

.....

>> There, hello.

>> Hello. I'm just starting up. I'm revising some of (inaudible).

>> Oh, yeah, it was like lightning fast. So -- yeah. I don't take offense.

>> OK.

>> We needed something on paper.

>> I know. I know. I put it in red. (Inaudible).

>> Laura, Google docs. Got it. Open. All right. Yep. There we go. You, me, Michelle, John. Right. Right. I'm going to have to send out a reminder to the group. An email. OK. Thank you.

>> Hi, Michelle. Good morning. Did you get the Google doc? Laura sent that out. OK. All right.

>> So your dolphin, was that the -- oh, so you're anonymous. Got it. Anonymous dolphin?

>> Just a moment.

>> Hi, Kate.

>> Morning.

>> We're going to wait a couple of minutes just to make sure. -- everyone who is coming will be coming. I didn't get any RSVPs so, I didn't ask for any RSVPs. I will do that next time.

>> My --

>> Did you get --

>> I didn't see an invite to Google. So -- the group.

>> I just sent that out.

>> You know, where we can post our comments. I never saw the shared Google.

>> Right. That just went out this morning.

>> OK.

>> Yeah. I'm sorry, that's late. But that went out just this morning. There was a little bit of hiccup in writing it. So -- Laura and I put our heads together this morning and created something to work from because time is running short, especially if we want to get this into the -- into the report, the recommendation.

I think that's usually Kate and Laura -- the deadline is usually mid January. For getting the governor's and legislators' advisory report? Generally, mid January. Yeah. Yeah.

>> Yeah, that first week of January tends to be.

>> So the first -- I thought it was like the 15th.

>> Or second week. Somewhere in there.

>> I think the second week. Yeah. So I think it would be good to visit, you know, get the group back together the first week of

January. I know jumping ahead on my agenda here. But, hopefully, we'll be able to do some work now that we have a document, at least to start with. And I figured the off shoots can come from, you know, this is the seed pod. And hopefully, the off shoots will happen.

>> Looks like this is, Val and Bill Hudson are not coming. So do you want me to email them just to double check? Remind them?

>> Yeah, if you don't mind. Giving them a quick message. And also, the FEMA person.

>> Right. Yep. Thanks for that.

>> Yep.

>> Yeah, I will follow up with Val. I'm not sure she's actually interested -- but I will follow up. She may have a lot of other irons in the fire, as we all do.

So --

>> Mm-hmm, yeah.

>> I would just as soon get started if you're OK with getting started.

>> Sure.

>> OK. Great. Well, welcome. And thank you. I apologize for the rough draft taking so long. We thought Val was writing this. And found out very recently she was not. So -- thank you, Laura, for the -- quick assist.

So, basically, what we need is, I think, essentially, a recommendation for the governor, I think, the fact that the legislative advisory report is going to happen in January and it's already December.

So I think there needs to be a piece in there. I'd like to see it fleshed out more in this -- oh, there's Bill. Hello, Bill. Hello, good to see you.

>> Hi, there. Oh, hi, sorry about that. Sorry I'm late.

>> That's OK. We're glad -- glad to have you at the table.

>> I'm busy on a different project. So, yeah. I have a part-time job now and I'm coordinating services and oh, boy. All right. I'm here, I'm here, I'm ready to engage. How many do we got here? How many do I see here?

>> Four. Five. Five.

>> There's 8 people all total. This is Laura. But there's only 5 for the committee. So yeah. We're just really missing Val, that's all, really.

>> Hey, just joined --

>> I've been here a while.

>> OK. Oh, and here's Kate. Welcome, Kate. Thank you for joining. We were just getting started. I love your tree.

>> Oh. Thank you. I'm sorry I'm running late. I appreciate it.

>> That's OK. That's OK. Does everybody know each other? Probably Kate, you don't. Can we quick run around and introduce

ourselves so Kate knows who we are. Laura, you want to start?

>> She knows who I am. Hi, Kate.

>> OK. Kate Parrish?

>> Hi, Kate Parrish here, I work for HireAbility and I'm here in Vermont. I think we have met before. I am the coordinator for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Deafblind services and I work in the employment sector.

