would pool a number of resources and cover a larger area.

We have to look at what makes sense in terms of areas to cover based on topography and then also based on you know, those those towns, the splash counties that.

Logically work together.

So we have looked because we, you know, we have mapped the regional planning commissions, the the counties obviously.

Other boundaries, you know, these would be of interest to to look at as well.

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 19:27

So we can get controlled access.

There's no like because it's.

A federal tool that has licensing and things that go along with it we can get.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 19:36

Right, right.

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 19:37

We can get the team access to it.

There's no like public website location right now to to access it from, but we can we can get access to it through Eric Philpott.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 19:45

OK.

Oh, actually, maybe the the best thing would be just.

The one image that you showed with the three regions, the north-south and central and then how they were further broken up into sub regions, if we could have a list of the towns that are in each of those regions, then we can recreate that fairly easily.

**MJ** Morrison, Jennifer 20:15

Think.

**DA** Dominick Arcuri 20:15

Is is that something that could be shared?

**MJ** Morrison, Jennifer 20:17

I think it might be useful for someone and I don't know who someone is to spend time with Eric when he's available because there's more layers that we're not seeing. And like when I think about when I think about what I don't know which.

**FD** Farnham, Douglas 20:24

Mm hmm.

Yes.

**DA** Dominick Arcuri 20:27

Sure.

**MJ** Morrison, Jennifer 20:34

Is how to communicate around mountains and you know, stuff like that.

There might be someone like Ron or other engineer tech people, Scott Neal, who might be going through the different layers.

Mapping with that that they've already loaded into this and say that most closely resembles what we know to be true in Vermont, particularly if we can add the topography as a layer into the map.

So I'm not sure that exporting one particular thing is going to. It might be one of those processes of discovery, Dom and obviously we could set up a meeting with you and Scott, Neal and whoever. All else is, you know, the brains of this operation. Around what makes sense for regions.

And then once we know what we want, figure out how to get a hard, hard copies of it.

**FD** Farnham, Douglas 21:24

Mm hmm.

Yeah. I think Eric will be able to facilitate that, I think.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 21:29

Rape.

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 21:31

He would be able to facilitate a deeper dive into the tool, like showing you every layer that's built in there. What that looks like he can work on getting the topography built in. If it's not in there.

Which?

It wasn't the name Blair, but I think it was like one of the base layers that we started with.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 21:52

Excellent.

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 21:52

And then yes, I think at the end of the day.

None of it is protected information, it's.

It only takes a couple steps to access because Fema's the one maintaining it for us and doing a lot of the legwork and building stuff for us, which is helpful.

But they haven't given us any issues as far as exporting data from that. If people wanna see.

You know the the different layers that the data that created those.

Most of it is just Vermont data, right that.

And the only thing that the only layers they wouldn't export for us would be the individual assistance damage data.

That's something that they don't want to share, right? That because of because of the individual nature, yeah.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 22:38

I don't care about that.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 22:39

OK. Yeah.

That wouldn't issue.

All right.

OK.

Yeah. We would appreciate that.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 22:50

Take a meeting with Eric, Dom and Rick if you can help me figure out who should be in attendance. I personally will take any opportunity to spend time with Eric because he's a heck of a guy and very helpful.

So you will enjoy your time with him, but we could set it up with whoever you think from the task force should be present up to three of us.

And who from MCP and et cetera?

**DA Dominick Arcuri** 23:18

OK, great.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 23:19

Bonnie and Jason. Sorry, Rick. Go ahead.

**RB Rick Burke** 23:19

That would be ideal.

No, I said.

That would be ideal, absolutely.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 23:23

Yeah, Jason and Bonnie.

Does this sound like this?

Would be helpful.

I know Scott's not here, but does this sound like a promising next step for mapping?

**JM Jason Malloy** 23:34

I I think it even just at a bare minimum, having you know a look at how they have their regions.

Broken down, at least preliminarily, that could be of use to us, as well as some of the

other information.

So appreciate that invite.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 23:57

I think it's just important that we try to familiarize ourselves with as many.

Schemes that already exist, particularly the ones that work well or make sense for the mission that we're trying to accomplish.

