

This transcript was exported on Jun 08, 2021 - view latest version [here](#).

Bud Mertz:

This is Bud Mertz. (silence)

Tom:

Hi. This is Tom.

Bud Mertz:

Hi Tom. It's Bud Mertz here.

Tom:

Hey, Bud Mertz.

Bud Mertz:

How are you doing?

Tom:

I'm doing good.

Bud Mertz:

That's good. That's good. [crosstalk 00:02:18] here.

Tom:

How are things on your end.

Bud Mertz:

All about vaccinations right now.

Tom:

Yeah.

Bud Mertz:

But we're getting there anyhow.

Tom:

That's a big project to take on this fast as the as the county is big.

Bud Mertz:

Yeah. We're 360,000. At first the product wasn't really available, so a lot of anxiety and frustration from people trying to get appointments, they can't and all that other stuff. It's on a conference call earlier today and they feel the availability is going to increase here. Probably, by mid-April that we'll have more than enough, so that's good to hear.

Tom:

Bob, what percentage of your county is over 65? Do you have any metric on that?

Bud Mertz:

I don't have it off the top of my head here but we're pretty much a senior citizen county. I would say it's a pretty hefty number.

Tom:

Okay. I was just curious. Every county's a little bit different, but certainly it adds new challenges. Have you done any mass sites, or what's the primary distribution?

Bud Mertz:

We have one health center that has three separate hospitals in my county. They're pretty much the big player in here. But we also have 16 pharmacies, which is spread out in a more rural areas, so that's nice, and they're getting their dosages and whatnot out there. We haven't really did a mass vaccination because the product isn't really available. There's no sense in setting up to do 5,000 when you know you're not going to get 5,000 doses.

Tom:

Yeah. Good point.

Bud Mertz:

I think that's based on our current infrastructure that if the vaccine is steadily available to them that we could probably have everybody vaccinated within 60 days.

Tom:

Okay. My wife's been vaccinated but I'm too young and, I would say too healthy to get on with it. What are you going to do?

Bud Mertz:

Here they went strictly with the 1A category. It's 65 and older or under 65 with underlying conditions.

Tom:

Right.

John Molnar:

John [crosstalk 00:05:56]-

Bud Mertz:

Then you have your targets. You have your first responders. Right now they're looking at using the Johnson and Johnson for the food service workers and those target groups.

Tom:

Okay. Very good.

Bud Mertz:

There's a lot of work. My project today was working on the home bound people and trying to come up with a plan that we can deliver the vaccine to the people that are home bound and have a way to coordinate it, because once you open a vial you have six hours to use it all or it's wasted.

Tom:

Right. I joined one of these lists, I guess it's part of Facebook. They find situations where somebody backed out and they want to not throw it away. I don't know how these guys find out about it, but then they send you a note, "You got 15 minutes to call and schedule your appointment." I don't know how they do it but it's quite effective. It prevents people from throwing the vaccine away, basically.

Bud Mertz:

Oh, yeah. I've heard stories where I've had clinics go across the street to the subways and vaccinate the customers and workers, just not to throw it away.

Tom:

Yeah.

Joe P:

[Joe 00:07:39]

Tom:

Hey, Joe.

Joe P:

How you doing, sir?

Tom:

Very well. Bud Mertz is on with John Molnar, myself.

Joe P:

How are you feeling John?

John Molnar:

I feel pretty good. Thanks guys.

Joe P:

It's great to hear that. Did you get your flu shot or your a vaccine rather?

John Molnar:

I have not. I haven't reached the 65 age 11 here yet.

Joe P:

I passed that a long time ago.

John Molnar:

I'm [inaudible 00:08:20] them.

Tom:

Hey, Ira.

Ira:

Hey, how are you?

Tom:

I'm doing good, Joe P is on, Bud Mertz is on and John Molnar.

Ira:

Excellent. Good afternoon everyone. How are you?

Bud Mertz:

Good afternoon. Good.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Chris Eisenbrey, EEI.

Tom:

Hey Chris. Good afternoon.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Tom, how are you?

Tom:

I'm doing well. I read on [crosstalk 00:08:54]

Chris Eisenbrey:

It's your favorite day tomorrow. Your favorite day tomorrow.

Tom:

Yes. One of them. That's true.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Well.

Tom:

Actually, I get excited more about March madness than I do St. Paddy's day now.

This transcript was exported on Jun 08, 2021 - view latest version [here](#).

Chris Eisenbrey:

That's true.

Tom:

Anyway, Ira is on and both John were on as well. John Molnar.

Ira:

Speaking of March Madness, are we going to find out in a few years that Louisville was busy trying to spray COVID on all sorts of teams to get in.

Tom:

Ira, I would put nothing past anyone.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Well, Rick Pitino is not the coach anymore.

John Molnar:

Rick Pitino is actually at Iona, and he did make the tournament.

Chris Eisenbrey:

He did, he did. James Madison didn't make it though. Sorry about that, John.

John Molnar:

Yeah.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Tom we've become so virtual. I was looking for the web link, the zoom link or the WebEx link. We're going old school here.

Tom:

I thought I would spare you all.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Had enough today.

Tom:

Just do the old fashioned conversation.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Yeah.

Tom:

Yeah, it's funny.

Ira:

I could talk about this thing called in-person meetings coming up again, I'm not sure. It struck a recollection, but I'm not a hundred percent sure what those in-person meetings are like anymore.

Bud Mertz:

What is in-person?

Tom:

So it's true. More and more people are talking about this hybrid, in-person. I was talking to a friend of mine, "These companies spent four and a half million dollars on events last year. It cuts back to zero. That's probably the main reason they didn't have to let anybody go." I said, "So plan going forward." He said, "I wish [inaudible 00:11:19] not going to resume that in our industry." The big industry companies are going forward, but it doesn't mean the buyers and sellers are going to be there. They're rethinking this whole thing. It's really interesting. I don't know if that's typical, but I think it's going to be a while, or it goes back to normal. I think people will go but...

Chris:

Tom, all I know is I've got a face for a conference call not for a teams call. I'm glad that's what we're doing.

