-	
2	SANDY HOOK ADVISORY COMMISSION
3	FEBRUARY 22, 2013
4	9:30 AM
5	Legislative Office Building
6	Hartford, CT
7	
8	
9	
LO	TERRY EDELSTEIN, Committee Co-Chair
11	BERNIE SULLIVAN, Committee Co-Chair ADRIENNE BENTMAN
12	RON CHIVINSKI
13	ROBERT DUCIBELLA KATHLEEN FLAHERTY
14	ALICE FORRESTER EZRA GRIFFITH
15	JOETTE KATZ CHRIS LYDDY
16	PATRICIA KEAVNEY-MARUCA DENIS McCARTHY
17	BARBARA O'CONNOR
	WAYNE SANDFORD DAVID SCHONFELD
18	HAROLD SCHWARTZ
19	
20	
21	
22	BRANDON SMITH REPORTING & VIDEO LLC
23	249 Pearl Street Hartford, CT 06103
24	860.549.1850

1		AGENDA
2		
3	ı.	Call to Order
4	II.	Report on Lessons Learned
5		Commissioner Patricia Rehmer, Department of
6		Mental Health and Addiction Services Commissioner Joette Katz, Department of Children
7		and Families Commissioner Stefan Pryor, Department of
8		Education Commissioner Jewel Mullen, Department of Public
9		Health
10	III.	National Perspective in School Crisis Response
11		Marleen Wong, LCSW PhD - Assistant Dean and
12		Clinical Professor at the University of Southern California School of Social Work
13		Thomas Demaria, PhD - Long Island University, Director of the Psychological Services
14		Center and Trauma Response Team of the Doctoral Psychology Program
15	IV.	Local Experts in Trauma Response
16		Steven Marans, PhD - Yale University, Harris
17		Professor and Director of the Trauma Service at Yale Child Study Center (Cancelled)
18		
19	V.	Other Business
20	VI.	Discussion
21	VII.	Adjournment
22		
23		

(The proceedings commenced at 9:30 a.m.)

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Good morning, everyone. I'd like to call this meeting of the Governor's Sandy Hook Advisory Commission to order. My name is Terry Edelstein, I'm the co-chair along with Bernie Sullivan of this commission. Our chair is out of state and Scott Jackson asked me to chair today, and near the end of the day Bernie will take over as chair.

We have several items of business before our presentations. The first is that we have sent out an agenda. Commission members have copies of the agenda on your table. I'm looking for a motion to amend the agenda of -- Dr. Marans was supposed to be with us this afternoon and is unable to join us. So I'm offering that we have a new agenda that starts with lessons learned, national perspective and school crisis response.

(Motion approved.)

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Thank you very much.

I wanted to just review the agenda briefly in terms of some of our logistics. First, as you know, we're being recorded by CTN, so do use your microphones and turn off your microphone if you're no longer speaking.

We have an aggressive agenda today that is going to be focused on trauma surface and school crisis experts, and what we're going to be doing is asking our commissioner

panel to be with us between about 9:30 and 10:45 this morning. We'll take a brief break after that, and then we'll talk about national perspectives in school crisis between 11:00 and 12:15, and follow up after our lunch break with more question and answer.

And then we will be talking to the Aurora Public Schools between 12:15 and 12:45 via Skype and taking our lunch, after that then returning for Q & A, and then I know very important to the commission members, we'll be talking about future programs, organizing future panel discussions, and talking about our process and the report that we will be issuing in draft to the Governor by the 15th of March. So we expect that we will be wrapping up today's meeting by about 3:30 or 4:00 o'clock. We have a full day of meetings.

As we go to the report on lessons learned, Dr. Schonfeld, who helped to organize the day, has several comments.

COMMISSIONER SCHONFELD: Sure. Just very briefly, Chris Lyddy and I put together this proposal and we didn't have enough time to notify really all the members of the commission, so I just wanted to clarify that the goal of today's session is to talk about how schools can become better prepared to both get ready for and respond to crisis events to help children adjust and cope with them.

So the commissioners have gotten some information that although they may be talking about other issues related to school security and other factors that are complementary, the goal of our follow-up questions will be more focused on really the mental health aspect. And I also want to clarify that our longer term goal is to have another session that speaks more to mental health services that may be within the community or more broadly, so that the goal is really to talk about the interface between school crisis preparedness and response and mental health needs of students and staff.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Thank you.

I believe we're going to be starting with Commissioner Rehmer. And I invite all of the commissioners to join us at the table. There are extra seats on the side and you're all very experienced with that. If you'd like to do that you're welcomed to.

COMMISSIONER REHMER: Good morning. Given what Dr. Schonfeld says, I hope that these remarks are appropriate. I think they are specifically to lessons learned, but also just to share a little bit about what the departments did when the tragedy first occurred on 12/14. And also I want to make sure that everybody is on the same page in terms of what the state has the ability to do, and perhaps what more we might need as Dr. Schonfeld said.

So, the state does have a comprehensive disaster plan that is utilized both by the governor's office and then our department has an emergency command center that we put into place when the governor puts his into place, or in this instance we kept ours up and running after the governor's was brought down.

2.5

This disaster response plan is really though focused on natural and manmade disasters and does not necessarily have a plan specific to responding to a mass casualty school event like Sandy Hook. Responsibilities that may be mandated during federally declared disasters may not apply in an event like the shooting at Sandy Hook. And in addition, as we all I think have learned and know, school tragedies have very unique aspects that may necessitate a specific plan.

Since school tragedies impact students, parents, school staff and the larger community, the plan must identify interventions for each of these groups. We believe the plan should specify short and long-term interventions and it may be appropriate to specify a design for a school recovery program.

DMHAS and DCF, along with other state agencies, but we took the lead on behavioral health and successfully provided an immediate response, but intermediate and long-range plans have been delayed because of the lack of a plan

and a program model. So again, as many of you know, DMHAS and DCF was in there with what we call our DBHRN teams, which are specially trained teams that actually go in in emergencies and will respond and -- I'm sorry, Disaster Behavioral Health Response Network is the title actually for a DBHRN team.

And in this process we also incorporated a strike team from Health & Human Services with the assistance of Dr. Mullin in Public Health, and used DCF's Emergency Mobile Psychiatric Services providers to come together and respond as quickly as we could and as fully as we could to this situation.

DBHRN was a collaborative initiative that first developed after 9/11. It was developed by DMHAS, DCF and the UConn Health center and Yale in order to be able to respond immediately to behavior health needs following a disaster. DBHRN team members are trained in psychological first aid, incident command, and they participate annually in disaster exercises.

Training requirements for other responders like

HHS and the EMPS staff from DCA differ, and just in time

training perhaps could be more effectively delivered for

these sorts of situations in particular in order to

minimize role confusion when we use blended team responses.

One of the things that we experienced certainly in the first few days after the 14th was some role confusion among our staff, some misinformation I think in the broader community about what our role was and what we would be providing to the school system and the community at large. And as you might anticipate, a great deal of interest from national experts, experts locally, and people that were very interested in being involved in helping us. It was a well-intentioned request to be of assistance, but in the direct days in the aftermath it was very, very difficult to coordinate this, and that led to some of the confusion about what was happening and what was not happening.

We had over 70 individuals respond to all seven schools in Newtown following the shooting. The school responses varied from one week to almost two months. At the Sandy Hook school we continued to have clinicians, both from the private non-profit sector and from the public sector in the Sandy Hook School. But this has also been the longest DBHRN response that we have ever participated in and highlights the need to recruit additional team members and order to be able to sustain a longer term response without compromising our agency functions.

Obviously, after this sort of event, we are able to do whatever we can to support the community and the schools, the teachers, the parents, the families that were

impacted, but we have done that with some drain to our internal system in terms of the services that we provide. And in this sort of situation, as you might expect, the need for mental health in general and the request for services has increased. So our ability as a state agency to respond to that has been somewhat less than we would have liked, and that is because we really feel that the priority remains Newtown at this point.

In addition to this, we believe that the DBHRN training could be enhanced. Current training requirements, as I mentioned earlier, are more focused on natural or manmade disasters. Training we would recommend should be expanded to include psychological first aid for schools and more specific training focused on trauma intervention in the schools. Although, again, one of the things I would like to emphasize is that the trauma effects of this, as you all know or many of you know, do not occur in the first days following the event or even in the first weeks. anticipate that that -- and we are seeing now, two months, almost three months after this, that we're seeing more need for individuals who are able to appropriately treat different age groups who are experiencing some trauma symptoms from this event. But that is not what we go in and provide within the first several weeks.