It just. I would love to see what the hospital catchment areas look like.

You know what I mean?

Look at that. And maybe somebody's light bulbs go off and people go well, that's exactly what we should be doing, right? So.

Thank you very much, Doug.

Is there any last minute wisdom you want to give us about trying to sort this out?

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 24:34

Yeah. I would just say there's also the regional Governance Study Committee that's going.

They haven't gotten down into the weeds about.

You know the geographic breakout, they've talked about the edges.

I think that work is going to be largely paused from now through the session because one of the Co chairs did not win re election.

So that's a thing that's out there, but I doubt that it will be producing complementary or contradictory information in the next six months.

It will probably pick up again in the summer.

And they've also been given access to a presentation on on that tool.

So we're just trying to share the information.

And I think the last thing I would say is obviously just acknowledging we're creating the regional recovery networks for a different purpose, right.

So how we went about that might be valuable information for you, but it wouldn't make any sense for the for.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 25:29

Right.

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 25:35

For it to be more than just contributory information for you.  
Because it's based on where people were hurt. Yeah, yeah.

**RB** **Rick Burke** 25:41

Ask me a question before.

Hey, Doug, I I really appreciate this insight and and having you know what you're doing and our our teams have an availability to the information and to your insight and and Eric's the great.

I was curious when you put the data together, are are those? Is that information based on responses?

Emergency response information that's coming from any of the dispatch centers or you know, I mean you're you're getting calls for service and and so as you're creating your map.

Is that one of the underlying layers that help you develop it based on, you know, emergency response to given, you know given geographic areas?

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 26:22

So we looked at an overlay of.

We didn't have the emergency response data, but we had two on one data which is kind of a proxy for that, right?

The damage report information.

We looked at the FEMA claims, which is like the adjudicated version of 211.

You know, that's assuming that people successfully engage with FEMA, which is not always the best assumption, right?

So we took both of those things with a grain of salt because.

One of the 211 reports, you know.

Two on one data is useful and it's good preliminary data, but it's preliminary, right and then?

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 27:10

And it's about property damage, Rick.

It's not about life safety.

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 27:11

And it's about, yeah.



**RB** **Rick Burke** 27:12

Yeah, yeah, I'm assuming it's a FEMA report from you're applying for aid as a as a 2.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 27:18

It's a.

It's a report that we we gather to know how to help Vermonters and connect them to services. Like is your heating system out and is it going to be winter. But the 211 data was sort of the first stop for people to say to flag for.

The state. Hey, I have damage and because they can't report it to FEMA until.

A.

A certain level of disaster is approved by the White House, so in the absence of telling people to sit on their hands for 810 weeks and not do anything.

**RB** **Rick Burke** 27:43

Right.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 27:49

We have them report dated 211.

We were able to address immediate needs, you know, for them. And then when FEMA declared that we were eligible for individual assistance, then they could suck up all that data and fill in around the edges for their FEMA report.

**RB** **Rick Burke** 28:06

Thank you.

It's helpful.

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 28:08

Last year we started using that two on one data to do call backs and confirmations with people to make sure that if they had damages that they were engaging with FEMA. If they were willing to some people.

At the end of the day, are unwilling or uninterested in engaging with FEMA.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 28:29

I'm unwilling.

I'm I'm not interested in any more contact with FEMA.  
Do you think that will come true?

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 28:38  
So I think the and actually one last thought, Commissioner.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 28:39  
OK.

**FD** **Farnham, Douglas** 28:44  
Response and recovery are like two sides of the same coin and and response of course overlaps a lot with communications.  
But it is.  
I don't know.  
I guess I'm struggling to say it. It is interesting that they are two sides of the same coin.  
They do have an inflection point, but we have been trying to be very careful in the recovery effort about.  
Not letting the tail wag the dog, right.  
There's a lot of more operational time sensitive response related issues that in my opinion should take priority.  
And recovery is kind of something that every time it happens.  
Need to be shaped by the facts unique to that particular event.  
And I do every time I dip my or in this water, I worry about things that I'm doing improperly influencing the response and the operational side of the structure.  
So there's there's always that risk, right?  
But we still have to talk about it and we just do our best to keep in mind that while they're connected, the response more often impacts the life safety and.  
Recovery is important, but it is generally not a life safety concern, so it is a lower order of risk when you're dealing with recovery issues.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 30:11  
I'm super appreciative that you made time for us on such short notice and this is, for me been very helpful and I look forward to spending time with Eric and the map.  
Any other questions to him?