Tom:

Hey Chris. Bob's on, Ira, Joe, and Chris Eisenbrey are on. We're waiting for Christine and Kelly. Christine and Mike in Brazil cannot make it today.

Tom Hyatt:

Hey, Tom. It's Tom Hyatt also.

Tom:

Hey, Tom Hyatt. Very good. I didn't need to count it. Well, Chris, we can go ahead and start or we can wait another minute, your call.

Chris:

Why don't we give them just another minute to see if they come up?

Tom:

Sounds fine.

Chris:

You said that Joe [crosstalk 00:12:41] was on?

Tom:

Joe P is on, yeah.

Chris:

This transcript was exported on Jun 08, 2021 - view latest version [here](#).

I just want to hear [Joe 00:12:47] for a second. Knowing who my new employee is.

Joe P:

I really did enjoy that.

Tom:

Oh, that's right.

Chris:

I would say that enjoyment is not being shared by him. How's that?

Joe P:

You made my whole month when I read that. To celebrate I'm opening a new bottle of Scotch right now.

Tom:

So we're talking about March Madness. I'm trying to see who the Cinderella teams are going to be this year. I don't know if any are emerging, anybody have any ideas?

Joe P:

Well-

John Molnar:

[crosstalk 00:13:44] Loyola.

Tom:

Okay.

John Molnar:

I was going to say Loyola of Chicago has Sister Jean still rooting for them. They went pretty far two or three years ago. I wouldn't be surprised.

Tom:

They were listed as the one-on-ones to watch. I forgot about that. The Loyola Chicago.

John Molnar:

Are they playing games tonight or am I making that up?

Tom:

I don't know if they're playing, not NCAA tournament. Any tournament they're playing tonight. I don't know.

Joe P:

Thursday is the first night. Tonight is roll out if anybody gets sick with COVID.

Tom:

Oh, I see.

Joe P:

[inaudible 00:14:36] have replacement team can move in. If in fact, somebody has to drop out, I believe by the end of the evening.

John Molnar:

Vegas has some lines on that.

Tom:

Is Duke back in it, by the way?

John Molnar:

I don't know.

Tom:

They were out because of COVID. I wonder if they're back in now.

John Molnar:

Oh, then everybody wins.

Tom:

Yeah.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Tom, we're trying to get a quorum here.

Tom:

Yeah, we're one down. Jim, and Kelly, said they were coming. And Kelly just sent me a note he'll be a few minutes late, and Jim said he was on his way here.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Well back to Tom, your question about, quasi virtual or a hybrid. We potentially here at EEI might have a partial face-to-face, partial virtual, depending on the choice of those involved, one of our quarterly CEO board meetings. So we've had three or four in a row that have been strictly virtual, but they are making plans just in case things work out to the good to give the option to do face-to-face, but also have a virtual component. But that would be in September. And it really is dictated by what our member companies are doing. The various, investor on utilities. But at least they're planning for it.

Tom:

They picked a place to have it?

This transcript was exported on Jun 08, 2021 - view latest version [here](#).

Chris Eisenbrey:

In September we always have our board meeting at the Broadmoor in Colorado Springs.

Tom:

Beautiful [inaudible 00:16:38]

Chris Eisenbrey:

Yeah. Nice place to be your potential for a business trip, hopefully, fingers crossed, in a year. We just finished one year. I have not been in my office since March 12th or 11th of 2020, but I'm sure a lot of people have been in the same boat.

Tom:

Wow.

Chris:

So you guys need to come back at EEI, we've got plenty of places to eat downtown, a good parking that you can pay for.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Yeah. I had to go downtown Chris to go get my hair cut today and I grabbed some lunch downtown. So I was trying to contribute [crosstalk 00:17:14]

Chris:

There you go. Support our tax base.

John Molnar:

Chris [inaudible 00:17:21] preferred, if you've been paid the meter and got a ticket, that's a little bit more [inaudible 00:17:25]

Chris:

That's not my job anymore.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Yeah, that's true. Let's hear about it. I use the park mobile app and it just reminds you to keep plugging the meter. So I don't think I'm going to get a ticket anytime soon.

Chris:

That's good.

Tom:

[inaudible 00:17:48]

John Molnar:

Did [Jim 00:17:53] join? I thought Jim joined. Didn't he?

Tom:

Jimmy you on? I think Kelly joined.

Kelly:

Yeah, I'm on.

Tom:

Hey, Kelly.

Kelly:

Hey Tom.

Chris:

All right. Tom, why don't we get started?

Tom:

Okay. Very good. You want to run the agenda? You want me to run it?

Chris:

Go ahead Tom, you're good at it.

Tom:

All right. Very good. First up on the agenda is determination of a quorum, which we have. Next step is to review and approve the December 2020 minutes from our board meeting in December. We go to the board website, put the link out. All the minutes are up there, I didn't spend all the documents, so we put the link out there.

Chris:

The link was pretty easy, Tom.

Tom:

Good.

Chris:

So you need a motion?

Tom:

Yep. Need a motion or discussion even one.

Chris:

I didn't have any [inaudible 00:19:06] so I'll make a motion.

Tom:

Okay.

Chris:

Motion to-

Kelly:

Second.

Tom:

Who's that, Kelly?

Kelly:

Yep.

Tom:

All right. All those in favor.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Aye.

John Molnar:

Aye.

Bud Mertz:

Aye.

Tom:

Great. Next up is our finance report, John Molnar. John.

John Molnar:

I'll be real quick guys. I think if anybody looked at the finance report, you'll see quite a bit of listings of the projects that we're working on. A lot of these are the eight FEMA projects that are being added onto the listing. In fact, last year we basically had about \$1.3 million in grants. This year we have about 1.8 or we had about 1.8 million in 2020, and already this year we already have close to 2 million signed up in grants and that's only through September, when basically the grant cycle turns over. That's pretty much a what? 75% at \$2 million. And that will probably grow, I would imagine up into the neighborhood of close to \$3 million. So it's almost double in two years here, what we'll be doing in the eight FEMA project accounts. The other thing-

Tom:

John, that's primarily staffing, right?

