

Valcour Gov Board
10/13/2021

Attendees: Adam Cohen, Jen Beane, Mark Anderson, Ryan Brady, Craig Gardner, Michelle Hunt, Lori Malloy, Robert McKenna, Amy Messier, Justin Stedman, Darwin Thompson, Betty Wheeler, Larry Eastman, Matt Sullivan, Steve Laroche, Nathan Harvey, Kim Prior, Tammy LaCourse, Eric Shepard, Vegar Boe

Start 1003

Approve Minutes
Motion – Michelle
Second - Justin

Governor's Buprenorphine Task Force Research Request – Tucker Jones
Tabling – How do we track people who are using Buprenorphine without a prescription. Tucker unable to make today's meeting due to family leave but will hopefully join next meeting.

Program Manager Policy – Vegar, Jen, Larry
4.9 – Issue with “remove” alerts – changed to “sun-setting” to “ensure historical reference”
Is it appropriate to break alert codes from the program management policy? Yes, probably because of the potential depth of the alerts. Michelle and Vegar will take the PM policy draft and pull out alert, incident codes, etc into own policy
***Make sure to include that PM's need to be track and ensure trainings as needed.

Training Policy – Mark
Good that training and Live are separate. Training server and Live servers are not tied so why can't you require that they complete to “x” level of training before they have access to Live server. Have to complete basic user training before access to Live. (3.2 says that)
Broader question: All the people who were trained before DPS, how were they trained and is there any record of that? Frustrating because of the training dashboard makes you go through all basic training to get to specific module training.

Valcour Access Request (initial discussion)
Know there are going to be more non-LE agencies asking to be on the same program. At the precipice of public safety changes in Vermont. Are there ways to be welcoming without harming network or Valcour community?. May be good to have someone from VCIC come and speak on an official VCIC perspective on who has access to CJI. Will discuss further going forward, no change will take effect until after go live in January.

Adult Protective Services
Do have LE jurisdiction and follows mandated policies. Does APS meet minimum standards to even access? They currently meet subscription services. If they are sworn personnel involved, it is an easier conversation to have. But need to be looking at agency as a whole not individual. Most APS are former officers but may not still be certified, how does that fit in for access around CJIS policies? Like Howard Center employees who have access are falling under an existing ORI and that ORI is held accountable to users it gives access to. Does APS have their own ORI or who would ensure their access and use is acceptable.

Constabularies

Has LE jurisdiction and training objections and mandated to follow state policies on traffic stops and UOF. Has come up before and has always been an issue with no ORI, elected every March, and CJIS issues. CJIS issues from VCIC is access and control and maintaining CJI. Statement from VCIC is because CJI, worry is not access to Valcour itself but around general network and infrastructure security. Constant turnover in constables, elected constables are independent but appointed are under the community select board's authority. Who does background checks on elected officials? Constables have struggled with training issues because agencies do not want to take potential liability to train new constables. Might be worth a presentation from interested constables. Constable duties are very different due to individual certification, location, and appointment. Not all towns grant constables LE authority and restricted by state law to not enforce outside of town's jurisdiction. Seems potentially legislative language needs to change or VGB defines as a policy who has specific certification or position (elect vs appointment) – VGB may be an easier route compared to how the legislature works.

Chittenden County SA

Discovered they do not currently use soft token and that needs to change. Currently no waiver from VCIC that they don't need to use soft token. SA's office doesn't have an issue starting to use them, they didn't even know it was a thing until Mark just approached their IT about it. Just got the software today and they are working on installing it soft token on all the devices. Have they provided a date on when they would be in compliance? They are supposed to have everything installed and configured by Friday, so they should be in compliance by next Monday. Should someone be auditing overall two factor log-ins and overall that SA's are in compliance? Generally speaking, yes it should be audited. In the next few weeks it could be a broader discussion with DPS and the vendor about who should be auditing because it needs to and it is currently on the agency to audit. Comfortable with current course of action as long as they do bring it into compliance asap.

Adjournment @1110

Motion – Betty

Eric - Seconded