**FD Farnham, Douglas** 30:21  
Yeah.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 30:25  
Well, thanks, Doug.

**FD Farnham, Douglas** 30:26  
OK.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 30:26  
We'll let you go and get back to the rest of our riviting agenda. Thank you.

**PW Paul White** 30:27  
Right.

**RB Rick Burke** 30:27  
Thank you, Sir. Thank you.

**FD Farnham, Douglas** 30:27  
Thank you for having me.

**PW Paul White** 30:28  
Thank you.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 30:33  
What does the team think?  
I mean, when opportunities like this come along to hear from how other people have decided to carve up the state, would it be useful to bring them forward to the group?

**DA Dominick Arcuri** 30:44  
Yes, yes, certainly.

**PW Paul White** 30:45  
Yeah.

I was surprised when he rattled off the list of all the different regional groupings that they considered. I was surprised that the the state police division of the state was not one of them.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 30:58

Yeah, that's. And maybe it is 'cause. He only rattled off like 10.

**DA Dominick Arcuri** 31:00

That's true.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 31:03

He said that they have dozens of layers, but yeah, interesting. We have the 10 barracks across the state.

**PW Paul White** 31:03

Right, true.

Which are pretty much centered around population centers.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 31:14

Right, right.

Population centers that don't have municipal services, right?

**PW Paul White** 31:19

Right, correct.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 31:21

So anyway, OK, so I'm appreciative of Doug's time and we can move on now to public comment.

Emily, I don't see anyone other than internal team here.

Does anyone see any members of the public?

**PW Paul White** 31:37

No.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 31:40

OK, seeing no members of the public, we will skip on to project updates.  
Televate you can go first.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 31:50

OK.

Thank you.

I probably.

The task force members are very familiar with, you know, where we are. Currently we're in the the heat of development certainly of the kind of the meat of the the project, the inventory and Assessment Report draft was delivered.

I say delivered, but via remote access a couple of weeks ago and we've all had a chance to review that and provide comments.

We compiled the comments which were sent back to MCP and they have developed updated documents based on those comments and we're currently in the process of reviewing those updates and the comments provided to hopefully soon finalize that document.

In parallel, we have held a number of workshops to further.

Provide input into the system planning process.

We have successfully held workshops with four lessons learned from previous activities.

Operations dispatch operations.

Technologies.

Technologies including CD, RMS, Others, Governance Workshop and finally earlier this week we held a wireless coverage workshop which addressed both the issues related to LMR coverage as well as.

Regular broadband coverage.

Also.

Recently we did have the 3rd and final community listening session which was held on the 6th of December.

Finally, what I'd like to report is that we have a draft outline for the system planning document which has been provided by MCP, and we are currently in the process of reviewing that and we will have some comments back to MCP on that as well.

We look forward to getting.

Draft sections.

That report, as soon as they are available to hopefully kind of piece meal the the

document to us to give us capability to review it.

Whenever it is available, since we will have a tight schedule for turn around once the initial draft is provided, which is scheduled for January 10th, which course is?

Coming up quite quickly.

**MJ** Morrison, Jennifer 34:33

Do we have a Tom?

**DA** Dominick Arcuri 34:33

I believe that.

**MJ** Morrison, Jennifer 34:34

Do we have a a date?

**DA** Dominick Arcuri 34:35

Yes.

**MJ** Morrison, Jennifer 34:37

I'm putting time on my calendar for Monday to review the draft outline.

I just don't think I can do it this week given my schedule.

Do we have a date that we said we'd return feedback?

**DA** Dominick Arcuri 34:49

We don't have a date when we provide feedback, no, but we want to do that obviously as soon as possible. If you can review it Monday, that would be great. We have.