>> Nice to see you again, Kate. We did meet with the inclusive hiring program.

>> Yep. Michelle?

>> Thought so.

>> Hi. I'm Michelle. Name sign Michelle. So I am a parent of a 10-year-old deafblind plus child and two younger siblings. I am the President of Vermont Hands and Voices, nonprofit, parent led organization that educates and does advocacy as well as fellowship opportunities for families who have children who are deaf or hard of hearing birth to 22.

>> Thanks. Bill? Would you please introduce yourself?

>> Sure. Hi, everybody. Hi, Kate. It's good to see everybody. I am Bill Hudson. So I am an advocate volunteer for the deaf and hard of hearing community and I'm also a member.

>> Thank you, and I think I'm the last one. Hi, Kate. I'm Charlea Baker, I think we've crossed paths before. But I'm with the hearing loss Association of America Vermont Chapter. And I am also the chair of this subcommittee and we are trying very hard to make sure that emergency services and press announcements and communications are accessible to deaf and hard of hearing Vermonters. Because that has become obvious that's become a huge issue and area of concern.

So, thank you, everybody, for coming. I'm not sure how many of you got the Google doc of a very rough draft quickly put together. Which states -- how many people have not seen it yet? Did everybody get a copy of it? Excellent. OK. Wonderful. I think that a lot of the wordsmithing in there, and I welcome a ton, because I just kind of banged this out this morning.

Is going to happen in this next month. But I really would like to take the time to get any updates in terms of any open doors, any process, any successes in trying to breakthrough this wall of noncommunication.

I think one of our challenges is that for the hearing administrators of this -- of these kinds of programs and activities really have a basic misunderstanding about what accessibility means for hard of hearing and deaf people. And you may have noticed that in this document, I mentioned hard of hearing and deaf.

I know that's not the conventional way, but I feel that what has happened is that deaf and hard of hearing has become by default in the hearing world, oh, yeah, those people who sign. And

so, if you provide an interpreter, everything's all cool.

So, I'm -- I sort of tweaking, I'm poking the system here by saying hard of hearing and deaf. I'm just trying to break through some of those assumptions because as a hard of hearing person, I run into those assumptions a lot. Hey, we got an interpreter for the deaf and hard of hearing, we're all set.

You know. So, so that is why the wording, I'm not sure how people feel about that. It was a deliberate choice for not trying to make controversy or aggravation, but to really -- the hearing world doesn't have malice, but they sure have some misunderstandings. And I think it's important to kind of shake that up a bit so they're willing to come to the table and go, oh, OK. If we have a person designated, they've got to understand there are two languages and two modes and two things that they have to be handling and just doing captioning is not going to help one group. And just doing interpreters is certainly not going to help the other group.

So -- does anybody have any objection to that flipping of the terminology? Yeah, Bill?

>> This is Bill. I'm not an objection to it, no. But maybe the word and make that a larger kind of understanding. So hard of hearing and deaf, you know, just initialize it more so to understand they're two different categories.

But I definitely understand the draft on it. And I do like the English imposed there. It was good.

>> OK.

>> We're switching interpreters now. I mean, it's important to understand, too, the difference for deaf and hard of hearing and the difference in those groups. Businesses are challenged with that. So it might really help to have it set up in a way that English is more accessible for everybody to understand.

>> Right. Yes, Laura?

>> You're muted, Bobbi.

>> So, yeah. Say it, again, I'm so sorry. I was muted. The abstract, you know, is that what you're wondering is the abstract that you want to change in that? Is that what you're looking at? The first part I'm looking at right now? It's called abstract. Is that -- was that -- called abstract? Yeah.

>> Yeah. I think that, I see this as sort of a jumping off point. Because we had a couple of different. We want to make a recommendation in the legislative report. We also want to initiate some communication with emergency services. And people who are in emergency services and say, how do we work together so that these protocols can be implemented?

So, it's sort of a tool box to start with and parts of it will probably go one way and parts of it will go the other way. So I think part of the discussion is, how much goes into the

legislative report? And what kind of side projects or in roads or, you know -- I see this as a time critical project because emergencies happen. They just do.

