



SCHOOL SAFETY INFRASTRUCTURE COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: [7/15/2013](#)

Meeting Location: [Legislative Office Building](#)

Approval: [8/8/2013](#)

Recorded By: [Jason Crisco](#)

1 ATTENDANCE

Name	Title	Department/Location	Present
Donald J. DeFronzo	Commissioner	DAS	Y
Stefan Pryor	Commissioner	SDE	N
Pasquale J. Salemi	Deputy Commissioner	DCS	N
William Shea	Deputy Commissioner	DESPP	N
William Hackett (Sitting in for Comm. Shea)	State Director of Emergency Management	DESPP	Y
John Woodmansee	Education Consultant		Y
Richard E. Morris	Dir. Public Safety & Emergency		N
Frank J. Costello	Structural Engineer		Y
Ronald Jakubowski	Former Asst. Superintendent of Schools for Operations and Facilities		N
Steven Waznia	Firefighter		Y
Adam Byington	Police Officer		Y
Irene Roman	Public School teacher		Y

2 MEETING LOCATION

Building: Legislative Office Building

Room: 1A

3 MEETING START

Meeting Schedule Start: 12:00pm

Meeting Actual Start: 12:07pm

4 AGENDA

- Opening Remarks by Chair
 - Chairman DeFronzo opened the meeting by welcoming everyone back. He introduced Lieutenant Governor Nancy Wyman, who would be joining the council today for a few of the presentations. Chairman DeFronzo also mentioned that Bill Hackett from DESPP would be sitting in for Deputy Commissioner Shea.
- Approval of June 25th Minutes
 - Chairman DeFronzo then asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Waznia. The minutes were then approved with no corrections.
- Group 1 Presentations

- Chairman DeFronzo introduced the first set of speakers from Group 1, Mutualink/Sonitrol: Mark Hatten CEO/Chairman from Mutualink, Colin McWay President/CFO from Mutualink and Doug Curtiss CEO from Sonitrol.
- Colin McWay from Mutualink gave an overview of their technology. His presentation can be found on the [SSIC Website](#). Doug Curtis then wrapped up the presentation with an explanation of Sonitrol's involvement and IRAP (Interoperable Response and Preparedness Platform).
- Chairman DeFronzo stated that this is a very new comprehensive approach to communication. Due to the comprehensive nature of these agreements, the Commissioner asked if Mutualink finds all participants (schools, public agencies, private sector etc) eager to get involved? Mr. McWay responded that even though we have a diverse group of participants, the technology allows them to respect the privacy and security of each participant's data, information and processes. Their "invitation and acceptance process" to signing on replaces the need for formal agreements or MOUs. He gave an example of a Federal Reserve Bank being on the same network as some shopping malls.
- Chairman DeFronzo asked if there any back up power system requirements. Mr. McWay said that they advocate for both back up power and network plans.
- Officer Byington asked if there is any potential lag time with regard to the video. Mr. McWay responded that the system is designed to work in real time. The data is prioritized, with voice being at the top of the list. The system cannot only operate in real time; it can also enable participants to share archived data, such as recent video.
- Bill Hackett asked if this technology could be integrated with our state systems. Mr. McWay responded yes, we can plug into any type of media technology. The source can be added to any network. This technology can also be used on Smart devices.
- Jon Woodmansee asked how hard it is to train someone in this technology. Mr. McWay responded that it takes about ten minutes to learn how to use this system. We've designed a simple drag and drop interface.
- Chairman DeFronzo stated that one thing we're wrestling with in this council is the autonomy of our 169 towns in CT. Once we're done with our process here, it's going to fall to the municipalities to determine and customize systems that are best for their community. Would these multiple systems present any difficulty in linking together? Mr. McWay responded that their system is designed to handle these variations.
- Chairman DeFronzo then introduced Doug Titus from ASAA ABLOY, who is also representing the Security Industry Association. Mr. Titus gave an overview of the challenges each school faces with regard to locked entryways and how those challenges can affect designs. Some school

designs are based off of open space concepts, separate pods or traditional hallways with classrooms branching off. High Schools may also have different expectations with regards to doors over an elementary school. Mr. Titus also made a few suggestions concerning definitions. He thought it would be a good idea to ensure that there is consistency among schools and the state concerning the definitions of “lock down” or “school security.” Mr. Titus also emphasized the importance of assessments. Assessments help to create better security, so that you know who’s entering into a school. Visitor management solutions work by telling you who is entering the building and by which entrances. It also allows you to add or remove access of visitors, temp workers, etc. Mr. Titus suggested that the council should be mindful of Fire and Life Safety Codes and ADA/Accessibility codes when making their recommendations. It’s important to keep people safe inside, but also important to get people out to safety as needed. A good blend of both mechanical locks and electronic solutions is typically the best approach to school safety with regard to entrance ways. Presentation documents can be found here - [SSIC Website](#).