**MJ** Morrison, Jennifer 34:58

You're welcome.

**DA** Dominick Arcuri 34:59

We have a.

We have a call with.

Mcp on on Mondays at 11.

So we can certainly discuss comments then Rick and I have reviewed it. We're

compiling our comments and we'll send those out prior to that. So you can have those as well.

It's.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 35:19

OK.

**DA Dominick Arcuri** 35:20

It it's a, you know, just that online right now it's not terribly lengthy.

So there it shouldn't be a lot to to review.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 35:30

Appreciate it.

**DA Dominick Arcuri** 35:32

Happy to answer any other questions.

OK.

Thank you.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 35:42

Alright, Jason Malloy, you're up from MCP.

**JM Jason Malloy** 35:47

So not not a whole lot to add to what Dom said as far as the excuse me, as far as the system plan document, we definitely heard everyone's feedback on the length of that document loud and clear definitely.

Anything over 100 is 100 pages. Probably won't get read.

Our target, at least internally.

We're trying to be as concise and informative with our language as we can.

So we are.

Pretty much shooting for roughly 30 to 50 pages, give or take.

Hopefully that'll be a little bit easier of a read for everybody and a little bit easier.

Easier review process.

And.

That's that's really only a update. I have other than what we already provided.  
For dog.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 36:50

I haven't looked at it yet, Jason, but appreciative of your you know.  
Reflecting back to us about the length of the document, I think that.  
Understanding that the inventory document was super huge, I still think the concept  
of companion documents for people who want to go on a deep dive on certain areas  
is a good one.  
So if you do run into technical areas or you want to give a much longer explanation  
on.  
Or training standards or appendices, things like that.  
I think that's a great way to break out of the main main body of the report, a place  
where people who want to take a deep dive can without having to weed through it in  
the body of the main report.

**JM Jason Malloy** 37:41

Understood. Appreciate the feedback. Thank you.

**PW Paul White** 37:45

So a quick question, this document that we're talking about reviewing, giving  
feedback on, it's just the one page table of contents, right?  
Is there another document that I missed?

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 37:56

That's it for now.  
It's just the outline.

**PW Paul White** 37:57

OK. OK, right.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 37:59

It's an outline, right?



**DA Dominick Arcuri** 37:59

Oh, that. That's true, Paul. Yeah.

**RB Rick Burke** 38:03

So so Paul, there we are reviewing and have provided an initial list of of of of inquiries on the inventory report, the second, the second draft of that report. So Dom and I are are reviewing that and and if any of the task force members have the time interest to review it, they can. But I think during our last meeting we were John and I were tasked with you know with going through that document and PROV. Feedback.

Two MCP regarding the status of it and and we are we are doing that and and you know intend to finish that today not later than tomorrow if if any of the task force Members would like to review it again that document was sent over by Jason. Over the weekend or or I think it was Friday, it arrived.

**PW Paul White** 38:59

I'm not sure that I got that.

**JM Jason Malloy** 39:03

The late Monday night, but close enough for government work. Rick.

**RB Rick Burke** 39:07

Alright, you know it, you know.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 39:08

Yeah. Paul's Paul's address sometimes is finicky, but sometimes people are using his old address.

**RB Rick Burke** 39:15

Be sure that you use his task force address.

**PW Paul White** 39:20

Yeah, I got.

I got 2 emails yesterday.

The second one was just correcting the link that was included in the first one for the table of contents, but I didn't.

But I don't think I got a second draft of the previous document.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 39:38

I see.

That was just sent to Barb and Jen.

In the Monday evening e-mail.

**RB** **Rick Burke** 39:46

Alright, that's what I'm looking at.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 39:47

Together.

Monday.

**RB** **Rick Burke** 39:51

I see it.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 39:54

8.

**RB** **Rick Burke** 39:54

Came in and it was a late night.

I was 11, came in 11:31 PM.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 40:06

Isn't that funny?

**RB** **Rick Burke** 40:09

Yeah, it's it's to myself.

**JM** **Jason Malloy** 40:09

And.

**RB** **Rick Burke** 40:12

Bonnie, Phil, Barb and and Dan.