You know, it is -- it's not like winter isn't here. And, you know, and you get the snow and the ice and you've got to let people know things and the pandemic is not gone. Speaking of somebody who is just getting over COVID. And so, these kind of weekly governor information sessions, which are a wealth of information, important information, crucial information, is simply not accessible. It just isn't.

And so, I think that just writing a legislative report is something that grinds through a slow process. And I think, I guess, my personal view is that we really need to -- we need to push this on several different planes.

I don't know if people feel differently with that. Do you see the legislative report as the most important thing? Are there -- other thoughts of how we proceed? Yes, Michelle? Oh.

>> Yeah, Kate has had her hand up.

>> Oh, I'm sorry. Kate? Kate McCarthy.

>> Yep. There we go. Sorry, I was having a little difficulty. I think from my perspective, I can't really speak on the legislative part, right? Because we need to remove ourselves from that. However, I can give some thoughts in terms of the emergency services that you had just mentioned. And, you know, one of the things that we're working with, hopefully, with the state and many of you is a rough focus after action report.

So, you know, of course, we had Irene many years ago in 2013 and then most recently the flooding that's been going on in Vermont, and I think, you know, under leadership of Laura and others who are on this call, as well, the state was able to identify some significant gaps, right, in the beginning, you know, I can speak to the gap in the interpreters and you know there weren't many and how do we get the contracts signed? And when do we bring in the state and when do we bring in FEMA?

But also to your point, which you brought up on one of the working groups, there tends to be a lot of focus, as you said on sign language interpreters and making sure that we have contracts in place with that. How do we also emphasize the need for, you know, additional assistive technology? Or whatever that might be? And make it as streamlined as we do with an interpreter? And I think from both of those perspectives, we can be helpful.

>> Mm-hmm. OK. I'm curious, Kate, if -- is there on the federal level, do you have someone designated to ensure, you know, whether this happens in Mississippi or whether it happens in Oregon or whether it happens in Vermont that the communications are accessible?

For both?

>> So from a federal perspective, keep in mind, we, FEMA, the federal emergency management agency, we go into almost as a guest as the state. We get called in when the state reaches their limit and they need additional assistance. So the example the most recently of the flooding.

Vermont needed that additional assistance and then the Federal Government comes in. And so, yes, I can answer it from this perspective. In each of the regions, FEMA has ten regions across the country. And so, region one is all of New England. So from Connecticut to Maine, and in this case, that particular position is myself.

So I'm deployed to support Vermont, but when we don't have disasters, it's what I do during, you know, my regular day job. And so, from that perspective, I can provide the support to you to assist the state in writing the plans and making sure they're meeting the requirements and providing that technical assistance and guidance.

And so, absolutely. But the end result as to whether or not someone, whether their plans are written up to code and whether they reflect the requirements and the laws really falls on the state and groups like this to kind of make sure that the state does it.

And then, where we come in, if there's gaps, like there was a huge gap in the beginning with interpreters in Vermont and then working with Laura supplementing that with a contract to get more interpreters into Vermont. So we can come in to help to address those gaps and support the planning beforehand, but it's really becomes kind of a state and local requirement. Does that make sense?

>> Right. I was wondering in terms of, I understand that FEMA being federal does sort of take a backseat. I wonder about the opportunity if you know there's going to be a press conference and you're going to be present and, you know, I certainly have sat through enough of them with the headphones and the struggling to hear where, you know, the governor says something and then, secretary of state says something and then, we have the FEMA person come. If you're part of that that, is it an opportunity to say, gee, you know, is there accessibility for deaf and hard of hearing people? Is there captioning? Is there an interpreter? Which sort of might trigger the local folks to go, oh, you know, we --

>> Yeah, absolutely. So you know, in my position, I do my best to ensure that if someone from region 1, can't speak to headquarters, but someone like the federal coordinating officer, FCO William Roy in Vermont right now. If FCO Roy is included in any type of press briefing or anything like that in Vermont, yes, it does fall on, you know, myself and others to make sure there's a reminder going out that says, well, in order for us to participate, we need to ensure there's full accessibility.