25

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And so I think that it's important again that we differentiate so that the people who wanted to come in and provide trauma treatment within the first few weeks after the event, really we didn't need them at that point. We needed them -- we need them now, we need them further down the road, and I think one of the things that I think we also need to do is educate the public, the communities, the school systems so that the expectations are not only appropriate but are in sync with what we're able to provide and what should be provided at different times along the time frame that we're involved in.

2.5

School districts have been overwhelmed nationally following similar school shootings, and Newtown is no different. Roles like communication, management of mental health response, provision of security, managing personnel and labor issues, and donations overwhelm school systems, impairing their ability to make plans and make decisions, and we certainly experienced that in this tragedy. An otherwise very highly functioning district may be slow to respond because they are now being required to manage new or expanded responsibilities related to the disaster.

We believe the state should develop a short-term school support team that assists school districts as they work to resume normal functioning. The team and specific roles could be pre-identified in order to bring rapid

assistance to a district that is struggling to meet the day-to-day demands of the school system, in addition to the very heavy demands that result from this sort of tragedy.

The team would be comprised to address core functions described earlier, and the team could be made available to school districts and they could elect to use the supports.

And again, the coordination I can't emphasize enough. As we all were working together very diligently to try to coordinate, the response is extremely complex. It has been said that the disaster response is often the second disaster, especially when it is poorly coordinated. The outpouring of support and offers of assistance from state agencies and local providers is overwhelming to families and to children affected by the tragedy.

One of the things that we all saw in the days following the tragedy and it continues to occur, and you're all aware of this, is an enormous amount of media attention which hampers even simple things like our ability to reach out to families in a meaningful way when they're unwilling, understandably, to leave their house because there are cameras everywhere on the street that they're living on.

You know, we maintain contact, we still have contact with all of the families that were impacted by this. We started that interaction with DCF the night of the tragedy. We were involved with the death notification

with the State Police and the clergy, and then followed up to speak with the families to ask them what they needed and what they would like from us. Obviously in the days directly after the tragedy, they didn't know what they needed or what they wanted from us.

2.4

2.5

We maintained contact and where families -actually, we did have seven families that said they really
were not interested in anything at that point from us. We
sent letters to all the families, including those families,
offering how they could reach us, how they could reach DCF,
how they could reach providers in their community when and
if they were ready for support. And again, those
relationships started on the 14th and have been maintained
as much as possible when the families are interested in
maintaining them.

We also believe that behavioral health training needs to be expanded to school personnel. And the final thing I will say because there's other commissioners that need to speak and we don't have a lot of time, is that we really believe that the local system, additional emphasis really needs to be placed on enhancing school capacity to respond to disasters that may be of a less overwhelming nature.

I think that this quickly turned into the need for a strong behavioral health response and we were able to

do that to the best of our ability, but we believe that

training and psychological first aid for schools, school

management of grief and loss, and the effects of trauma may

help prepare schools to better respond to disasters.

I do not know if you have copies of some of what.

I do not know if you have copies of some of what I've just read to you, but if you don't I would be glad to provide that to the subcommittee.

And with that, I'm assuming, Terry, that you want to hear from other people before questions?

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Yes. Thank, you, Commissioner Rehmer.

Everyone on the commission should have received a copy of your written testimony, and all of the materials that have been distributed to commission members are being posted on the website for the Sandy Hook Advisory Commission. We can provide more link information for anyone watching on CTN, but it's a link off the governor's home page.

Our next commissioner speaking is Commissioner Pryor, Commissioner Mullen. I know Commissioner Katz is our last speaker.

Okay. Commissioner Mullen.

COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Good morning, Mayor

Jackson. Terry, on Mayor Jackson's behalf, Representative

Lyddy, Dr. Schonfeld and other members of the Sandy Hook Advisory Commission.

I'm Dr. Jewel Mullen, Commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Public Health. I appreciate the opportunity to share my observations on the state's response to the shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School, and to offer recommendations that may refine our preparation for crises in school settings.

My reflections are based on the work I was privileged to perform in collaboration with my colleagues after the governor's partial activation of the State's Unified Command system on the afternoon of December $14^{\rm th}$, 2012.

As you've heard, our work is not finished.

Although this testimony is not intended to be a primer on public health emergency preparedness, my comments do reflect my agency's focus on all hazards preparedness.

There are specific actions that we should perform during every crisis, including those in schools.

Within the State's Unified Command system we knew soon after the shootings occurred that we needed to mobilize a large behavioral health team. Our response demanded resources different from those we employed to address other catastrophic events the state had managed in the previous 15 months. This time we were not confronting

power outage, food and sheltering needs, and overtaxed health care systems as we did following Storms Irene and Sandy, and the October 2011 Nor'easter. Still, as in those other circumstances, our response called for integrated activity between federal, state and municipal government to coordinate a number of services and to mobilize responders.

Accordingly, as we identify ways to support schools, we must recognize that they exist as a part of large systems, local, state and federal. Our framework for supporting schools should explicate the components of those larger systems which should be brought to bear for an effective response and recovery following a crisis.

Acknowledging that my colleagues also are sharing their lessons learned in our response to Sandy Hook, I will highlight from a public health perspective successes and other lessons learned that we should consider in the strategy to support schools in the future.

Number 1: We operated in a strong Unified

Command system let by Governor Malloy and the Department of

Emergency Management and Homeland Security. The Unified

Command structure ensured that we maintained situational

awareness -- and I promise not to get to jargony -- about

events occurring within the school system and at the Sandy

Hook fire station which had become the local incident

command post where many of the activities of responders,

public safety and volunteers were coordinated. This framework enabled our simultaneous intense focus on different aspects of Newtown's response. For example, some of us assisted the school system's planning to address the needs of students while some helped municipal agencies with other responsibilities.

2: Recognizing the magnitude of the crisis, we promptly requested federal assistance on December 14th.

Collaboration with partners from the United States

Department of Health and Human Services was invaluable.

Our Region 1 partners and members of the U.S. Public Health Services Commissioned Corps, who traveled from across the country, supported the school system and town emergency responders with planning and logistics. They also delivered direct behavioral support services to families, town and school personnel, and responders.

Number 3: My colleagues listened to town officials and teachers in order to determine how to best meet the community's needs. We understood that resilience was one of their strongest assets. We were cognizant that they had endured other recent challenges. Especially throughout the weekend after December 14th, a number of us who were present in Newtown talked about the cumulative impact of recent life events on community residents and responders.

Just about six weeks post-Sandy and a little bit after Irene and the October Nor'easter we were handling we were handling this. We did not make assumptions about their ability to cope or to have primary authority over plans for their short and long-term recovery. Moreover, my colleagues' expertise in trauma-informed care was apparent.

Number 4: We maintained the ability to correct course if needed, respecting the ultimate authority of municipal and school leaders who were the primary decision-makers.

Number 5: We learned quickly that an effective plan to restore so-called normalcy for and aid the recovery of the school's children required that we first address the needs of the school personnel who would have to implement the plan.

Number 6: We modeled strong agency collaboration. I want to underscore that effective interagency partnership is something we have worked to achieve for the past two years. We didn't have to figure out how to work as a team. We've remained committed to learning from our efforts as we determine how to perfect our work.

Based on those observations, please consider the following recommendations as you draft the strategy for supporting schools through crisis events.

First, I recommended to utilize the state's Unified Command System to guide response and recovery.

Second, strengthen the integration of our educational and behavioral health agencies into the Unified Command System. We can start with a formal after-action review of the Sandy Hook events and then a tabletop exercise with other state agencies.

Number three, through an after-action assessment we can also determine strategies to ensure that response systems like those established in the school system and fire station function as seamlessly as possible. A school system's response and recovery are linked to that of its town.

Fourth, as was done following the work of the Two Storm Panel, consider holding a drill or practice exercise that involves school personnel as incident commanders. Given Connecticut's decentralized government, with a number of towns that rely on part-time services and shared regional assets, there may not be a one-size-fits-all framework for assisting every school, but there ought to be a basic framework that each town starts with.

Number five, continue to create and nurture relationships with community partners, experts, and the individuals who offer to assist during a crisis so that coordinating the resources they offer does not threaten the

effectiveness of our collective response. The metaphor that I've used to describe this, and that's what Commissioner Rehmer alluded to, was the visual image of all the donations that we've seen and that people still have to sort through. It's one thing when those are inanimate objections; it's another one when they're coming to you as individuals who want to help but also are going to rate their experience to your response based on your capacity to meet their need to be responded to and to be helpful at that time.