John Molnar:

That's all staffing. That's correct. There's a couple of that are involved in that. Some large projects that we're dealing with, some gun violence issues. Chris, thank you very much. I appreciate that. But some gun violence training is what that is about. That's a half million dollar job in that arena. Besides that, Tom you're correct. Everything else is staff.

Chris:

Yes. Kelly we're training people how to do gun violence.

Tom:

[inaudible 00:21:17]

Bud Mertz:

That's awesome.

Kelly:

How much of that staffing though? I'm curious though. How much of it flows to the bottom line? Most of it goes out right through to the people themselves, right?

John Molnar:

Well, we modified that Kelly, to include... It used to be six and a half percent, it is now 9%. Basically, instead of \$130,000 to our bottom line, we're up near 200,000 at this point. That goes to our bottom line for that. So it's 9%.

Kelly:

9%. Got it. Okay.

John Molnar:

And you guys can look at the numbers and see where we are. I wish I would have did this now that I thought about it as I thought through it here on the way to the meeting. But the other point that we're looking at is just to give you an idea, we have close to \$700,000 in the bank at this point in time. With the additional 200,000 that we're talking about close to 200,000, we'll have close to \$900,000 in the bank. Chris Eisenbrey, EEI, we did receive the funding for EEI. So thank you again for that as well. But anyways, all of that helps within this equation.

John Molnar:

Please, it's not to say we're going to sit on our laurels, but we have never had an ability to have two years, basically a runway for the AHC. Again, we're certainly doing more stuff than that, and working on projects that sometimes they work, sometimes they don't. But regardless there's basically a two year runway for the AHC. At this point in time, if we don't add anything onto the project side within this arena. So again, guys I can't thank you enough for what you guys have done, what Tom has done, what this whole team has done to basically change the whole face of the AHC here. Tom, would anybody have any other questions? That's really what I wanted to go through, but I just wanted to say it continues to get positive on the account.

Bud Mertz:

And a lot of help due to you too, John, as well. So thank you for everything you've done to really transform the structure of the organization in this way, and really at the right time. That need was there, that eight FEMA need was there. You guys just really made the most of that opportunity, I think.

John Molnar:

The other thing that we do though, that you will see on here is that we do work Tom, and I basically coordinate with Hyatt. I guess, other we'll be in the mix here regarding a modification in the contract for the executive director as well as the PMO. And they kind of weave in Bob, as the projects go down those salaries go way down as well. So keep in mind that you'll see sometimes those salaries are a little bit higher, then we go back to the current state and basically being near half of what we're talking about until we hit more of that project work. So just to let you guys understand what Tom and I work with and do as we worked that, and Tom Hyatt is working on that as we speak to adjust those contracts.

Bud Mertz:

I just want to say as a past president, during a time where we lived paycheck to paycheck and project to project that is a impressive report, and I just want to commend the staff and the leadership of the board as far as getting us to where we're at right now.

John Molnar:

Chris, that's what I have.

Chris:

Great job.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Chris and Tom, this is Chris Eisenbrey from EEI. First, thanks John for the nice words. We've always felt very strongly that this has been a great investment. I'm glad you're getting the check a little bit sooner than you did in the past. We think we've ironed out some of our accounting issues on our side. Hopefully that'll help. But one question I did have is, right now what are the staffing levels? Because I just don't know other than, Tom and Tom and John if there are other staff and are you looking to expand in the staffing area?

John Molnar:

A lot of the staff is coordinated. Tom can talk to this as well, but certainly the IT staff that we have, we work with Abel and Abel's team. And Abel has probably about four to five people underneath him that work both the IT issues, the marketing issues that we deal with, and certainly there's a related function to the IT scenarios. That is one aspect that we spend salaries on. I won't call them salaries. It's more contracted work Chris, that we deal with. Another contractor that we're dealing with is Laura Johnson on the webinars and the workshops and the summit, and all that type of work that we are getting. Probably, I got to tell you, I think it's underneath \$20,000 that we work all with everything that Laura Johnson does. She certainly worked in probably half a body at \$20,000, so that's really what we're dealing with there.

John Molnar:

We're also on a contracted basis with Tim Carney to help with Tom and some of the marketing materials, like the annual report and stuff would work through some of Tim Carney's efforts. The accounting people, there's an accountant that we have on staff that we worked through on a contracted basis, and of course the auditing people, as well as the people that we get pretty much on a free basis to work the facilitation on the [sys 00:28:50] working groups and the GIS working group committees, that Tom probably has on. Tom, what? Six people pretty much, at least 20, 25% of their time working to help with some of these initiatives that Tom is working through. Some of that doesn't show up on the map that you're talking about, Chris, because of the in kind resources that people are putting into the AHC, but we probably have 20 people on this staff.

Chris Eisenbrey:

I just never had a good grasp, so then I appreciate that. I also recognize that you guys were probably going to talk about this down lower on the agenda. So I apologize.

Tom:

Any other questions for John? Just one final comment. I think we've been running so long on a lean and mean mentality. I think now it's paying dividends. We've done more with less than any organization I think I've ever been part of. That's off to everybody. Anyway, next step is our discussion here. We have a new administration that has come in. We had a number of discussions on topics, potential topics that the consortium ought to look at. We just came out of our resilience summit, where we had 31 sessions covering pretty much the entire gamut of federal, [ISAK 00:30:27], trade associations. Kelly, you facilitated a couple of panels that had private sector organized by sector.

Tom:

What I thought today we'd do is take a minute. Maybe talk about some potential areas we may want to expand into. I know these are emerging topics, but I know there's issues going on in our big metro areas. I know there's other issues going on within states. I just thought maybe we might at least brainstorm on some potential ones here. Where we're going with this is our system is pretty simple. If we have a topic we want to explore, the first step is we do a webinar and we bring those people together and we see if there's something we can leverage and work from that, and from there we'll go and create a work group around it, and from out of that there might be a project, there might be some other things, but we start small with an idea.

Tom:

The first one I wanted to just offer up, which seems to be a big one I know. Chris, this whole thing about our new environment for social unrest and what are the threats, how are our cities organizing around that? Is there a need to have a best practice discussion? I just wanted to throw that out there as a potential topic.