Is that always the case? Not necessarily. But that's a policy that we've set from region 1, I can't speak to Mississippi

and California and all of the other places that you mentioned. But that's the reminder that we provide, but keep in mind, that's only during a disaster, right? Now, if it's not a disaster and our regional administrator, someone who is in the main office for FEMA in the region goes to Vermont for a discussion, again, there we once again can provide that support and that reminder to the state. But it kind of is like, OK, how do we do it so we don't need that reminder, right? So it's an automatic kind of thing?

But to answer your question, yes, definitely, we do that.

>> OK. That's actually very helpful and good to know. So it's not just us saying to the state this really needs to happen but to have the reminder come from outside saying, this is how FEMA does it in terms of accessibility, is that in place here? As an advocate for hard of hearing and deaf people, I found that sometimes asking the question will trigger the thought process.

So that is helpful. Anybody else? Yes, Michelle?

>> I have a followup question. When FEMA sends out kind of that reminder, is it spelled out what best protocol is? IE, interpreter is, you know, viewable, it's closed captioning, picture in picture, it is spelled out what that should look like?

>> Yes, from our perspective, again, from the federal perspective, absolutely. At times, based on the locality, that also can impact it. Remember, there might be different languages. So let's use the example, you know, that we're talking about interpreters, right?

As Laura knows, we worked hard on maintaining and getting the interpreters in Vermont, it was important to try and find people from Vermont, right? Who did the interpreting because they were more familiar with terminology and things such as that in Vermont.

But the closed captioning, anything that's a requirement by law, Michelle, that's included. So, you know, we always have the interpreters, always have the CART, closed captioning, whatever it's supposed to be. But remember, if it's a Vermont television station or a Vermont press conference, Vermont owns it.

So in this particular, I can advise then, and I have in the past, someone from FEMA to not be present because the accessibility requirements were not being met, which then might have triggered, as you said, increasing the opportunities for the accessibility.

But in the end, if it's a Federal Government run meeting, event, discussion like we've been having the stakeholder calls, right, we provide the services. And so, that's where the distinction is. However, like we said, right now, kind of being in between is a perfect time to plan for it and say, OK, FEMA, the next time you come into Vermont, we appreciate the fact that you ensured that all of these services were provided.

However, can we also next time keep in mind that we need

a little bit more in the category of hard of hearing or little bit more in this category. And then, we can build it into the menu to make sure the next time we come to Vermont as you said, it becomes a natural reminder to Vermont. Even though we might not be fully responsible. I hope that clarifies.

>> Yeah. Yes. It does. Or Michelle, I guess -- you be the judge of that. All right.

[Laughter]

Anybody else? Yeah, Laura? Oops, I saw Laura's hand first and then Kate.

>> Yeah, I just put something in the chat here. So, I know that Vermont public matches the act, no -- the accommodations act. They talk about the public accommodations, you know, that are provided for the public, I'm wondering if we should include your legislative report. Just a thought.

>> I'm not sure -- you want to include the legislative report into what?

>> Did we include that into --

>> We were wondering if that would help. -- maybe to do what we want to accomplish. Would that help if we added it? Did we get that wrong, Sabrina? I did get that wrong. Go ahead and clarify it.

>> Did we include this legislative public accommodation law already in place into the legislative report you want to file?

>> Hmm. I know that the advisory council writes a report every year to make recommendations. There's going to be, I imagine, a long report about education from the other subcommittee. We would also be making a recommendation in terms of accessibility.

I'm not sure of, you know, you've got the federal accommodations, you've got ADA, those things are out there. I'm not sure we need -- we've put that into our report. Is that what you're asking? I guess, I'm not quite understanding your question.

>> I'm asking because we're talking about the state level. So I don't know if it would be helpful to -- what is this?

>> As a reference.

>> As a reference. What Vermont public accommodation law is. So to include that in the report is also what is required at the state level, not just federal.

>> Yeah. I think anything that gives credibility to the recommendation. You know, we're not making this up out of own heads but saying, you're not -- you're not following federal law, you're not following state legislation that says you need to be accessible. So I'm not aware -- I'm not a good lawyer.