Number six, communicate with our federal and regional partners, EMS, emergency medical services, education, Homeland Security, mental health and public health to learn about and create an inventory of assets that they can provide to assist us in future events.

And number six (sic), strengthen our knowledge base about how to meet the needs of the adult personnel who are part of the crisis response in their schools, and ensure that we have a plan to address those needs promptly. As we look to them to support their children, we must support them as well.

Leadership that was informed by expertise, emphasized partnerships, and upheld local authority was essential to our response to the events at Sandy Hook School. It's needed in our response to all school crises.

When the time comes I'll be happy to answer your questions. And meanwhile, thank you for giving me the change to share my thoughts.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Thank you very much for the detailed recommendations and the recounting, and if you have that available for us in writing later that will be very helpful.

Commissioner Pryor.

COMMISSIONER PRYOR: Good morning.

It's a pleasure to be before you. I'm very grateful for your commitment and for voluntarism in carrying out this work, and I am really in awe of my fellow commissioners' incredible work in the course of this crisis and their remarkable professionalism really on in many ways a 24/7 basis with limited opportunities to sleep immediately thereafter and then really on an ongoing committed basis all the way to this moment in time from December 14th forward to today. So I think them for their incredible work and it's an honor to be present with my fellow colleagues.

I'm going to touch upon five points in the course of my discussion. I do not have written testimony presented for today, but would be happy to present materials if they are useful elements of what I describe

subsequent. The five points I'll review with you now and then I'll actually discuss each of them.

2.0

2.5

First is supplementing local school district capacity.

Second is various forms of relief at the local level that the state can provide.

Third is statewide statewide response in tandem with local response.

Fourth is coordinated decision-making.

And fifth is school security and school design.

I will only briefly touch upon each of these points for the sake of time and to enable the broader discussion that we all wish for today, and you'll note that I will not touch upon mental health or behavioral health with any intensity because my colleagues are present and I know the Q&A will focus on such material.

So first, as for supplementing local school district capacity, you've already heard from two fellow commissioners about the needs in this area, but let me try to drive the point home a bit further.

It's enormously clear that when a school district such as Newtown is faced with such an unthinkable tragedy, there is a rush of activity and there is burden from the level of voluntarism exhibited from across the locality, the region, the country. The tasks may be familiar, may be

unfamiliar. Finding a way, such as what Commissioner

Rehmer described along the lines of a school support team

structure template that may be adjustable makes enormous

sense. Let me give a flavor for the kinds of activity that

occurred under these very, very difficult circumstances.

The press, you've heard from the previous testimony the press and the media attention, very understandable, very justified for the events of Newtown, really were specifically overwhelming at the school district. We found it necessary, we received a specific request from the Central Office of the Newtown district to provide some personnel to field questions there were so many, and it's almost impossible to be accustomed to the range of media inquiries that occur.

So in fact our public information officer from the State Department of Education, she is here actually, Kelly Donnelly, in the audience. She embedded within the department and worked basically full time for a period of weeks to help manage the media influx. That's an improvised solution. It may be that in the procedures going forward we ought to contemplate the communications dimension of this work. And there were many other communications dimensions that went beyond the walls of the Central Office of the school district.

On the facilities front, it's well known that there was a search that needed to occur given the impossibility of utilizing the Sandy Hook School facility. This is a point that may apply in cases of other disasters, though each is unique.

2.4

There was a need to identify a school.

Fortunately the Chalk Hill School in Monroe became available and there was nothing short of miraculous work done by the Monroe community along with many, many others to bring the school up to speed. Construction services, the construction services division of the state played a lead role; the fire marshal and the State Department of Education in helping on a very preliminary basis to support the local effort. The local effort is what got it done.

But that's the point. Ought we have systems and a thought process for swing space in the case of disasters in multiple forms, not just these kinds of unthinkable tragedies, but also natural disasters and other scenarios that may overwhelm a community. I think this solution was arrived at very ably, very nimbly, but can we learn lessons about how to do that once again, and in fact how to go about the process for identifying longer term facility solutions.

Something specific to this response that may be translatable across responses, in the immediate aftermath,

meaning the minutes and hours following the shootings themselves at Sandy Hook School, the education department was in touch with the Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security, the State Police division embedded within. Around the response we began to coordinate as is appropriate through our protocols in the state across these agencies. Remarkable work was carried out by multiple agencies.

One of the things that we found valuable in terms of being on the ground quickly that had not been a formal part of the plan was that we called upon our technical high school system. There are 17 campuses and centers in the technical high school system which are most directly affiliated with the State Department of Education. Because the technical high school system, as Pat Keaney-Maruca knows as a member of the State Board of Education, because it operates effectively like a school district.

It's a statewide school district. It contains many of the resident personnel and procedures necessary to support another district. So what was helpful was to be able to actually ask the superintendent of said system and other emergency response personnel to be on the ground immediately. And we may wish to look to that example for future disasters. We've not done that before given the geographic reach of the system and the ability to do so.

Both of my fellow commissioners who've already spoken referenced donation management and the influx of donations. There was what I perceived to be a terrific coordination effort of receiving and vetting donated materials and services which was carried out in concert with the Unified Command and the Emergency Operation Center and with tremendous local effort and effectiveness.

As pertains to the school district itself and its Central Office, I think we can improve upon this already strong response. There were curricular materials being donated and arriving at the district's door. There were personnel -- volunteers I should say, arriving and wishing to offer services in the area of mental and behavior health, but well beyond, all kinds of volunteers.

I will note because of my personal and professional experience after September 11th as a resident of the vicinity of the World Trade Center and then working five years on the recovery and the rebuilding from the World Trade Center, including work with Bob Ducibella, I will note that in the immediate aftermath of 9/11 there was something that was established by the business community through the statewide equivalent of chamber of commerce called The Partnership for New York City, and that was called Restart Central.

And Restate Central actually vetted volunteers, selected them to staff a sophisticated donated goods and services matching system, not just cataloging goods and services, but also specifically determining if there were Ikea work stations that were being donated, which companies that were no longer in the twin towers needed such materials.

If there were AT&T calling cards, because companies were squatting with fellow companies, often competitors, and needed to find a way to bill against a new system, those kinds of matches were made. I do think that the donations management system worked well in the case of Newtown and continues to work, whether we're talking about the influx of teddy bears of the influx of other specific needed materials. I think though that we might be able to do even more as pertains to a school system in particular, identifying even in advance as a template those goods and services that they may need on a donated or a discounted basis and figuring out how those matches may occur. I do know that there was some complexity in the Central Office on this specific point.

So those are some of the points that I wish to make on the importance of supplementing local school district capacity my first category, but what I would like to note is that the notion of a team structure that

Commissioner Rehmer property and justifiably mentioned I think is something we should explore more specifically.

What would that look like beyond the specific examples I've referenced or that Pat has referenced; what do we mean by that; are there new personnel required or is it a hybrid of existing personnel; how can we help to instruct districts or inform them as to the procedures for forming such a team on their level, at the district level.

Second point, second broad point, forms of relief that the state can offer. The --

CO-CHAIR EDELSEIN: One minute. Does anyone else have a microphone on? Just so we can check on the feedback.

COMMISSIONER PRYOR: The Newtown school district through its local board of education and its superintendent contemplated multiple ways in which to support staff and students in the wake of the tragedy. Two specific forms were arrived upon and forwarded to us.

I know we're still experiencing feedback here.

Is there anyone here whose -- okay. I'll try to sit back and see if that helps.

Among the various ideas that were discussed at the local board of education, two specific concepts were ultimately forwarded to the State Department of Education for consideration, and for that matter to the General

Assembly. One was relief from the 180-day rule, which is to say that school attendance must occur for 180 days minimum; that the days that were lost due to the tragedy at Sandy Hook ought not be computed. The General Assembly passed special legislation authorizing and in fact requiring the State Board of Education to receive a request from the local board and conduct a waiver. We did that. So that whole process was carried out.

First there was a request in the sequencing for Sandy Hook, in particular of the school, ultimately for the district both actions were taken. I wanted to put it out there as something that we should consider for the future as to how such 180-day waivers are managed.

The second request was as pertains to student testing. There was a debate that occurred at the local level regarding whether testing ought to occur -- is it helpful if I turn this off? Does that...

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Maybe switch the desk and we'll try that. We're checking on the technology.

COMMISSIONER PRYOR: We'll see if this is better. Thank you very much.