Chris:

Tom I'll start. I think here in D.C., our capitol has led the way and just throwing up a fence and putting a lot of national guard people around it. I say that kind of ingests. It is an issue, and the question is where's it going, and what's on the horizon? I know that we're trying to work front-end on that, look towards the summer and see what drivers we may be having for either more of that or less of that, depending. I think we're in a middle ground right now, but I think there's a tinderbox on either side of that, just waiting to happen. From our perspective the jury selection is underway. I didn't hear if they

finished or not, but that whole jury trial that's going on around Chauvin, could definitely light up more civil unrest, or it could just light up folks out there peacefully protesting.

Tom:

Right.

Chris:

And then all depending on what the prior administration decides, or the former president decides he's going to do with his own presence out there that could light up as well. So we're looking now and trying to get the fillers and the parameters for what we need to be thinking about here in D.C..

Tom:

Ira, any comments and perspective from New York city.

Ira:

For us, primarily it's a law enforcement and NYPD is pretty closed lip when it comes to this. The biggest challenge for us is the information sharing I think that goes into the impacts, and trying to understand how we manage that without overwhelming people. There's still some conversation I think around the messaging that comes up during an event from an emergency management perspective. I think everything's been overshadowed by the vaccine effort.

Tom:

Yes. Well, that was my next item to discuss is on the vaccine front. We get updated every Friday on nine o'clock sys calls. There's so many angles to that. I was just curious if there's one that as an organization you all felt we should be looking at within the healthcare vaccine [inaudible 00:34:53]

Ira:

I would just sort of throw out there that off the top of my head. AHC has been successful from a technology perspective in implementing and guiding, and putting together some great technology tools. I think one of the challenges that we've faced in New York city, that's been widely discussed has been the... I think it's happening in lots of places is the very pathways, or the multiple systems that organizations are using to register people for vaccinations and schedule their appointments. Different providers are using different tools, so there might be some sort of opportunity to look at best practices for a technology aggregator that a municipality or some single entity could simply dictate what the technology requirements are, or the data requirements are, and incorporate that into a one-stop shop for things like this for scheduling on a mass scale. Just a thought.

Tom:

Ira, do see that as kind of a one-off or is that something could be repurposed for other things down the road?

Ira:

I think we're a little bit beyond the COVID vaccination elements, but I think that to me there's an opportunity to look at the lessons learned from something like this. There will, I think be opportunities to leverage some scheduling system and it might be something that you can build out a structure for

how to implement, depending on whether you need to set it up, whatever you need to set it up for as a municipality, a registration system, or assigning appointments for anything. You can even open an open tool, but building off the lessons learned of suddenly many competing tools.

Tom:

Okay. Very good.

Chris:

Tom, one thing on the vaccination side. I think Ira hit it, and he was right. I don't know the timeliness now of that, but it was a huge issue. Some places that may still be a huge issue because there's a lot of places that are not as far along. I think is maybe New York or D.C. per se, that may still be a kind of issue out there for folks. I think the second thing that's an issue around vaccination is, who's been vaccinated? There's a whole lot of issue that goes around. I don't know Ira how you guys are doing it in New York, but we've basically taken the approach of, we can't ask employees, we're not asking employees if they have. We're providing the opportunities and that they get vaccinated in our system, we can track of how many within an area have been vaccinated. But with the federal government going out in all sorts of different directions to make vaccine available, going through the CVSs of the world and the Walmarts of the world and things like that with no hard requirement that they report to the states, who's been vaccinated. It becomes difficult to say, have we reached that 70% vaccination point?

Chris:

I know that's something that we're struggling with across the board. Because as we look at the numbers of people we've vaccinated, they're not all D.C. people. We're back saying people from Virginia and Maryland as well, if they're essential workers in the district. So our numbers are skewed on that. There's a big issue I think around all of that.

Ira:

I got to agree with you. Look at how they faced the target groups in between the 1A, and the 1B, and the 1Cs and all that stuff that you're doing here. As I look at the senior citizens count, it's just pretty impossible to know when that proper phase from the 1A, to the 1B would go in because you don't have the data that says that this much of percent of senior citizens in your communities were vaccinated. Having some type of analytical tools that could capture some of these reporting requirements and use that to then strategize locally would be a great help.

Chris:

Literally demand stops, like we did our first 75 and older. Once the demand started to trickle below 80% of our vaccine appointments being booked within a certain amount of time we opened it up to 65 and older. As those started to wane beyond the 80% being filled immediately, we opened 16 to 60. So there is no 100% on what was just said. There's no hardcore way to be tracking how you're hitting what parts of your population.

Tom:

Do you all see that as an individual opt-ins citizen report, or is that something that could be bad for companies where we can honestly get that data, keep it in the sites just for government use only. I'm

just curious to see, is it a simple data gathering effort or is it a massive public education and opt-in effort?

Ira:

I know Pennsylvania, they have a system called PA-SIIS. There's a requirement for all the providers in Pennsylvania they went to the providers, the pharmacies and the health systems to inoculate. There's a requirement within 24 hours after you administer the vaccine that patient information to be registered into the system. I'm assuming it goes to the state because there are some graphs that aren't very useful, but they do put out numbers and stuff like that. But I don't know what it's like in other states. I think what I can pinpoint as far as the federal partnership. I question if the federal partnership is mandated to use that system or not.

Chris:

Is not. But I hear you, that we've got the same thing. From our vaccination that we get in... I call it as a state, even though we're the district. Whatever we get from the federal government and we send out to our folks the vaccines. We do the same thing, we have same providers that are doing vaccinations for us, we have that reporting requirement. So what we've in our allocation we can track. The allocation that the federal government giving to all the other special programs, we have no visibility on, and there's no requirement for them, even though we've sat with them and said, "Please report this to us." We're not getting it from everybody. And then on top of it, there's the underlying issue of even with our partners, who we have vaccinating our hospital systems and the other pharmacies in HQ or... Excuse me, the community health care folks FQHCs. We're getting data from them on how many vaccinations they're giving and information from that, but distilling that down to our true population is becoming difficult.

Tom:

Right.