[Laughter]

I'm not a lawyer at all. So I can't pull out that specific legislation that would be relevant but I think in our wordsmithing and the nuts and bolts rolling up our sleeves in the next month and

passing this document around, I think that's certainly something to add in there. Because I think anything that bolsters our case would be important. And I don't think the section is going to be terribly long compared to many of the other reports. The one thing I'd just really like to have emphasized in this is that this has real human impact. This endangers people who are deaf and hard of hearing.

Having, you know, a lack of access to this information in a timely, immediate way, like all of the hearing people get, this truly is a -- I didn't write down negligence, but I think making the point that this has true impact. And the solution to this doesn't have to be complicated and doesn't have to be expensive.

We're not talking about a new position, we're not talking about funding a new title. You know, a whole new person to do this. This is a matter of identifying who is responsible, who is going to be responsible, this is a responsibility on top of their other list of responsibilities. So it shouldn't be that hard.

To my way of thinking, this should not be so hard. Bill, did you have your hand up?

>> Yes. Kate Parrish. But this is Bill. I agree, Laura, wait, Bill -- Kate was before you. Oh, OK. Kate was, OK, sorry about that, Kate.

>> Oh, I'm sorry. I lost track. Kate?

>> No, all good. So, I think it's important to add in that, too, that legally, legislators are also community members, right? And maybe they're not aware of all the actual laws in place and the legalities of them. I mean, just looking up the laws specifically about captioning, accessibility, just doing a rough Google search of that, you find the key points of what they're referring to.

The point is that, you know, they're supposed to provide it. They're required to it. And I think that's helpful, too, to really emphasize it's already established law.

I don't know.

>> I agree. Thank you, Kate. Bill?

>> And sorry, also, I forgot to add one other thing. I have a question. Sorry, Bill. I know we have contracts with interpreters, I'm also wondering if we have contracts with CART services. And Laura responded, no, we don't.

So, I'm wondering if we need to add some type of reference point for that. Maybe, you know, if we're going to say this is the problem, we also provide a solution to that problem. So I'm wondering if it would make sense to also have a reference to different types of contracts for CART services that we can employ in emergency situations that are ready to go.

I don't know if that's a possibility. And this is Laura, White Coat won't do a state contract. So, they prefer to do it case by case for each request that comes up. This is Kate, so what about the other one? RCC -- I mean -- it could be a state level type of

thing. There's funding, there's state funding available for those types of things to cover that type of situation.

I don't know. I don't know. I mean, it's just one other place that we could take advantage of resources we already have and they're already in place.

>> Good point. RCC.

>> Right. And RCC complains they don't use their services. So yeah --

>> This is Laura, well, people worry about, oh, are things available and that money might run out quick. I don't know. I don't know. It's something to consider.

>> But White Coat doesn't have an exclusive contract with the state, am I correct? Laura? They just have a contract, that we certainly could go to a competitor who may offer us -- offer the state a better deal.

>> So, one thing to consider when FEMA comes in is we develop contracts, right? And so, when we're not in the midst of a disaster, I try and identify those agencies, organizations, we'll be quick to have those contracts set up, right?

And also, if we were to have a stakeholder meeting in Vermont, who might that be? And so, during the emergency, Laura, Val, Rebecca, others provided sort of the contact information that we wound up using. It had to go out, out to bid, but I guess there was WURN primary group that did that.

So if there's others that you recommend, if you can make like a list, I have a generic list, but if there's a list of some of the top contractors, whether it's for sign language, CART, whatever it might be, then we can start on our end kind of having those situated. At least if there's an emergency where we're participating. And that might be helpful.

>> We don't always know. And I'll rely on the experts, you're the experts, I'll rely on you to say, OK, here they are. But sometimes, it takes a little bit of time to get that into place if it's not already in place.

>> That's great. Thank you, Kate. Bill, I'm sorry, I don't mean to --

>> It's OK.

>> I'm agreeing with all that's being discussed here. I'm on board with it and I was just going to put that in. It's all on point. You do need a point person for all of these resources and I mean funding is not the issue at large but yes.

>> OK. Laura?

>> We also wanted to let you know, BGS, the buildings and grounds general services, they're the ones that hold the statewide contracts for things, and I did do a little bit of research a while ago and found out that any state contract they have people are not

required to, but it's recommended to use statewide contracts. That might help in a way. I don't know.

But people who are being hired in, it's something to consider if they're on the BGS contract list.