There was a request for relief from testing this year. There was a debate and discussion at the local level as to whether testing ought to occur. There's an annual Connecticut Mastery test and an annual CAP test.

Ultimately the request was made only for the earlier grades, the Mastery test, and the debate consisted of a discussion around whether an assessment at the end of the year would enable the system to be forward-looking and to focus us on the crisis, but also on student achievement and on serving students, and by virtue of that helping to support the staff. The decision was made that a waiver would be beneficial.

We are now in the process of taking the steps necessary to provide such waiver, but wanted to note that for school systems there are unique circumstances like that that need to be thought through and these were quite specific circumstances where these actions were taken. And I think we would benefit from in any tabletop, any lessons learned exercise, thinking about these decisions as well.

Third, statewide simultaneous response, it's very important that as we respond to the specific conditions on the ground in a given district or town during a crisis, we also think about the impact upon the entire state. And I'll talk about the Sandy Hook tragedy first and then extrapolate a bit.

In the case of school personnel, teachers and administrators in the wake of Sandy Hook across the entire State of Connecticut wish to know how to talk about these tragic events with their students. And one of the services

that we needed to provide was to provide some of the prompts and some of the ability.

Dr. David Schonfeld was the professional on the ground who helped us formulate, in fact drafted the prompts that were offered as a specific guide to teachers to enable them to talk with their students if they so wished at their option. And other resources were placed on the State Department of Education website around trauma and bereavement and related subjects. That procedure had not been followed previously. This was new to Connecticut for the Sandy Hook experience and we think should follow.

In addition, I should note that in the case of Hurricane Sandy and even in the case of the recent snowstorm, the State Department of Education has started to convene the first ever statewide conference calls with superintendents of schools in concert, fully in concert, with the Unified Command and the Emergency Operation Center.

Superintendents of schools are themselves first responders and our first decision-makers as pertains to their schools, but too frequently they are not directly in the communication loop as pertains to in the case of these weather scenarios, weather conditions, road conditions, and other scenarios that affect their schools with a bit of distinction and with emphasis required on specified points

as distinct from the town. There must be coordination through the emergency command structure at the town level, but how ought we provide the right information to superintendents around these subjects, a continuing subject for us.

I'll move quickly on points four and five because I know time is short.

Coordinated decision-making, my colleagues have emphasized this point I think very ably and very correctly. One of the things I'll say is that it was breathtaking in its effectiveness how the Unified Command structure got up and running under the leadership of this governor and this lieutenant governor and these commissioners, and we were very grateful for it.

I do think that there needs to be even more thought given in that context to the precise methods for coordination on the ground in the moment following the crisis. I think we all managed to figure out the structure, we were able to find the table literally wherever we were located as we traveled together to coordinate and map out our approaches. But there wasn't a formula for it, there wasn't a prescription, and I would say that if we could think even more about how the stateside structure went partially or fully mobilized, and that was done quite effectively.

How does that translate at the local level for the individuals, the professionals who are literally on the ground? I think we need to give more thought to that and how that works for future purposes.

And then fifth, school security and school design, I know that you had a previous session on this subject and you had the benefit from hearing from architects and other professionals which I think was an outstanding move on your part.

We convened, we, the State Department of Education, with really the leadership on point from the multiple state associations, CAP, CABE, CAS, CASBO, convened a convention that was attended by over 900 personnel back on January 24th. Bob Ducibella was a presenter at that session, along with Jim LaPosta whom you also heard from.

What I want to point out in this area was having experienced the aftermath and the long-term response to September 11th, and the planning process around the World Trade Center, both the commercial facilities and the memorial and the work around lower Manhattan subsequent, the issue of security arose persistently. And the question of how to embed security devices, security elements in existing facilities or new construction arose frequently. And Bob Ducibella was one of the best professionals in the

mix by far, and there were other colleagues who were terrific.

One of the key themes that emerged for me, one of the key lessons learned I should say, is that one need not create a fortress in order to fortify a facility. I think you heard those exact words expressed because it was partly a function of the conversation with Jim LaPosta and with Bob coming out of the symposium. But it's so critical that we care about and we pay attention to the school climate, the school culture or the school experience that students and staff have, in addition to the absolutely necessary security elements that must be added to the environment. So how can school design naturally incorporate security elements; how can such components be invisible; how can the architecture and design decisions actually benefit from decisions around security.

I've seen it occur under other scenarios, including 911. There is sophisticated and sensible and sensitive design work that can be done, and I would simply reemphasize the point that we must commit ourselves to those kinds of approaches or we will regret what we have done to our schools when all is said and done.

I'm going to stop there and look forward to the Q&A. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Thank you, Commissioner Pryor.

Commissioner Katz?

COMMISSIONER KATZ: I'll give it a shot and see if this works. It seems like the problem has been resolved. Thank you.

Good morning, acting commission person Edelstein and distinguished members of the Sandy Hook Advisory

Commission. My name is Joette Katz and I'm the

Commissioner of the Department of Children and Families.

I'd like to begin by specifically expressing my gratitude to my colleagues. You've already heard from three of them today, and also Commissioner Rubin Bradford was extremely instrumental in helping us get through this. I agree with everything they said and I'm grateful, frankly, to have able to work alongside them since this tragedy.

Let me also express my gratitude for this commission's work. We commissioners were brought to the table early on to identify topics of concern and suggest names of people to serve.

At DCF we put on our website very early on everything we had done so that the public would be apprised, but I'm grateful for this commission and for the testimony that you've heard today because I think it really

puts it out and center, front and center, and provides the necessary details that we're missing.

For the remainder of my remarks I do not mean to lecture, but frankly after 20-plus years on the bench and many years of teaching law school old habits die hard and that tends to be how I speak.

As the head of the largest state agency responsible for children, their well-being and their mental health needs, I am compelled to ask you to tread lightly and cautiously. As you and other lawmakers grapple with what to do next in the wake of Newtown, it is essential to understand what is known, what is not known, about violence against children and mental health and their interaction.

Failure to more fully educate ourselves and appreciate the need for a nuanced approach to both areas may lead unintentionally to adverse outcomes for children, even if motivated by the best of intentions. For example, many are calling for an increased police presence in the nation's schools. The appeal of deploying law enforcement to defend against external threats of violence is understandable, but could come with its own dangers. Indeed, the influx of officers in schools could further criminalize young people, particular youth of color from marginalized communities, and impede the development of

what should otherwise be positive and safer school environments.

We know from research and practice that the most effective and direct way to keep schools safe is to foster a positive school climate, yet we know very little about the direct effect that police presence will have on that climate. Further, if school districts decide to utilize law enforcement personnel in schools, particularly in schools where youth of color and youth for under-resourced communities will feel the greatest impact, those districts should have a clear understanding of what their role should be.

Currently there's a dearth of research on what approach to introducing police in schools has the most success in preventing rather than merely responding to violence, to ensuring that all youth feel safe, that they are protected, not policed, and fostering rather than impeding a productive and nurturing school environment.

Additionally, we should not lose sight of the fact that according to national data less than one percent of all homicides among school age children occur on school grounds or in transit to and from schools.

While no one would minimize the tragedy of any death or other violent incidents to schools, this figure

demonstrates that most lethal violence takes place in your people's lives outside of school settings.

2.5

I would caution as well about the superficial response by many to conflate mental illness and violent behavior. The truth is that the vast majority of people with mental illness pose little risk of violence and that mental illness is properly addressed as a public health, not a criminal justice issue.

According to the estimates based on the 2011
National Survey of Drug Use and Health, one in five
American adults experience a mental illness in the past
year, and 11-1/2 million people, or 5 percent of the adult
population had a serious mental illness. But a 2009 U.S.
General's report on mental health concluded, and I quote,
"The overall contribution of mental disorders to the total
level of violence in society is exceptionally small," close
quote.

This central misconception can distract from other efforts to reduce violence and unnecessarily stigmatize millions with mental health disorders. It could also actually undermine public safety by discouraging people who pose the greatest risk from seeking services, which in turn could result in many with serious mental illness ending up in the criminal justice system, often for minor quality of life offenses and other non-violent

offenses. This of course would further perpetuate the mistaken impression that mental illness, criminality and violence are inextricably linked.

I further caution against revising the duty to warn. In fact, I ask that you tinker lightly with the requirements that mental health professionals report clients to the authorities because that could also cause those with the greatest need not to seek services.