Yep. So yeah, the other other other Members weren't provided it.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 40:19

On Monday night, for real.

**RB** **Rick Burke** 40:22

Tina, come on in the evening.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 40:22

Yeah. So it was Monday evening.

**RB** **Rick Burke** 40:24

Yeah, 11:30.

**JM** **Jason Malloy** 40:25

Yeah. And that was only.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 40:25

Yes, I think the the was for for Tel Aviv to review the comments and we have boiled that down to are in the process of boiling that down to just a a handful of comments that we feel are necessary for the majority of the task force to review.

**RB** **Rick Burke** 40:30

Yeah.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 40:44

Certainly.

There, you know.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 40:47

So I I show at 11:25 AM.

Jason sent it to all the task force and Paul, it's to your.  
Partner e-mail address.

**JM** Jason Malloy 41:00

I think we're, I think we're talking about two different we're talking about two different emails.

**RB** Rick Burke 41:02

No, that was a table of contents.

**MJ** Morrison, Jennifer 41:05

Oh.

**DA** Dominick Arcuri 41:05

Yeah, that was the draft.

**JM** Jason Malloy 41:08

You're referring to the table of contents e-mail.

**DA** Dominick Arcuri 41:09

Table of contents.

**MJ** Morrison, Jennifer 41:11

Yes.

**DA** Dominick Arcuri 41:12

Right.

**JM** Jason Malloy 41:12

The the one that was sent out late in the evening Monday, that was the redlined inventory report and the stakeholder review worksheet with our responses.

**PW** Paul White 41:13

Right.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 41:24  
Jesus.

**PW Paul White** 41:25  
Yeah.

**DA Dominick Arcuri** 41:26  
Yes.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 41:26  
I don't have it sitting in my inbox.  
Can you resend it to me?

**JM Jason Malloy** 41:29  
I'll I will forward.  
Yes, ma'am, I will.  
I will forward it right now.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 41:33  
Thank you.

**RB Rick Burke** 41:37  
Alright, not.

**DA Dominick Arcuri** 41:37  
And again, our plan televised plan is to we have reviewed all of those comments.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 41:43  
Right.

**DA Dominick Arcuri** 41:43  
There's dozens of them, of course, that were compiled and we're trying to boil that down to just a handful that we feel the task force needs to take a closer look at.

**PW** **Paul White** 42:01  
Beginning.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 42:03  
OK.  
Very good.  
Do we have other updates?

**RB** **Rick Burke** 42:05  
We could do, which we could do during the Monday, the Monday meeting if.  
You know if it's a benefit.  
Monday the 20, the 23rd meeting.  
But I'm assuming 'cause. I'm assuming people are going to be taking off so.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 42:25  
Oh.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 42:25  
I'm I'm working on Monday.

**RB** **Rick Burke** 42:28  
Yeah.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 42:30  
So OK.  
We are done with project updates.  
Is that correct?

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 42:38  
Yes.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 42:40  
Do we have new business to come before the task force?

**RB** Rick Burke 42:44

I have a question though before we leave.

Move on, Jennifer.

I could so, so, Jason, are you you need our feedback on the document before you reach out to the the PC apps and and and and dispatch centres to confirm their data is that is that a correct you know position?

**MJ** Morrison, Jennifer 42:48

Yes.

**PW** Paul White 42:53

Play.

Run.

**JM** Jason Malloy 43:09

But we would want to make sure that all of language and such.

Any updates required of the task force that those are made?

That way we can send a clean.

Copy to each individual agency of their data.

**RB** Rick Burke 43:31

Yeah.

With that said, the sooner the better we Dom and I can finish our comments.

You know today not later than tomorrow, if any, if any, of the other task force members want to weigh in on that. First of all, they have to have a copy of this, this document. But I don't know.

I don't know if it's required.

**MJ** Morrison, Jennifer 43:49

I think the I think the next step is for the agencies to confirm their information.

So if you guys, you guys know what all our first round of feedback was, you've conveyed it?

**RB Rick Burke** 43:59  
Right.

**DA Dominick Arcuri** 43:59  
Yes.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 44:00  
They're now replying to us.