- Chairman DeFronzo asked if there are any model schools in our state that are using advanced lock technology. Mr. Titus responded that it’s possible that some may be better than others, but wasn’t able to provide specific examples. He said he’d be happy to follow up with the council once he had an answer.
 - Chairman DeFronzo asked, day to day, what are the most difficult challenges that you face with regards to school security. Mr. Titus replied that cultural challenges, the act of simply complying with common sense safety measures, can be the most difficult to deal with.
 - Robert D. Mitchell, Mitchell Architectural Group, was the last presenter from Group 1 to speak. Mr. Mitchell has experience in the design of research labs, pharmaceutical companies, vivariums and others. He’s involved in large variety of security designs. Mr. Mitchell explained to the council the current process that’s taking place for the new Sandy Hook building. They’re using an Integrated Project Delivery System, which includes: architects, engineers, builders, consultants etc. from day 1. This creates a much more fluid and open design/build process. They’re requiring that all architects have a familiarity with FEMA’s Primer to design safe school projects. They’ve setup an ad hoc committee that consists of a psychologist, security engineer, chief of police and former student. This committee is tasked with answering various questions about the school and then reporting back to the commission. Mr. Mitchell suggested that the SSIC force schools to show that they meet the standards of security, but don’t dictate how they accomplish those standards.
- Group 2 Presentations
 - Robert Ducibella, Founding Principal for DVS Security and Consulting Group and a member of the Governor’s Sandy Hook Commission, was the first speaker to present from Group 2. Mr. Ducibella discussed the

process for developing implementable standards. He mentioned that it's a difficult task to develop implementable standards for a broad spectrum of schools. The council should consider establishing standards for different types of projects: Renovations, Renovations and Expansions, and Brand New Schools. Standards should be created that are subject to a cost benefit analysis. These standards would differ based upon size and population of school, k-5 or middle school or high school, rural vs. urban sites, regional demographics and budget. Each school should be allowed to locally assess best value for price spent. Mr. Ducibella also suggested the standards produced by the SSIC should take four tools into consideration: Physical security improvements, technology improvements, operational enhancement opportunities and the creation of staff policies/procedures.

- Brian Humes from Jacunski Humes gave the second presentation for group 2. Mr. Humes spoke on his experience with designing safe public facilities. He mentioned that a comprehensive plan should include three basic components: Detection, Deterrence and Response. In particular, Mr. Humes mentioned that all three of these components must be integrated together or none will function. He hopes that a "bunker mentality" for school safety architecture isn't taken as a result of Sandy Hook, similar to the Danbury PD bombing in the 1970s. Presentation documents can be found here - [SSIC Website](#).
 - Chairman DeFronzo asked Mr. Humes if "response time" is part of the design components for his projects? Mr. Humes responded that they do in fact consider "response time" in designs. Most of the projects he's involved with are locally funded, so budgets can be limited. Deciding where to spend funds is crucial and "response time" is a key factor.
 - Mila Kennett an Architect/Senior Program Mgr., High Performance Resiliency Program at US Department of Homeland Security gave the final presentation for Group 2. Ms. Kennett gave an overview of the Science and Technology Directorate. She also gave an overview of FEMA's Primer to design safe school projects, Appendix F of the Primer and Integrated Rapid Visual Screening software (IRVS). Presentation documents can be found here - [SSIC Website](#).
 - Chairman DeFronzo asked if Appendix F from the FEMA Primer is similar to the NCEF (National Clearing House for Educational Facilities) checklist. Ms. Kennett replied that the NCEF checklist is actually based off of Appendix F from the FEMA Primer. They're essentially the same thing, but the Primer's checklist is a bit more comprehensive.
- Review of Next Public Session
 - Chairman DeFronzo asked that staff work with John Woodmansee and Commissioner Pryor to determine the best setup for an education focused session. The SSIC hopes to hold this meeting sometime in the first or second week of August.

- Time and Date of Next Meeting
 - Chairman DeFronzo then entertained a motion to adjourn, which was made by John Woodmansee. A voice vote was taken and approved.
 - Staff will notify members of the date, time and location of the next meeting

5 MEETING END

Meeting Schedule End: 2:00pm

Meeting Actual End: 2:40pm

6 NEXT MEETING

Next Meeting: To be determined