Furthermore, I hope you can continue to examine whether those with mental illness are in fact more likely to be victims of self-harm than they are to commit violent acts against others, which studies from a decade ago strongly suggest.

Focusing on mental illness is essential, but I worry that we will lose sight of the underlying drivers of violence, which we know that substance abuse, a history of physical abuse, juvenile justice involvement, unemployment, parental arrest are but a few of the risk factors.

These are just a very few of the concerns that I felt the need to express. The instinct we all have to help save, protect and prevent is admirable. I would simply ask that you are careful not to act on that instinct, unaware of the unintended consequences that could result, and in the rush to judgment you resist temptation but rather study

these complex issues as you do in your own professional practices.

Thank you for this opportunity.

2.4

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Thank you very much, Commissioner Katz. And thank all of you for your compelling words.

I'd like to open up time for questions from our commission members.

COMMISSIONER LYDDY: Thank you, Chairman.

Good morning. And first before I ask my questions and make my statements I want to say thank you to all of you. Having been in the firehouse that day and seeing all of your faces, that alone is a great source of comfort not only to the local leaders in Newtown, but more importantly to the Newtown community. So thank you.

With that said, I do have a number of questions and unfortunately we don't have the time for me to ask all of them. So I do want to just to focus on something that I heard in trying to listen to the trends throughout, is this blended team response and the potential for role confusion in coordinating recovery efforts, offers of mental health practitioners coming in, best practices experts, but also your own internal functions as state departments.

Legislators often talk about trying to break down the silos, and on $12/14~\mathrm{I}$ saw those silos go completely

away, at least from the outside looking in, and I don't know if that's always a good thing because of the role confusion and the inability to manage your function.

2.5

So if you could maybe, Commissioner Rehmer, talk a little bit about that and what your approach would be in terms of this blended team response in approach.

COMMISSIONER REHMER: I think that you're correct that the assertion that departments are siloed is often a criticism, but there are times when it is appropriate. In this instance, however, the ability for us to work together was crucial because of the impact on the community, the school, children, adults. There was nobody that wasn't affected, and so what we tried to do to the best of our ability was to support each other by, if you will, dividing the labor in some way.

So, for example, the DBHRN teams, which are the first responders in terms of crisis which were comprised of Commissioner Katz's staff and my staff and many, many staff from private and non-profit agencies locally as well, decided to focus on different areas. So the DBHRN teams were in the schools, primarily dealing with the school teachers and principals and individuals who had been traumatized through the event. The private non-profit agencies focused on providing support and relief to family members who had been affected, not necessarily the families

of victims, but other families clearly who were affected, but it did include some families of victims. So there was a family support center that was brought up that was staffed by Danbury Hospital, Wellmore, Clifford Beers, several of the local community providers, and they specifically dealt with, again, families, Newtown individuals who felt like they needed immediate relief, somebody to speak with immediately.

2.4

And what we saw, in the first week or so they were seeing about 300 individuals a day, including some family members of victims who came to get assistance with the surviving children in the family.

So again, it becomes this who's doing what, but everybody needs to engage in something. The most important thing, as I think both Commissioner Pryor and Commissioner Katz and Commissioner Mullen said, was our ability to be on the ground and to be coordinating on a minute-to-minute basis because, frankly, the need is minute-to-minute, especially in the first four or five days where changing and decisions were bring made and we were trying to respond and be very respectful of the local superintendent, the local town selectmen, the teachers, the principals and the families.

So on Saturday I think we spent 14 hours planning our approach. On Sunday by 9:00 a.m. we had to go in and

replan because the needs were changing that rapidly. And so while the silos are important in some instances, in this instance there really was no ability to sort of stay within our silos. Education became involved with behavioral health. Child and family needed to work very closely, Children and Family Services, with us in terms of adult response, child and family response, and the overlap. And Public Health had a role in making sure that we were all responding to this very serious emergency in a coordinated way.

So I think that in that respect the need to sort of flatten the silos was critical with all of us luckily having very positive relationships. I think that if that hadn't been the case, there would have been much more difficulty in terms of how this was approached.

And I don't know, Representative Lyddy, if that really answered your question.

I do want to take -- I missed saying this in my earlier testimony, and I want to emphasize the need for intermediate and long-term planning. The focus or our teams is not to stay in Newtown. It would be inappropriate for us to do that and it's not our role. But there are also various funding sources that allow us in many ways to pull back from the behavioral health support.

So we have brought in from California the Child Behavioral Traumatic Stress Institute who utilizes local agencies. So Clifford Beers is involved, the Yale Child Study Center is involved, the Village is involved, UConn, those are the four identified agencies that work with this national agency. I think they will provide training and education to many other local providers, but they have come in with the superintendent and the town selectmen's approval and done an assessment and evaluation of intermediate and long-term needs. They are writing the grants that we may be able to avail ourselves so that we can access federal dollars and they will be now guiding as we pull out of the Newtown system what goes on there in terms of intermediate and long-term needs for behavioral health. And I forgot to mention that earlier and it's a very critical piece. So I just wanted to mention that.

COMMISSIONER LYDDY: Thank you.

Dr. Mullen?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIOENR MULLEN: I thought I would share this. Although I think it's -- I don't think we've come across as acting as if we're giving you all the answers because we're so good at this.

I did want to share that on December $14^{\rm th}$, when we talked to one another and realized the magnitude of what we were dealing with, we could very quickly say to one another

we've done a lot of things but we've never done anything like this before. And there's such importance of the humility that comes from having that insight early on that it forces you to step back from thinking you can do it all or that you have a specific role, when the response really requires the interdependence that not only pools our experience and expertise, that also helps us sustain one another.

And while we really knew the importance of maintaining clarity in that throughout, one of the things that we also are maybe to subtly or not too subtly saying is that as we think about a system to support schools overall, it's the kind of response that we want our communities to have. Because role confusion doesn't just have to happen inside state government and for us to all be effective we have to have that collective mindset.

So I'll stop and pass the mic.

COMMISSIOENR KATZ: Age is great, and as one of the older people in the room -- I just had a big birthday so I'm still feeling it -- you realize how little you know. And to echo Jewel's remarks about humility, I mean there are so many things that you're just not prepared for, and certainly December 14th was one. And I guess my remarks earlier was just meant as a caution because, for example, right now other people are looking at workers' comp and the

ability -- because I for one am extremely concerned about the first responders and their ability to recover. Well, I wrote an opinion 20 years ago that would have provided for post-traumatic stress. We went into a recession and the Legislature, and I understand why, took that back. So, again an unintended consequence, and so I guess that's what I mean when I talk about living so long that there are things that you didn't really anticipate. And certainly when I wrote that opinion and when the Legislature acted in response to it, no one anticipated December 14th.

But in more direct response to your question, I think we all checked in on each other routinely and we checked in on each other's staff routinely and I think again because we recognize that there's just significant overlap, and it's like when I talk about the children in DCF care, there is no child who has only one issue, and that child comes from a family. And yesterday I was part of a debriefing session with some of our mental health providers and they were talking about the impact on their children based on what they have had to experience. And so it's all -- it's not clean. It's very messy.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Dr. Forrester?

COMMISSIONER FORRESTER: Thank you so much,

Commissioners, for your testimony today and your honesty

around we've never done anything like this before, and I

can certainly echo Clifford Beers' experience, we've never been available to help at this level.

I have a couple of questions or reflections and I feel like, Commissioner Rehmer, you did an excellent job of sort of talking about the response, and Commissioner Katz, the experience of looking around the room and being with others, it echoes quite clearly. And I know that night on the 15th when I walked into the room in the evening that I looked across the room and I saw colleagues from private providers who were part of the death notification teams, and we said in debriefing meetings of our own, you know, we knew each other and we had each other's back.

I feel like Connecticut is such an unusual system in particular with children and children's cases. We have a mixed care system. We have the state providers and the state residential or hospitals, but we also have private providers who are handling the day-to-day community based work. And I just want to encourage what I thought I heard today, is that when you are planning, when there is a system being planned, that the private providers, the local people, Wellmore, Danbury, Newtown Youth and Family Services, the folks who are there in the community who are part of the state system are incredibly included in the conversation around the response. And of course we have

what happened in Newtown, of course we have to prepare across the state. But I think it's important.

Chris said something around, you know, silos of activity and different commissions having silos, that it's very important for us to as a response to realize that we have many, many people who are working in the system who might not be directly, may be partially funded by the state as my agency is. And acknowledging the incredible generosity of the private providers and the community people, to me it was overwhelming how important the relationship was in this crisis and how important it is for us to build on that and to grow on it.