Ira:

Just to add one more thing, and then I'll be quiet. Then what the issue you have at a local level, because I represent the county, so then I don't know. One of the initiatives that we have in the state is a target pop-up clinic to target specific groups. So if I wanted to target senior citizens, I would have no idea without any data how many senior citizens were vaccinated. If I wanted to target the food service employees, there's nothing there that says there's nothing that I can strategize to say, "Hey, I need to put this clinic here because there's nobody up here. There's very limited participation." Or, "Hey, I got a group of food service employees that I want to vaccinate." I have no idea I could open up a clinic and three people show up because they already got vaccinated.

Chris:

That's it.

Ira:

Thanks.

Tom:

Okay. This will be the last time we talk about any of the potential new issues, or update on our [crosstalk 00:44:29] sliding here?

Chris:

Tom, I defer to the group if this is right for the whole group or not. We mentioned the gun violence stuff before. Our mayor put an order out, not an emergency order but basically calling the increase in gun violence we've seen in our city as epidemic, and a crisis. So we set up an emergency operation center around that, or putting the same focus on that as we do for COVID and for other things. I would say it's akin to the opioid response that was going on. We're not the only city or town in America, that's experiencing a serious increase in gun violence right now. So I don't know if that's something that the group thinks is a big enough of an issue or not?

Tom:

Any comment.

Kelly:

My opinion it's definitely a big enough issue. It's hard to imagine the issue other than coronavirus itself. It's more important these days. The question is, can we bring any value to it? And I think that the value that all hazards consortium brings is the whole notion of knocking down silo walls and connecting technology together and those sorts of things. It's a good question, Chris, is there an opportunity there? I think that, just going back to the COVID saying, that if you look at what happened in a lot of places there was a government construct there for vaccinating. It was something that was built up over really painfully slowly over a long period of time. And then when the pods needed to be stood up, it was a hybrid model where most of those plans were ignored and governments went forward and they constructed this Frankenstein's monster of the Walgreens and CVSs on one side, and then a little bit on the hospital, healthcare, FQHC side, and then the mega pods, and then bringing FEMA up. It's not as ugly and operation as you could conceive. I think that there's an opportunity there because I think that, had they leveraged the private sector in an organized way, the way the private sector can deliver those sorts of things. It could have been a lot smoother, and that's something I think we can bring.

Kelly:

I do think that on the technology side, the driver is going to be electronic health records. If you look at what happens in a hospital, I have an app and all of my health data is on the app. When it came my turn to be vaccinated, my iPhone told me and I just went and clicked something and scheduled it. That's the future, I think. Not everybody has an electronic health record now, but I think the future is that they would. I don't think they're going to construct something outside that when it comes to that, but there may be an opportunity for us to help that along somehow, make the connections that can build that out. I like to think of it in terms of the COVID commission, like the 911 commission. There's going to be a COVID commission, they're going to look at this job and they're going to talk about all the things that went wrong, and there's plenty of them, and they're going to be like, "This is what we need to do now to make it better next time." That's where I think maybe some of our future might be.

Ira:

Kelly, I think as usual you're right on. I think conversations I've had with my colleagues in Israel, when people have talked about, why do things move so quickly there? One of the answers is that everyone's part of, one of two health HMO's and all the records for every citizen is electronic, and in the system.

They were just able to not move forward with all that data in one place, rather than having all this competition.

Ira:

The other thing, I think I just have to see it, but one of the things, there's this on BBC Select, the 54 days, I think it was. Dr. Barbot, our former health commissioner, one of the things they talked about was for all the planning... And Kelly knows this well for all the planning that we do, and did with the subject matter experts in the health department and emergency management. I think the one thing that people didn't really factor in was the... And they said it was the politicization of the process. We spent years and years working in the silo of healthcare and the subject matter experts, all thinking along the lines of what they would do if faced with this challenge and if they were empowered to execute their plan. And then all of a sudden, when faced with the opportunity to put it into play... This happened a lot of places, the governors and mayors all said, "Wait, no, we'll take it from here," and created a little bit of a mess.

Kelly:

Nowhere that they not do that, I think.

Ira:

But that's one of the challenges. When I started in emergency management in 2003, we were working on the pod plan. We had pod plans. But I think the idea that the politicians would come in and totally offended. Instead of saying simply, "Let the people who know what they were doing." But, "I'll get off my soapbox now, thank you for the therapy session."

Kelly:

I always agree with my friend Ira, but for me somebody somewhere needs to give me those hours of my life back. I don't know how many hours I sat in the pod planning meetings. I need to get that back.

Ira:

Agreed.

Tom:

Well, good.

Ira:

All right. Well, this will be the last time we talk about it, but I think at the end of the day we want to look at staying relevant, and it's a good time every year to revisit at our first board meeting, what are the issues that are pressing, that are new, that didn't exist? There'll be some other ones that come up along the way. Just for sake of time, I'm going to jump forward real quick into our updates discussion. Tom Hyatt, and you're up on the agenda here.

Tom Hyatt:

Nothing too much new to report on legal. I continue to work with Tom and bounce around ideas as we think about our evolution and the grant funding that John talked about coming in and out. As we pivot from large contract to others that this organization has always been about innovation and always been about being flexible and being agile. So we continue to do that and be on track to that. We looked at a

couple of contracting things together, and we'll continue to look at these things as they come forward, but otherwise pretty much steady if you go on legal Tom.

Tom:

Any questions for Tom? Okay. Let me jump into just a quick discussion on AHC services. We talked about the staffing and advisory service. What I think is the most interesting about that one is, that is basically zero marketing on our part from the consortium now. Others may be marketing on our behalf, but I just think that was a good business proposition. And that thing has really grown and is trust. The people there know us trust us, and we got people inside that understand it's a good value. I see that continuing to grow. One of the things that we want to do is expand on that and build a talent farm system. Where we can identify new and emerging young folks that are coming in emergency management, what kind of process could we put together that would build off of your collective years of experience and training and plug them into exercises or webinars that we conduct to do that? And then when the stuff hits the fan, you all have a pool of people to pull from as do the consulting community. I think we need to explore that this year.