>> Hmm, OK. And Laura, I'm assuming that any kind of contract having to do with deaf and hard of hearing, you're going to be at the table. Am I right?

>> Hopefully, hopefully, I'm there, in theory. So far, I have been.

>> Standing behind you pushing.

>> But I don't want to assume that's going to automatically happen, either.

>> OK. All right. OK. So -- action plans. Because a lot of really good ideas. Ideas on moving forward.

>> This is Kate Parrish. It seems, we should have as -- as we approach January, we should have a deadline of knowing, I mean, we only got a month. So we've got to budget our time accordingly. So I'm wondering it's helpful to look through this draft. And I have my own draft, as well. So I will compare the two and add in where I feel like it could be fleshed out a little bit more.

>> Mm-hmm.

>> But it seems like we're all in agreement, though, and we'll get it in there. Maybe referring to the Vermont Public Law, as well, there's one section on that about accessibility and accommodations, public accommodations. And maybe we, I don't know, an idea of having a CART section, maybe that's something to instill into this, as well.

And it's also part of public services. There are CC, so we have a designated place to use some of that information.

>> Mm-hmm.

>> Especially, if it's emergency-related. It's a resource we already have established in the state. I don't know. Something to consider to add in there. But there's one last bit to add in, where is that? But it seems like, you know, it's a pretty good draft. We're pretty close to done on it.

So, really good progress and it's close to ready, I think.

>> Thank you. I wonder, and I'm open to opinion, sometimes, I think it's the legislators who read tons of paper. And really get -- I imagine, you know, I'm a bookworm, but I can imagine reading through all of this stuff.

I wonder if it's important to start this document for -- that section for the report with stronger language in terms of putting people at risk or a neglect of legal obligation by the state. I don't know if fiery language is is appropriate, but I think if we keep it kind of dry and -- it might be glossed over.

And I wonder about making legislators actually be aware that this is -- this is truly a dangerous situation. When people do not have access to emergency information. I mean, this makes a hazard.

And legally, the state is required to be accessible.

>> Yeah, I was going to add one thing to that. So, again, I mean, I can't really have a part in the legislative part, right, but I can certainly guide in terms of, you know, recommendations for certain things.

I think definitely, and I just thank you, Laura, for sending it to me in a Word document. I think you do something initially that says, there are so many people in Vermont, you know, that might require certain accommodations, put that out there right in the beginning. Then, I would possibly consider where you have in the end about several emergencies, you know, put a little fact up there in the top. You know, reminding them that even with the floods that first 24 hours did not have the following accommodations.

However, it's recognized why because there were limited services, limited information. And then, the other thing I would recommend including all of the things that Kate Parrish talked about were good. But it can't hurt at the tail end to kind of list what those are, right? So I mean, if a legislator is not familiar, but they're taking this and they want to now make a statement, give them some simple language that says, well, when we're talking about these services, here's some examples of what we're talking about.

And then, they have the knowledge of how many people, they have the knowledge of an impact that recently happened, right? Some of the solutions, and then, also, examples.

>> Yeah. I think, being very specific is important. And just to sort of correct the record, the first 24 to 48 hours, there was no interpreter, there has never been captioning.

Ever. It just was never provided over the air waves. To this date. So Bill, your hand was up?

>> Yes. I recall quite a few years ago, the commissioner for the deaf and hard of hearing when they were established at this House -- so it was one of the commissioner, legislature, the wording was used as we're discussing here, as well, was trying to get the attention of the legislature, it didn't have a lot of reading. They kind of glance at it and put it aside.

And so, it might be advantageous to have the data there at the beginning. Like 57,000 Vermonters were without life-saving, you know, assistance and so -- just a suggestion. Maybe to add some data, as well. And maybe one simple sentence that would highlight that.

>> What do people think about the idea of -- we're going to have this document, this is going to be part of the governor's advisory legislator letter. Not taking this exactly, but tweaking it, rewording it, making it shorter, and -- I don't know if that can come from the council to send that specifically to the state emergency management people?

To sort of make a direct line of there's a problem.

>> Can you say the last part again?