And I think the last thing I want to say, having been involved in the trauma response, we have to be extraordinarily careful to not create new victims and new blaming. We don't know how to do this and the only way we're going to be able to do it is by working very closely together. And I think that that's a very important thing.

And I guess finally leadership, I think what you were saying is that leadership is so critical and making sure that in other response like this it's very, very clear who's in charge, and I think that the problem with the state and the local and the private providers and then the volunteers, it gets very unclear who is leading.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Mr. Sullivan.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Regarding the first responders, having spent a lot of years in public safety I know very often they are very difficult to get them to admit when they have a problem. Has any consideration been given to some kind of a professional debriefing of the first responders after the fact to try to identify that those are in need? Because many of them just won't come forward.

identifying one of the issues that we were aware of immediately, which is the first responders, the police, the fire individuals both from Newtown and the state, had witnessed things that many of them had never witnessed before, and the need to provide debriefing and to provide support for them in an ongoing way during the crisis and after has been a critical component of what we've talked with the governor about. Commissioner Bradford has been very, very involved in this. There has been — there was support on site through HHS specifically for first responders that Commissioner Mullen coordinated.

And we've also provided debriefing for state and local police in an ongoing way through outside resources because one of the other issues is who debriefs the people who are usually the debriefers. And so we are bringing in

different people to do that, but we are certainly cognizant that even with the debriefing we have more work to do.

2.0

2.4

And we do have a program in the State of

Connecticut that is a peer-to-peer program for State Police

that I'm hoping as we move through this will continue to be

effective because sometimes police officers can reach out

to their peers rather than reaching out to professionals or

to others. And so I'm hoping that that program will also

provide some relief for individuals that are dealing with

this.

COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Thank you for asking that question. I spent a lot of time the weekend after the shooting going between the school and the fire station. I also have staff who are among the first responders. And I agree with you that people, some people won't reach out. I also witnessed the degree to which the events of Sandy Hook were just one in a series of different experiences that a number of responders who have been doing this work have encountered over time. And it was quite something to see the ways in which their community also mobilized to support them, the ways in which people were ready to relive their stories, sometimes even tell about their own PTSD in the moment.

And even based on what Commissioner Katz said about workmen's comp, you know, my comment about

understanding that children exist in a town that needs to
be healthy, this is a very important issue for the state.

We heard Commissioner Pryor make reference to his
experience in 9/11. The governor talked about his own
experience supporting people when he was the Stamford mayor
during 9/11. So it is a very important part of that
comprehensive system.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: I just wonder if you could comment on how you are contending with the vicarious traumatization of the providers who are going in and doing this work with folks. And I would add how are you managing your own vicarious traumatization?

COMMISSIONER REHMER: We have planned debriefings for our staff. We have not been able to do the full debriefing at this point because we still are in the system and we want to be able to debrief people that have been in the schools in a way that they can be debriefed together. But we certainly recognize the need for that.

One of the things that I can say, Jim
Siemianowski, who is the head of our DBHRN teams, who
frankly in my opinion deserves more than anybody in the
state can give him in terms of the work that he did, and I
think most of my colleagues would agree with that because
he is the one that heads up our DBHRN teams with Kathy Dean

from UConn who had to get 70 people in there on Friday night and then keep people in.

One of the things we were very cognizant of, based on our experience from 9/11, was trying not to have people in there for days on end because it's just too tiring, and then people just get so caught up in what they're doing and how connected they are with these people that have been severely traumatized, that they don't want to leave.

And just I will say briefly, I was there from Saturday morning until Tuesday late night, and by Wednesday morning I woke up and realized I could not go back that day. It was too traumatizing for me. And so I think that within our departments we tried to support each other. I let people know that I wouldn't be there that day but that my deputy would be there, and then we began to hand off responsibilities. I would say that Jim, unfortunately, didn't have the ability to do that as much as I would have liked. He has been on the ground in the school system, in Newtown probably every day except for five days when he was on vacation when we were on the phone with him every single day.

So I don't think, Dr. Schwartz, that we fully have been able to do exactly what you're talking about. I think the vicarious traumatization is something that we

have to be extremely attentive to in the coming months, not only for our staff but for the staff of the private non-profits, for the staff of the school, for the staff in the educational system, and frankly for the staff of the whole state. Because the amount of media attention, the amount of explicit detail, the pictures that were on the TV screen, I think that there are things that many of us saw that we had never seen before and that we really have to pay attention to.

2.4

Again, it's not in the first few, as you know, it's not in the first few weeks afterwards. You and I have talked about this, it's the long run that we have to be careful of. And I would urge that this committee think about that in terms of resources because it is something that we are going to have to provide for in an ongoing way, and it doesn't come all the time without some close collaboration. My hope is that we will be able to partner with the private non-profit agencies that in fact do some of this debriefing and have them come in and do it, for example, for some of our staff, and that we will continue to do it for the police. There needs to be a whole statewide ability to focus on the vicarious traumatization that I know that staff have experienced.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: If I could just follow that up. This leads me to think that there needs to be an

effort to address vicarious traumatization for virtually everyone in the state, and that a process of education about what vicarious traumatization is would be very important for people who are not directly related to the incident but who have still been vicariously traumatized, horrified. I mean it's hard to find somebody who feels that their life has not been changed by this, but I think most folks are not going to be cognizant of the ways those changes will affect their mood, their sense of well-being, their cognitive abilities, and their lives in countless other ways, and that getting the word out about that would be very important.

2.5

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Let me just do a quick -COMMISSIONER MULLEN: May I add something? Just
because I think it's important for you know, and I know I
have something to say about every question.

But I wanted to share first that once again we've been extremely well-supported by the federal government throughout this as well, so as we talk about our Connecticut system we also don't exist in a vacuum. And Dr. Nicole Laurie, who is the assistant secretary for preparedness and response in the United States Department of Health and Human Services, has tracked what's gone on with us since December 14th. She emailed me on December 17th after I had had a phone conversation with her telling her

about the first few days of our response, and she emailed me back and said after talking to you I realized how stressed you were. And it gave me a moment to realize how stressed I was because when you're doing this you don't necessarily know.

But she came to Connecticut, to our department and met with us on January 11th, accompanied by Katherine Power, who is the substance abuse and mental health services administrator for HHS Region 1, along with seven other people from the federal government just to talk to us in a supportive way, but to understand that what we've done here is something that can inform federal efforts to support us and other states as well.

I think that was maybe one of our first opportunities to, from the behavioral health, public health side, like debrief a little, and it made a huge difference.

Part of what we are starting to look at now is how to really understand the short, intermediate and long-term impacts, not just in Newtown but across the state through this vicarious trauma. And some of you may be aware of there's a process, a surveillance process called an EPI aid, epidemiology aid, in which one can actually look at different indicators and signs of what's going on, to think about how to also anticipate what else you might be seeing in the state and plan for recovery.

Given how raw this all still is, we're not ready to embark upon something, particularly since we're not looking to do a research project, but use this to also inform the way forward for the long-term recovery.

2.5

COMMISSIONER KATZ: If I could just add very briefly, this is an area that has been of great concern to me in my agency, even obviously before Newtown. And we have a new employees assistance program and I've gone around to all of our offices to talk to our staff because so much of what they do is traumatic.

And clearly, you go into a house at 2:00 o'clock in the morning and you have to wrestle an infant away from a substance-abusing parent, as a hypothetical, takes its toll and you do it for 20 years it really takes its toll.

So in answer to your question, Dr. Schwartz, I think the more we can do to educate people about post-traumatic stress disorder and the symptoms, and I'm learning as I go along frankly, and I'm very concerned. I've been to two debriefings, one of just DCF workers who were deployed that night, and more recently the whole DBHRN team. And I sat there for three hours listening to stories and really having an appreciation of the trauma and the damage that all of these people have sustained. And no matter what kind of training you have -- and what really concerns me frankly about many of the first responders is

that they came from little town police departments with no experience, where a traffic ticket is the activity of the day. And so I think the more you can do in that regard, the more you can talk about it, the more you can educate.

I joked with friends at the end of the first week, on December 21st -- I shouldn't say this publicly, but I've said probably a lot worse -- I looked at my recycle bin and I saw, I said wow, and I realized that that's -- personally that's how I was dealing with it. I was coming home at, you know, 10:00 or 11:00 o'clock at night and having a couple of glasses of wine, and I don't do that. And I suppose there are far worse things I could have done, but clearly that was my way. And what concerns me -- I can say publicly that has stopped. That has stopped, that has stopped, but my concern is that people will self-medicate and they won't just self-medicate with alcohol. They'll self-medicate in lots of other ways that are far more dangerous.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: We're going to just extend this panel just until 11:00 in deference to the fact that I know all four of you have to be other places.

