

# Kansas Comprehensive Resource Management and Credentialing System

## Charter Group Meeting Notes From 21 February 2017

### Topics discussed:

#### CRMCS Updates

- Current SalamanderLive statistics (as of 2/13/17):
  - o # of Responders: 55,249
  - o # of Equipment: 21,269
    - Deployable Assets: 5,354
  - o # of Organizations: 3,979
  - o # of Admin Users: 1,789
- State sustainment cap for functional software (Command and rapidTAG) maintenance will expire August 31, 2017. This maintenance includes technical support and software updates which are the user's responsibility to install. This agreement covers all equipment purchases prior to the caps establishment.
- 1<sup>st</sup> responder laminate can be exchanged with MCID for clear laminate. This is encouraged for all users as the 1<sup>st</sup> responder laminate creates difficulty when scanning with mobile devices.
- There is GIS functionality built within SalamanderLive. This is an additional permission that must be selected for user and is available to anyone with access to the system.

#### CRMCS Charter Revision

- Updated charter (approved 2/21/2017) provided to the group identifying members and the group's objective.
  - o Objective: The CRMCS project team is responsible for focusing, discussing, and recommending strategic approaches for the following areas:
    - Sustainment of the CRMCS
    - Enhancement of the functionality and usability to the CRMCS
    - Promoting the use of the CRMCS within all disciplines across Kansas
      - Increase deployable asset visibility
      - Increase responder credentialing through affiliation tagging and proper qualifying
  - o Original outlined charter goals:
    - Short-term: Construction of project
    - Short-term: Define statewide credentials/resource standards
    - Long-term: Provide visibility of all statewide assets
    - Long-term: Support the CRMCS
    - Long-term: Meet NIMS requirements
- Recent advancements for the project were highlighted:

- AIMS migration to the CRMCS generated many new stakeholders
- Private Sector involvement in the system continues to increase
- All HLS equipment purchases will be required to be entered into the CRMCS
- The KBI is utilizing O1 Tag to track agent movements in the field during response
- Opportunities for further advancements were identified:
  - AIMS migrated equipment needs to be tier II typed
  - Additional private sector partners should be encouraged to utilize the system
  - Previous HLS purchased equipment should be identified and entered into the system
  - The KLETC could be an avenue to encourage LE agencies to utilize the CRMCS for badging of officers
  - Additional efforts should be made to make municipalities aware of the project and availability for their use

### **Stakeholder Complaints**

- Many stakeholders do not understand or like the current permissions approach for O2 Track apps. MCID advised that Salamander is still exploring the development of a “pin” concept that would allow the sharing of interTRAX data via an established user pin.
- KDEM emphasized to MCID that NO permissions should be established for the organization Kansas or KS DIV of Emergency Mgmt (to include w/children checkbox) for Kansas stakeholders.
- The system still lacks an Asset Inventory Management capability. This capability has been scheduled for delivery for the past year. MCID advises that this rollout should be within the next couple months.
- O2 Track should have a “Kiosk or Meeting” mode that allows users to simply scan in without having to interact with the app. This would allow for quick registration and mitigate user corruption of data.
- O2 Track used to have the ability to send reports via the app. This capability would be a benefit to current users.
- rapidTAG still has no push/pull capability with interTRAX Exchange. All other pieces of accountability equipment have this capability. This lack of capability highlights the developer’s interest in improving current software functionality.
- There is no editing capability within SalamanderLive Track (aka interTRAX Exchange). Any misinformation pushed to interTRAX permanently destroys the integrity of its reports.
- Stakeholders still resist the CRMCS policy for ESF 8 Health and Medical credentials requiring K-SERV verification. Their complaints revolve around the process being too cumbersome, the system not working, or their inability to convince responders to register for K-SERV even though they know the responder is qualified. Discussion was focused on the intent of the policy to increase confidence in medical credentials when viewed in the field and general consensus was that the current policy does not achieve this desired outcome. If medical

badges were viewed in the field today there would be no confidence in their validity. This lack of confidence is created by the following issues:

- Users within the system can issue qualifications without K-SERV verification
- Users can print badges for durations longer than the life of certification/license
- Expired qualifications for responders are not automatically removed within the system or by the Salamander Identification Verification (SIV) capability with O2 Track
- Many users are unfamiliar or ignorant about the criteria for medical qualification issuance
- Several users simply disregard the CRMCS policy
- *Tasking: The group agreed that the CRMCS Project Manager and the ESF 8 representative need to compose two strategies to achieve the original intent of the policy, 1.) a strategy that could be implemented without system modifications and 2.) outline the ideal application functionality that could include system, both SalamanderLive and K-SERV, modifications with cost estimates.*

### **System Sustainment**

- Brief presentation on the history of the project to include approach to equipment purchases, software maintenance agreements, and the creation of the Sustainment Cap.
- Current pricing outlook:
  - A 5 year price commitment has been made with MCID, KDEM, and Salamander that locks in the price of SalamanderLive, SIV, and the GIS feature through 2022
  - Field accountability sustainment has reached a manageable cost for Kansas. Before the creation of the Sustainment Cap the annual sustainment cost was greater than \$200k. Today the sustainment cost for field software is roughly 10% of that previous cost.
  - Salamander has changed the pricing of the self check-in feature with O1 TAG apps. Previously the state supported with functionality with a \$500 annual cost for all stakeholders. The vendor has changed this cost to be limited to 100 users and the state will no longer support this capability. If agencies wish to utilize this feature the cost associated will be their responsibility.
- Concerns moving forward:
  - Salamander continues to modify the pricing structure for products.
  - The printing infrastructure will need to be sustained for project longevity. The current printers throughout the state are reaching end of support by the vendor.
  - The efficiency of accountability field equipment must be increased. Large amounts of funds have been used to established ample amounts of equipment across the state, however the effectiveness of the equipment has not been demonstrated to date. This is largely due to a lack of a standardized approach to using the equipment for disaster accountability.