Let's get you once you guys provide a second round of feedback, let's have MCP get the updated draft out to the individual agencies because I'll be very curious to see. What feedback we get from them?

**RB Rick Burke** 44:20  
Fair enough.

**DA Dominick Arcuri** 44:21  
If I can suggest.

Has a meeting scheduled with.

Yourself, Jen and Paul and Barb tomorrow afternoon. And I know Rick has a conflict and we were trying to reschedule that which may not work, but maybe we can.

**RB Rick Burke** 44:36  
It's alright. You guys go without me.

**DA Dominick Arcuri** 44:38  
Maybe we can use that time to go over those few comments that we wanted to

address with the task force.

I think that would be a good time to do that tomorrow, tomorrow afternoon.

**RB Rick Burke** 44:52  
Some of those comments are are we comfortable in releasing this information you

know or is this something that we want to put in the report at this time one or two of those comments regard that?



**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 45:02

OK.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 45:04

OK.

Barb and I discussed offline the next meeting date, which technically should be on the 1st, which we're obviously not going to meet on the 1st.

Because of upcoming timelines and the importance of staying on on task as we go into the session, I would propose that we don't meet on the 1st obviously, but that we do hold a special meeting on the 8th to make up for missing the 1st.

And then meet again on the 15th one week later and get back into our every two week Cadence.

Does that sound rational to do? January 8 and 15 and then get back into the regular cadence?

**PW** **Paul White** 45:52

Yes.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 45:56

Tom K, Mike W.

**RK** **Ron Kumetz** 45:56

That's not reason. That sounds reasonable.

**MW** **Michael Wright** 46:01

Perfect.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 46:03

Perfect. Perfect.

I love that.

**MW** **Michael Wright** 46:06

Perfect.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 46:06

It's very firming for me, Michael. Thank you.

I needed that.

OK. So Emily, if you can.

Make sure that the task force members are adequately forewarned that the we'll have a special meeting on the 8th of January regular meeting #42 on the 15th and we'll get right back into our every two week cadence.

Is there anything else before I ask for a motion to adjourn?

**DA Dominick Arcuri** 46:42

How about Merry Christmas to everyone.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 46:44

Merry Christmas.

Happy holidays. However you celebrate, we're happy New Year.

**PW Paul White** 46:46

Hey, happy New Year.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 46:50

I think the new year is going to bring big things big things.

So thanks for all your hard work in 2024.

**DA Dominick Arcuri** 46:56

We'll we'll still be talking to some of you prior too, but for those we don't.

**RB Rick Burke** 46:57

Thank you.

**MJ Morrison, Jennifer** 47:01

I know, I know.

But this I mean I just do wanna say that.

The task force has put in yeoman's work in 2024 and all seven of us have spent a lot of time and we're getting there.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 47:10  
Absolutely.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 47:14  
We knew this was not one of those things where you get immediate gratification, but the moment of gratification has come so.  
Anyway, thank you to the task force members.  
Thank you to our trustee consultants, Emily.  
Thank you for your willingness to be part of this and we'll see you all on the 8th.

**RB** **Rick Burke** 47:33  
Thank you everyone.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 47:34  
Could I have a motion to adjourn? All moved.

**JM** **James Mack** 47:36  
So moved.

**RK** **Ron Kumetz** 47:36  
A motion to adjourn.

**PW** **Paul White** 47:37  
Awesome. Take your pick.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 47:38  
About 5 people making a motion to adjourn and we'll give Paul the 2nd.  
All those in favor of a journey say aye, raise your hand.  
I I got five of five.

**RK** **Ron Kumetz** 47:49  
I.

**MW** **Michael Wright** 47:49  
Bye.

**MJ** **Morrison, Jennifer** 47:51  
So we are adjourned.  
Thank you very much.  
Talk to you soon.

**PW** **Paul White** 47:56  
Thanks. Bye, bye.

**RB** **Rick Burke** 47:56  
Thank you everyone.

**DA** **Dominick Arcuri** 47:56  
Better.

**RK** **Ron Kumetz** 47:56  
See you next year.

□ **Mullaney, Emily** stopped transcription