>> You've got the Vermont -- you've got the Vermont emergency management folks. If, you know, we're not going to send them the legislative report because they're not legislators, but taking this same information in a truncated form and sending it directly -- I'd have to check with Spenser if we have authorization to do something like that or possibly we take that information and put it under Laura or HLAA will stand out there and take the arrows. You know, whatever.

But to take that information and hand it to, you know, so the governor and the legislators are getting this information that's awesome. But this document can be picked apart and put into a message that goes directly, I think, that could be a role of this subcommittee even if we have to I don't know, hijack it a little bit put it under other ospices, I'm not sure there's boundaries and technically policy things to mind. Yes, Kate McCarthy?

>> So one thought on that is we're planning to assist the State of Vermont in the launching of the larger stakeholder advisory group? And within that larger stakeholder advisory group, it would be an assumption that groups such as this, subcommittees, would come in and report and all that.

At that table because it's kind of starting initially from a federal, it's going to be the federal and the state, that might be a perfect opportunity once we get that up and rolling, hopefully, the launch will be towards the end of January right there as part of the agenda.

Here's a recommendation. And build it in because at that table, the plan will be, if it's similar to how other states are that state and local emergency managers will be at the table. And this group will serve in that role as advisors and providing the technical assistance. So larger work group, I mean.

The work of this group becomes kind of a natural part of reporting in, giving some ideas and recommendations to sort of guide the communications part, that might be another segue to get your message out.

>> OK. Yeah. So I think this needs to go different places. But I think our focus right now has got to be the legislative report. This has got to be in there. We are starting to run out of time. And so, one of the things I wanted to do is establish a meeting the beginning of January. We will all be fat and happy from holiday celebrations. But that first week of January, if we could meet, again -- in the meantime, I think we should be actively working on this draft.

And if people want to make a side draft and say this would be something that we would maybe send to pertinent leadership in the emergency management system, I don't know. Or BGS or whatever. Again, we're going to have to kind of figure out what hats we're wearing. We all wear multiple hats.

But, I should have asked first. Is there any other comments or questions about the document? So we can do this pretty much email and -- yeah, Laura?

>> Yeah, I want to make sure -- are you all understanding how the accessibility Google -- how the -- how to access the Google doc?

>> I'm learning.

>> OK. It just -- save that email, you know, where I sent you the invite, flag it, if you would. You know -- so I'm not going to send it out all the time. It'll be easier to find my email. Just -- so also, I want to add the subject is going to be called Accessible Subcommittee, you'll know that's the email related to this group.

>> OK.

>> OK. And it'll be easier for you to find it that way.

>> OK. All right. Monday is January 1st. Do we want to move the meeting, yes, exactly. Do we want to move the meeting to Tuesday? Tuesday? At 11:00? 11:00, Tuesday, January 2nd? OK, but in the meantime, we'll be in touch with this document.

>> I'm going to try, OK.

>> OK. All right. Excellent.

>> Sabrina --

>> Yeah, do you want me to contact her? OK. But you're going to be host? You be the host.

>> I'll be the host.

>> Perfect. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, everyone for getting together for all of the energy and ideas and everything. I think this is really going to make a difference. This is going to -- this is important, this is important work for a lot of people who don't even know this is important work for them but we do. Yeah. Bill?

>> Yes. Kate McCarthy, thank you for joining us today.

>> Yes.

>> Thank you for having me. I'll look forward to participating at the next meeting, as well.

>> Yeah. Your input has been very helpful. Very helpful in giving us a broader view of what we're dealing with and the resource that you are. We really appreciate that. And everyone have a wonderful holiday. And we will see you after the dust settles. But definitely, let's keep in touch and keep this actively working so that we have -- I'm hoping by the beginning of January, we'll really have a tool to document to launch. Super. Thank you so much, everyone.

>> Deb --

>> Yeah?

>> Deb? And Kate and Laura. I'm not going to committee meeting -- I think there's one Thursday? No.

>> Is there one this Thursday?

>> No. But Bill said, no, regardless, I'll follow up with Spenser and Will about our discussion here. So, the two chair people.

>> Yeah.

>> And then we'll keep them informed. OK. Just wanted to know all that. Thank you. Bye.

>> All right. Bye, everyone.