- The approach to training must be evaluated and likely pivot to address the needs of Kansas.

### **System Advancements/Enhancement**

- KDEM provided an overview of system development over 2016
- Development for the separation of training and qualifications is currently scheduled for execution this coming fall. This scope of work will include qualification prerequisites and special criteria acknowledgement.
  - Benefits of this development include less clutter in barcode (easier scanning), mitigating ignorance with qualification meaning, increased field confidence in responder capabilities
- KansasMAP will be updated to new GIS platform with faster response time. There are plans to increase functionality of KansasMAP to include interactive GIS interface between local and state governments and additional pre-disaster planning assistance.
- MCID was asked to provide anticipated Salamander developments to the system.

### **Disaster Accountability**

- The Disaster Accountability Discussion Forum Group (DADFG) provided the following statements:
  - To date, disaster accountability has not been successfully executed through the use of electronic accountability equipment within Kansas.
  - The inability to effectively perform disaster accountability has not been due to the lack of knowledge in operating the electronic accountability equipment.
  - Use of data collected from electronic accountability equipment is primarily for operational decision making (responder safety is never neglected or lost).

The approach to date has been flawed and a pivot in strategy is needed.

- DADFG observation presented:
  - *Training to date focuses solely on how to utilize the equipment, failing to identify how to “conduct” accountability.*
  - *Training targets the large audience base of county emergency managers, with multiple responsibilities and roles, to perform disaster accountability with intermittent deliveries not allowing for the specialization of disaster accountability for members.*
  - *The approach of “falling in” on positioned equipment statewide leads to delayed accountability operations and inoperable equipment.*
  - *No standardization in how to approach disaster accountability which results in varying jurisdictional concepts for executing.*
  - *The electronic accountability equipment is misbelieved to be a complete solution thus substituting NIMS established best practices.*
  - *There is a lack of understanding how to use the tracking information collected which results in accountability efforts being largely to generate a registration/check-in list.*

- *There are elements of NIMS accountability concepts that the electronic accountability equipment cannot execute resulting in limitations.*
- DADFG provided the following recommendations:
  - 1.) *Develop a bases for disaster accountability that standardizes basic concepts and terminology.*
  - 2.) *Train a small group to specialize in disaster accountability to include NIMS practices and electronic accountability equipment. This group would report to and assist the IMT RUL during a disaster, but capable of providing assistance locally without an IMT deployment.*
  - 3.) *Training should focus mainly on performing effective manual accountability through the use of ICS forms. Electronic accountability should be viewed as a secondary enhancement to these efforts.*
  - 4.) *Training should be tailor to Kansas to include both geographical and demographical characteristics. Additionally, training should be separated for local incident/jurisdictional responsibilities and the specialized team.*
  - 5.) *Position equipment for use by the specialized team. This enables quick deployment, ensured functionality, and interoperability among electronic accountability equipment.*
  - 6.) *Highlight capabilities (uses for) electronic accountability and educate incident management of its limitations.*
- The Chair proposed the acceptance and execution of DADFG recommendations:
  - 1.) Creation of a Kansas Disaster Accountability SOG tailored to Kansas
  - 2.) The formation of a Kansas Disaster Resource Unit (DRU) focused on the effective and efficient execution of disaster accountability
  - 3.) The creation of training curriculum for the DRU with emphasis placed on NIMS practices
  - 4.) The evaluation of and redefining local responsibilities for disaster accountability and creation of new training
  - 5.) Creation of a list of required equipment to manage effectively disaster accountability
  - 6.) Acknowledge software limitations and promote ideal use of equipment
- The Chair additionally purposed that the group morph the DADFG into the DRU.
  - Deliverables: A specialized team capable of conducting complicated disaster accountability with both manual and electronic approaches.
  - Reasoning: Increase effectiveness of the CRMCS project; alleviate local burden and support local operations; tailor disaster accountability training appropriately with two separate deliveries for the DRU and local EM.
- After discussion both proposals received consensus. The group acknowledged the inefficiency to date in conducting disaster accountability and need to adjust strategy. Moving forward the Disaster Accountability SOG will need to be finalized to include the formation and training of the DRU.

## **Other Discussion**

- Additional Tasking's:

- *Identify and present printing infrastructure options at next meeting (project manager)*
- *Send accountability sustainment form to regional councils by end of March (project manager)*
- *Conduct review of equipment definitions by next meeting (project manager and discipline representatives)*

Participated (13):

Pat Collins, Natalie Garrett, Deb Hays (Call), Randy Hill, Vaughn Lorensen (Call), Pam Kemp, DeAnn Konkel, Michael McNulty, Byrdee Miller (Call), Bryan Murdie, Brian Rogers, Jeff Welshans, Mark Whelan

Next Meeting: TBD