Tom:

A piece of news is, INL just got contacted by FEMA to reassess all of the EMI training. I just heard this today. Kelly, I mentioned your experience with EMI. I'm sure others have. Maybe with INL assessing what's there now. Jeff Stern is now the director over there, and from what INL told me, Jeff wants to revisit all of it. It's old, it needs refreshing. Maybe there's an opportunity he has to work with INL to do some of that at EMI down the road. We'll see. But training is going to-

Chris:

INL will need some people that have done this to help with that.

Tom:

Yes. Well, I talked to Ollie Gagnon and he was all over it Chris. We're partnering with them as you know on a couple things. One of them is they want to hire the Consortium now to do their annual meeting. As a matter of fact, I think they're going to stop doing their annual resilience week from the critical infrastructure side and just become part of our January summit. They were so impressed with the types of people that were there, the content, so that may end up being a new contract with INL for us to do that with them. But training I think is a big one. And I think you're right. I think they realized that the stuff that's there needs to be informed by folks like you all. That have been down the road, that can share real operational experience, not just the academic side. So we'll have a meeting on that coming up.

Tom:

The other component is our applied operational research project model. Tom Hyatt and I were talking about we're slowly coming out of the gate with that, that looks very much like the [FMRI 00:56:17] model. I think I mentioned this before to some of you, FMRI is a... I forget what it stands for Chris Eisenbrey, the electronic power research...

Tom:

They do projects with their members and we formed a committee of people on the sites that they work [inaudible 00:56:34] similar things. I think Joe Picciano, was involved in that. We'll provide more information before, but the [inaudible 00:56:43] is a great projects that can be crowdfunded by consortium member companies, [inaudible 00:56:49] governments, whatever, that bring about innovation and process equal and some technology. I know training is going to be a big one, but I also think there's going to be opportunities to revisit a lot of nagging probing issues. I'll give you one, Chris Eisenbrey you're like this. Chris, I believe EEI hires Greg Grillo, to do the NRE?

Chris Eisenbrey:

Yes, to do our national response. So then the tabletop, which is tomorrow.

Tom:

Yes, which is tomorrow. So I spoke with Greg today because Persia and some of the states that you know Tom, we ought to figure out a way where we could get a bunch of companies to fund doing NRE light, meaning focused on a regional level because one of the Persian made a comment, "Because NRE is great and the feds are involved, but when it really hits the fan, the states have to be involved. The feds are almost irrelevant at times, for the operational groundwork. I ran this idea by Greg. He thinks it's a great idea. We'll see what happens. But at the end of the day, that's the type of coordination project where if that works, we want to synchronize with the NRE exercise, but make it more state, local focus at the ground level, like we do with mutual assistance every year.

Tom:

Anyway, that's an example of an idea that we can put into a project down the road. So, stay tuned on that one. In the end, we'll be producing a booklet of projects. Hopefully some of those will get funded, where now we can actually apply staff and resource to it as we go forward. The last thing I want to mention is, we've been doing a lot of work with CISA and now FEMA on how they can engage us. The contractual model is always problematic, but one of the questions that came up, and I wanted to bounce this off of you all, is apparently the federal government agencies and by services very quickly, but getting projects and contracts underway is very difficult.

Tom:

So our challenge is how can we describe what we do as an organization, as a service. Where they would pay a subscription fee, like they do for a data set or a membership subscription over that. And they get certain benefits. We've never really looked at what we do like that, but to a federal agency, they can engage the consortium as a service provider, much faster than they can as a project partner. And I was just curious to get some of your feedback on what do you think of that approach and what do you see as the deliverables for that? Or partly could be some deliverables for that. I'll just go down the list, Joe P, what are your thoughts about what that might [crosstalk 00:59:43]

Joe P:

Not really, but just something that Kelly had mentioned during the last call, it was, "Let's not miss the opportunity linking that thinking to infrastructure." We could be the key integrator for information sharing, if the government decides to move really aggressively into building significant integration of what's going on with infrastructure, linking all the different organizations together. There's a lot that we can provide from information sharing. I see that as something that we need to be prepared to be ready to jump into. I think there's a lot of opportunities. We already have a tight link with the energy sector,

but when you talk infrastructure, you can link in transportation, you can link in communications and the opportunities. If somebody decides to make major investments we can be a major integrator in that process.

Tom:

Great. Got it. I'll just go down the list. Kelly, any thoughts?

Kelly:

Tom, if you would. My son just walked in.

Tom:

All right, Bud Mertz.

Bud Mertz:

First of all, anytime that Joe talks about infrastructure he always amazes me. He'll go down in my memory is always being the expert in that field. So I like what he said. No matter what the disaster is, it always affects an infrastructure and give up, when there was the quarantine and the shut down of the rail systems and the bus systems and all that other stuff. There's always an effector. He brought up some good points there. I just wanted to add to it.

Bud Mertz:

The only other thing that I would say is, to go in line with the training it's the sustainment of leadership. I think that that's powerful. Back in the day we visited states where they were appointing new homeland security directors and all that other stuff. The threat never goes away just because you get a new leader in there. It doesn't matter who the leader is there. In order to bring a leader up to speed, not only the training and the using experience. There's also a reality of values that a person has to sit in those positions that you can't teach it, but you can at least share it. I just think that sustainment of leadership is an important service that based on membership, we have those abilities.

Tom:

Thank you. If you're done. Ira, any thoughts about.

Ira:

Service oriented?

Tom:

Yeah.

Ira:

I would say just...

Tom:

Go ahead.

Ira:

Sorry. I was just going to say, I think the words that come to mind, either like aggregator or convener, I think that's the term you use frequently. The ability with a service that theoretically, I think the consortium could provide is the ability to pull together a focus group and industry specific meeting or conversation that someone in the federal government might be looking to bounce an idea off. People have relationships and they can talk to whoever they want, but one of the things that, a phone call to AHC can have 10 people from the electric industry, or from some other industry that we have relationships with on a call to throw an idea around two days later if it service that. We do focus groups a week where we have ideas and we go to a company, whoever meets the criteria that we're trying to target and they pull together that from their network of contacts. I think we could do that, but from a specific industry or infrastructure, et cetera. It might be a service that someone's willing to pay for.