Dr. Schonfeld, you had a comment or a question?

COMMISSIONER SCHONFELD: Yeah. I just want to make one comment, just as a placeholder, that we may wish

to revisit at a future meeting, and then I have one question for the group.

The first is I've heard in -- it's a caution about the potential use of certain language. I've heard a lot of discussion of debriefing to try and help with some of the stress that's been associated in the vicarious traumatization and the reactions.

After critical incidents I think a lot of people when they think debriefing think it's critical incident stress debriefing or critical incident stress management, which is a particular intervention developed more for first responder communities. And there's been a lot of work looking at that and has raised questions about its efficacy, and has also suggested that it has unintended negative consequences when applied particularly overly broadly. And so I sense that when people are referring to briefing, debriefing, they're really more referring to informational sharing, reaching out, psycho-education, providing supportive services, and offering longitudinal support.

That is not actually what critical incident stress debriefing is, so it's more as a placeholder when we talk more about the mental health aspects. I hope we revisit that because I remember in my time in Connecticut right after 9/11 people said let's get training in CISM and

CISD, that's the way we'll deal with 9/11. And so I think that may still be a pervasive misunderstanding amongst some members of the community.

So I just wanted to kind of put that in as a placeholder. I don't need any follow-up on that, but I just want to make sure we correct that or at least acknowledge that that's an issue.

I want to bring up a completely different area, and it was alluded to in some of the comments, but we've been appropriately talking about the systems level issues and I was very impressed with the amount of collaboration and the thoughtfulness, not only in the comments today, but in the immediate response that I saw.

But one of the things that I'd like to give some thought to is how to we prepare school personnel to be supportive to children? This is different, it's complementary to thinking about how do you identify mental illness, post-traumatic symptoms and disorders, and get the appropriate treatment, which is a very important issue. But how do we get school personnel ready to talk to kids who have experienced the death of a peer, that are dealing with the stress of coming to a school environment where they're scared of seeing their parents upset. And it's very hard to provide this type of training just in time, having tried to do that in Newtown myself. People are not

in a position to be able to learn new information when they are in the immediate aftermath of these events.

So one of the recommendations that had come out of the National Commission on Children and Disaster, as well the mental health subcommittee for the National Bio Defense Science Board, was to try and help educators, other school personnel, develop some knowledge not to be therapists and not to provide clinical care but to be able to support children who are dealing with difficult situations, whether those be around crisis or loss.

And so nationally we've been trying to think through how does that get implemented state by state. Is it something that we would encourage to be in state departments of education, in part of teacher preparation? Is it part of the professional development or in-service training that's offered throughout the school systems? Is it something that we encourage within professional development for re-licensure?

So I would just like to hear what some of your thoughts are, and again I'm not talking about training to do PTSD treatments, and it might only be a 4-hour module offered online or in schools of education, but how do you think it could be implemented here in Connecticut if you agree that it would helpful.

COMMISSIONER REHMER: I want to comment that I think you hit one of the issues dead on that I don't think we have the answer to, but that became I think apparent to all of us by Sunday after the event, which is if you have educators who are trained and prepared to talk with children about death, for example, as a critical incident, and they are not traumatized, that is one issue.

When you have teachers and staff who are equally or more traumatized than the children that you're trying to prepare them to go back into, I think we have a different issue that we have to figure out how to address.

If I can speak to one of the lessons we learned,
I think that there was a high sense of everybody needs to
go back to school and go back to normal. This was not a
normal event. This was not something that we had
experienced certainly. I don't think this is comparable,
frankly, this is my opinion, to 9/11. We took a lot of
lessons from 9/11, but people had very strong feelings
about the fact that there were small little children and
the impact of their deaths on the family, the community,
the state and the nation because biologically we all
respond differently to children under a certain age. So
that in and of itself gave us a different issue that we had
to address.

So we're talking to the teachers about you have to go back in, you have to go back in, you have to go back in, and you witness the response to that. They weren't ready to go back in. We had to deal with their trauma before we could put them in the classrooms with children that were highly traumatized. And if there's one thing that I feel very strongly about is we have to understand that better, we have to think about how to deal with that better, because otherwise we are sending teachers who are feeling very traumatized back into a situation.

One of the teachers that we spoke with said, "When I go back into the classroom after this event, it is the most important day of my career and I'm not prepared to go back in."

If we send those teachers back in to deal with families and young children that have been traumatized, we are not doing a service to anybody that's involved in that system. So I think your question hits the nail on the head. I don't have the answer for it. I think we need to think very carefully about it, and one of the things that Commissioner Pryor and I have talked about is the whole system, we had a superintendent that was highly traumatized having to make decisions in the moments after an event. And we weren't necessarily, it wasn't until about two days later when I was driving home thinking she's traumatized as

well. I mean that seems really obvious sitting here now, but in the aftermath I wasn't thinking about the impact on her ability to make decisions. That is not to say the state should come in and take over, but we need to think about a system where maybe somebody else comes in and assists that person very, very directly. And maybe it shouldn't be a state agency.

I don't have the answer, but I can tell you I witnessed some of the chaos that occurred because we were not prepared to answer that question. So I would really encourage people, and I think we all have to look at the literature, the national experts talk about how that should be managed, because if there's one thing I think we learned, we didn't know what we didn't know going into this. And so I would just, again, it's a really important question, but I don't have an answer for it.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: I think we'll just hear from Commissioner Pryor and then we'll be able to tap our local Connecticut resource through our commissions at a future meeting.

So, Commissioner Pryor.

COMMISSIONER PRYOR: I think Commissioner Rehmer has been very eloquent in response to the question from Dr. Schonfeld and I think that the issues that she articulates are exactly right as to the issues we need to explore.

I think just to put a finer point on one element of what Commissioner Rehmer was saying, when professional staff including teaching faculty and administrators are themselves traumatized having experienced or observed violence, how does a system get back up and running and how do we ensure that we are serving the needs of both the staff and the students simultaneously. That's the fundamental tension.

2.4

There are of course students, in this case young children, who were themselves traumatized and experienced violence. Very complicated scene. So even in addition to Commissioner Rehmer's points about what kinds of supports were made to decision-makers, how do we ensure that those decisions are made as pertain both to staff and students. Very profoundly complicated set of questions. And I'll leave it there for the moment, but say that I think we need to explore those questions more.

Also in direct response to Dr. Schonfeld's question, I think the areas that we may explore together as to the provision of additional training or additional preparation for teachers and other educators in advance of any foreseeable or unforeseeable problems and disasters, I would say the opportunities are as follows:

One is the teacher preparation process itself which takes place, let's recall, at colleges and

universities. So we're talking about the curriculum of colleges and universities as pertains to the preparation.

We, as Pat Keavney-Maruca knows, we at the State Department of Education are undertaking a new look at the entirety of the education preparation process through our role as a creditor or the teacher prep programs of the state. It's called the Educator Preparation Advisory Council. There may be a dialogue that should occur with EPAC.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The second area that worth of look is the ongoing professional development and professional learning more generally of teaching faculty administrators. We've made a fundamental shift in Connecticut. It was previously the case prior to the Education Reform Act of 2012 that one of the forms of professional development was CEUs, continuing education units, which were typically large format auditorium or lunch room or otherwise gymnasium sessions, not always but often, where teachers would sign up for a seminar often because of convenience more than necessarily content specific interest or need. Not always, but that was a common experience. We've eliminated that system and all professional development is aimed at being informed by evaluation of individual teacher needs through our new evaluation and support system, highly trained individuals, and what I would say is Dr. Schonfeld and members of this body, I think we need to look at specifically how do we

provide professional learning and feedback to school
psychologists and other mental health workers who are
school imbedded. I'm not sure enough thought has been
given specifically to that, and the intertwining with these
larger systems. Thank goodness for them, but how do those
interface.

And then second, for classroom personnel, what kind of training is necessary and what kind of feedback needs to occur along the lines that you're describing, Dr. Schonfeld, as pertains to exposure to violence, exposure to crises, trauma and bereavement.

So I just wanted to highlight those areas would require a lot more discussion.

COMMISSIONER KATZ: Terry, if I could just say one thing echoing on that or following up on that.