Tom:

Got it. Thank you. Very good. [Chris 01:04:40]

Chris:

Sorry, Tom I was trying to-

Ira:

He's Kelly's son that went...

Chris:

I like Ira's idea right there, because I do think with the group that we have that surround the consortium, there's a lot of true expertise in a lot of different fields, so I think those are great ones. Don't necessarily have an additional one to add, but I think that was a really good one.

Tom:

Okay. Very good. Kelly, you're back.

Kelly:

Tom, I do agree with Joe's point about infrastructure. I don't know if this is quite on point, but just to sort of beat the dead horse. If we had to do this again, in terms of COVID, it's going to involve the private sector to a much greater extent, especially when the landscape looks like, what Ira talks about, which is everybody having an EHR, an electronic health record. It's the not-for-profit healthcare, it's the for-profit pharmaceutical companies and the dispensary's. Government doesn't convene a group like that really well. In fact, that's an understatement. We could, it's a massive undertaking, but within INL overlay to even even start with focus groups about laying out a blueprint and then building it, I think that falls right in our wheelhouse, because this organization is founded on that precept that government and the private sector don't work well together, they don't trust each other but they are inextricably bound together.

Kelly:

By the way, the private sector does big things better than the government, especially on short notice. It's going to be a different world going forward. And I think if we're smart and we put our heads in the future, there's a lot of things that make sense for us to get involved with.

Tom:

Thank you, Kelly. Chris Eisenbrey, any comments?

Kelly:

No comments specific to this topic. Appreciate the offer though.

Tom:

Did I miss anybody? Okay. We have a call this week with representatives from FEMA and DHS about what this might look like. Kelly, we went back and gave him a proposal for \$6 million to start this coordination center. They really liked it, but it's a big ticket item. It's a new contract like that. And I just have a funny feeling that's where they want to go with us, but they're kind of hinting it, "You guys make it a service. It's easier for us to buy." That's where we are. I appreciate everyone's input on this. I'll find out more this week, but I'll circle back with everybody, so you know. But anyway, this just came up. All this has happened since the summit.

Tom:

Rick Driggers, by the way, is leaving. He was a temporary acting for the Integrated Operation Center. I don't know who the new person is, but Rick is going to move on. I'm not sure where he's going. I think Rick is the one pushing them in this direction from what I can gather. So stay tuned. I'll make sure we get back everybody on this one. I think that's it on the updates, any new business?

Ira:

Well, I would just say that I encourage folks to watch, Deanne Criswell confirmation hearing on March 25th.

Tom:

Very good.

Ira:

Let's see what the next steps are. Just a little plugs for all the good training that New York city does to prepare the next generation of female leadership.

Tom:

Very good. What was the date [crosstalk 01:09:29]?

Ira:

March 25th.

Kelly:

What do you think just having her in that spot? Which is pretty exciting. Is there an opportunity there just for New York city and OEM? Because all of this stuff is going to hinge upon the strategic direction that she sets. If we could sell her on things. I think what she's going to need to do is show some quick wins, obviously. So what could we do to help her with some quick wins? I guess that's the question. I think she's going into a tough organization. I think FEMA is one of the toughest. Chris you've been there.

They're very shorthanded. They've got couple of hundred openings, especially at the senior level, there are a lot of folks that left. She's got a tough road ahead.

Ira:

I think at some point there's going to be an opportunity to get in and have a conversation and she's familiar with the consortium. I can't walk in tomorrow and schedule an appointment for down the road, but I think it's the opportunities.

Tom:

Kelly, I think what you said is really important. All of these people coming in are looking for quick wins. Maybe we can help, maybe we don't, if they pick us always knowing, what are the top three issues that are on your mind? I agree. I agree. Helping people find quick wins sometimes easier than we think. Well, that's great. Congrats to her.

Ira:

I apologize. I have to drop off, but it's always a pleasure to speak to everyone. I'll catch up with you soon.

Chris:

Ira, can I hold you for a second?

Chris Eisenbrey:

Sure.

Chris:

And Tom Hyatt, I don't know if we need to ask Tom and John to drop off here, but we had a financial discussion earlier. We have a quorum of the board, and I don't think we've talked about an increase for our executive director and John yet with the board. I don't know if we need to go into a session with that, without them, or can we do it with them just on holding, listening?

Tom Hyatt:

Chris, this is Tom Hyatt. It'd be appropriate to go executive session, but if Tom or John want to comment before doing so that's fine too.

Tom:

Sure, we can drop. That's not problem if you all want to talk privately. No problem at all.

John Molnar:

No, that that's not an issue at all. Just to make sure we understand that the amount that we're moving towards is basically a reduction, because [crosstalk 01:12:38] the grant is over with. Just so that's clear. But no, I certainly will drop off.

Tom:

Okay, Chris, I'll let you take it from here.

Chris:

Thanks Tom. Thanks John.

Tom:

See you guys.

Chris:

All right. Sorry, folks. I know I threw that on last second here, but I've been wanting to do this for several meetings and Tom's recommendation was to get the group together and that's hard enough to do when we're scheduled. I do want to put on a motion out there for the board of looking at a 10% increase, and that's just my first thoughts here for both Tom and John. We haven't done an increase that I know of for them since they started, or even since they've moved over away from the relationship we had before. So to put that on the table for any discussions or thoughts.

Ira:

Second.

Chris:

This is Tom-

Ira:

I think it's appropriate-

Tom Hyatt:

Go ahead and take the second and then I'll get into the discussion, Chris.

Tom:

I got a second. Go ahead, Tom.

Tom Hyatt:

Thanks. Point of information on this. Tom and John, we've had a conversation or two about this already are in the process of pivoting their contracts this year. And John Molnar alluded to that a bit earlier in this call. Essentially last year, they were relatively lucratively compensated based on their efforts of fee for service, but it was a model based on they're doing a fair amount of consulting work themselves through the IDL contract. And that contract is now long down. It basically brings a lot less into the organization to provide compensation for their efforts. So what we've been looking at is basically scaling back their agreements to more like they were before the IDL contract, which is essentially being paid mostly as a traditional CEO and COO type of arrangement. I don't have their contracts front of me. Apologies, I don't have the exact dollar amounts to discuss, but that was Tom's comment a moment ago. It will be a significant reduction from where it was last year.

Tom Hyatt:

One thought, because I know Chris, this had come up once before, and I think we just didn't pursue it when the IDL thing came along, the idea of a 10% jump. And prior to that, we had not done it for many

years. I agree with that. I'm just thinking out loud here. We might take a look at what they were making before the IDL contract and make sure that this new agreement is at least 10% above that. That might be the right [bench 01:15:18] because the idea is a throughout year, it's hard to measure based on that.

Chris:

Right. That actually what I was looking at with their base was prior for the 10%, and now folks want to recommend a different percentage amount by all means. But I think a 10% increase from what their base was prior to. Understanding that they may have the opportunity again, to do consulting work. And that's fine. They've gone for many, many years without any increase. Just a thought for the group. Anybody want to recommend a different number or we good with 10?

Ira:

I'm good with 10. I think that's a good...

Chris:

Kelly.

Kelly:

What 10% is? I mean, what's the number? Do we have any idea?

Tom Hyatt:

Give me a couple [crosstalk 01:16:08] Just a second.

Kelly:

When you say that they haven't had a raise ever, how long is that?

Chris:

I think when they started with integrity. That's who we had on?

Tom Hyatt:

Yeah.

Chris:

They were salaried at integrity. We can go back before that, even with Tom and John, but I think integrity is the baseline of where we carried them over onto individual contracts with them, from that point. If I'm not mistaken, I think Tom was around 160, I want to say, and John was below that. But I could be wrong.

Tom Hyatt:

Just pulling it up right now. Chris, I'll have it for you just a sec.

Chris:

Thanks, sir. Did I answer your question Kelly?

Kelly:

Yeah. I want to be reasonable, but I think that in my organization, if I'd have grown the revenue like Molnar and Tom had done, I would be looking at more than 10% on a raised basis. And it's [inaudible 01:17:36] you're talking about a lower base. Could we even think about 12 or 15? I guess is my question?

Chris:

Why don't we get Tom to give the numbers and we'll see what that means. It's really not going to make that big of a difference on the amount of revenue that we're bringing in now. Twice our overhead.

Tom Hyatt:

I believe if I'm looking at the right agreements, Chris, they were at 180 and 160 respectively prior to the IDL agreements.

Chris:

I think if we did 15 for each, you're not hurting anything, Kelly.

Kelly:

Maybe if it's between 10 and 15, maybe we split the difference to 12 and a half. What do you say?

Chris:

I was good with 15. You want to put that out first?

Kelly:

No, no, no, no. I'm good with 15. I'm good with 15.

Chris:

Ira.

Ira:

Works for me. That's great.

Chris:

Bob are you still on?

Bud Mertz:

Yes, sir. And I'm totally in favor.

Chris:

I think we had, Joe P you're on? Maybe not. I lost Joe P.

Tom Hyatt:

Chris [crosstalk 01:18:54]-

Joe P:

I'm here. Can you hear me?

Chris:

Yes, sir.

Tom Hyatt:

Yeah.

Joe P:

Yeah. I was good with that number. Thank you.

Chris:

Okay. Chris Eisenbrey.

Chris Eisenbrey:

Absolutely. Sounds good to me.

Chris:

Anybody else that I left off, I didn't mentioned?

Tom Hyatt:

Chris, this is [inaudible 01:19:14] One other point of information is before the vote, if I might. Part of what we have to do here also, some may be familiar with this as a private 501(c)(3), is satisfy the rules in our body of law called the intermediate sanctions or process called the rebuttable presumption of reasonableness. In essence, that requires us to look at salary, comparables, things of that nature to make sure that we are in the market. Actually had Tom and John do that a couple of years ago for me. Actually, I suppose, a year or so ago when the idea of contract came along, because that was a big jump. They produce comparables then that lead me to believe that we'd be very comfortable with that now. So I may ask John to update that, just to make sure that we protected ourselves and say that we have gone through that process because it's actually a box that we have to check on, and then I need to say that we've done that, so I would have him update that. But I think even with the 15% we should be safe within that.

Chris:

Okay, Tom. So you're going to have them do that. What's the next thing that we would need to do as a board to... We've ratified this vote already. What else would we need to do to make that happen?

Tom Hyatt:

What I would recommend Chris is that, I'll work with Tom and John in finalizing these draft agreements, because we were in the process of doing just that already. We're pretty close to having them ready to go.

Chris:

We'll figure it out.

Tom Hyatt:

Again a 15% increase on their respective basis. Ask John, and I can do some spade work on my own to see what the comparables look like, and then bring the ultimate contracts back to the board for final approval. That way it should be pretty cursory since we've already done the discussion here. And we can with good conscience say that we've had the discussion, had the process approved the agreement and can check the box.

Chris:

Okay, can we do that by email, so we don't have to wait for the next actual board meetings to do that?

Tom Hyatt:

You can't do it by email, because that counts as a proxy voting D.C., which is not permitted but there's a workaround, which is that I'll send around as an attachment to the email. What's called a unanimous written consent, which is essentially a board action approving it. And if every director signs it, then that comes to the same. If we have any voting nay, which we're allowed to do, or if someone simply doesn't vote, because it does have to be unanimous, then it would have to come back to another board meeting to have it approved, and email would not do the trick, but we'll see if we can get everybody to do the consent and sign and return it back and that'll save us a meeting.

Chris:

That's great. Everybody okay with that?

Chris Eisenbrey:

Yeah, that's terrific.

Chris:

Anyway-

Joe P:

Sounds good.

Chris:

Okay. I appreciate you guys hanging on for another five minutes to get that done. I've been meaning to do that for the last couple of board meetings.

Joe P:

Great job, Chris.

Chris:

All right. Thank you guys.

Chris Eisenbrey:

This transcript was exported on Jun 08, 2021 - view latest version [here](#).

Hey, take care Chris.

Ira:

Bye guys. [crosstalk 01:22:03]

Tom Hyatt:

Enjoy. Happy St. Paddy's Day. They say.

Chris:

Yes.