Whatever you do I think it can't be a one shot deal, because anyone who's ever taken CPR knows. I told my husband good luck because memories fade. And the other thing is, quite frankly, literature changes. So, thank you.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Commissioner Mullen, did you have a final word on that?

COMMISSIONER MULLEN: Well, I'll take it. Thank you.

Hearing your question, the word that popped back into my mind was building resilience, resilience across communities, across the state. And you've heard some of the frameworks for doing that, but in this work that's part of how you want to keep making the systems better, understanding that we'll have to do something else when the next ante gets raised. But I think part of the answer is coming together across our disciplines, working with you and with our federal partners since you're saying that this work that you want to scale to a national level between the Department of Education, the Department of Health and Human Services and others, Homeland Security, to talk about how we build a more resilient nation because it's the capacity we build in people that creates that resiliency.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Thank you.

We're going to take a 10-minute break and start our next session at 11:15 promptly. Commissioner Pryor, Commissioner Katz, Commissioner Mullen, Commissioner Rehmer, thank you very much.

(Recess.)

2.5

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: We have guests who come from out of state and we want to make sure that we take good use of everybody's time. And we also realize some of the members are out in the hallway right at this moment, but I'd like to just give those members of the commission who

1 are here an opportunity to introduce themselves. I had 2 neglected to do that earlier, so starting with Dr. Griffith. 3 4 COMMISSIOENR GRIFFITH: I'm Ezra Griffith, I'm faculty of the Department of Psychiatry at Yale School of 5 6 Medicine. 7 COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Good morning. Dennis 8 McCarthy. I'm the fire chief and emergency management 9 director for the City of Norwalk. 10 COMMSSIONER SANDFORD: My name is Wayne Sanford. 11 I'm with the University of New Haven. I am a retired fire chief and I'm also the retired deputy commissioner of 12 13 Homeland Security here in the State of Connecticut. 14 COMMISSIONER FLAHERTY: Kathy Flaherty, staff 15 attorney at Statewide Legal Services of Connecticut, and 16 I'm also a mental health advocate. I'm on the board of 17 Advocacy Unlimited. 18 COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: I'm Bob Ducibella, the 19 founding partner of Ducibella, Ventor & Santore. I'm a 20 security consulting engineer, architect, structural 21 engineer and work in the design community with law 22 enforcement and developers.

COMMISSIONER BENTMAN: My name is Adrienne

Bentman. I'm a psychiatrist and the program director for

25

23

1 the Institute of Living, Hartford Hospital psychiatry 2 residency. 3 COMMISSIONER KEAVNEY-MARUCA: I'm Patricia 4 Keavney-Maruca, a member of the State Board of Education. 5 COMMISSIONER LYDDY: Good morning, Dr. Wong. My 6 name is Christopher Lyddy, I am a former state 7 representative for the Town of Newtown. My term ended this 8 past January. And I'm also a clinical social worker and I 9 work at Advance Trauma Solutions which disseminates Dr. 10 Ford's model for people with post-traumatic stress disorder. 11 12 COMMISSIONER SCHONFELD: I'm David Schonfeld. Ι 13 direct the National Center for School Crisis and Bereavement, and it's currently located at St. Christopher 14 15 Hospital for Children in Philadelphia. 16 COMMISSIONER CHIVINSKI: Hi. Ron Chivinski, teacher in Newtown. Also AFT Connecticut, second vice 17 18 president. Thank you. 19 CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: We're just doing brief 20 intros, Dr. Schwartz, if you would just introduce yourself 21 formally and then continue conversation. 22 COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: I'm Dr. Harold Schwartz. 23 Excuse me. I'm Dr. Harold Schwartz. I'm the psychiatrist-24 in-chief at the Institute of Living and the vice president

of Behavioral Health at Hartford Hospital.

COMMISSIONER FORRESTER: And I'm Alice Forrester.

I'm the director of Clifford Beers Clinic, which is a child
mental health clinic in New Haven.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: I just would like to remind everyone that we are being filmed by CTN. We'll share the microphones.

I'm Terry Eldestein. I'm the governor's nonprofit liaison, the co-chair along with Bernie Sullivan of the Task Force while Mayor Jackson is out of town.

It's a pleasure to welcome Dr. Wong and Dr. Demaria to join us in Connecticut. The way we're going to organize this portion of the presentation, we will meet in a more formal discussion until 12:15. Then we have a Skype call for half an hour, we'll break for lunch, and then we'll return with question and answer. And I promised those people who didn't have an opportunity to ask a question get first priority in future questions. So thank you very much.

DR. WONG: Well, thank you, Ms. Edelstein and commissioners. It's really an honor to be able to be here today to share some thoughts and some experiences I've had over many years. For those of you who may not know, I was the director of mental health, crisis intervention and suicide prevention programs for the Los Angeles Unified School District, which at the time that I was there had a

population of 750,000 students K-12, 120,000 employees, and covered a square mile area of about 705 miles. It was the City of Los Angeles and 26 other municipalities, so as a director of crisis intervention we had on average crises that occurred at the rate of 2,500 to 3,000 crisis incidents per year.

Tragically, I also became a consultant to the U.S. Department of Ed after the Oklahoma -- the bombing of the Murrah Building, and have been their primary consultant over most of the school shootings. So I am very familiar with what occurs during the recovery period, during the response and recovery period, and I just want to say that having heard the discussion of the other commissioners, I just thought their comments were so spot on, and I will proceed with my presentation with the idea that much of what I have say has been said by those who were here previously.

Currently I'm an associate dean at the University of Southern California School of Social Work, and I'm the principal investigator for a SAMHSA grant funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services as part of the National Child Traumatic Stress Network. And my partners at RAND and UCLA and I have been doing research in exposure to violence since 1998. And I won't have time to share

those studies now, but I want to focus my comments on what happens after a large scale tragedy or disaster.

This is a diagram that is historical in nature because it was created in the early 1980s, and it was an estimate of what the process was after -- reactions after a disaster had occurred. So you can see here, someone spoke about 9/11 or other school shootings, there usually is a warning period in which incidents occur which predate and define what the environment is prior to the crisis or disaster itself.

And then the impact, it's sort of under the surface, but then the crisis occurs or the disaster occurs and there's an impact. Now, you can see in 1980 the impact of those existing crises was great, but not as great as we could estimate now, and certainly not as great as the impact of this Newtown tragedy. It is across the country. It is felt most deeply and heartwrenchingly here. But I would say this impact goes all the way down to the bottom if not below the line.

And what happens in most incidents is that there is a heroic period. And what's important about this is that this is a time when everyone comes together and it is a window of opportunity for change. And I suspect that this window of opportunity is still open, and it is not limited in any sense by a determined number of days or

months, but with each disaster has its own undetermined number of days or months.

So for instance, in New York after 9/11 it was a matter of a few weeks, and the event which ended the honeymoon, as some of you may recall, is that there was a dispute among some of the victims, the families of the victims when they learned that the Red Cross was gathering money and that they were reserving a portion of it for future disasters.

Now, this was not any different from what the Red Cross did in previous years, but it was new to this particular community and the outrage was great. And that conflict continued until the executive director of the Red Cross had to resign. And she was a very fine person. I don't think it had to do with any kind of malfeasance, but it had to do with the nature of that conflict. And what happened is it plunged the community into a period of disillusionment.

And this is very normal. It is not something that is unusual. And part of this disillusionment period is that preexisting conflicts and those that emerge from the tragedy itself begin to play out in the public. So there's a lot of shame and blame and, you know, disagreements. And the important part of this is that at some point it reaches -- it just bottoms out, and it begins

the hard work of coming to terms with the reality of that situation at all levels in call systems so that day-by-day the members of the community, the larger community, the region, the state, the U.S. government for that matter, the country begins to work through what this means and what needs to be put into place. And I would say that this commission is certainly an important part of that effort of how to we begin to solve the issues that have emerged out of this terrible tragedy.

2.5

Now, there are tragically also other events that occur during the first year. For instance, it may not be well-known but after Columbine there were 20 traumatic deaths, and it got to the point where some students were saying, asking the question, "Are we cursed?"

There were children -- excuse me, students.

Children to me, my children are adults, but these high school students are children to me -- and for instance two of the students were executed in a subway and they never did find who perpetrated that shooting. They were workers there. There were several suicides, completed suicides of parents of a child, of a student who was a stellar basketball person. There were a number of other incidents that just rocked that Jefferson County school district.

And that is part and parcel of this recovery period to reach some kind of reconstruction. Because -- I'll talk a

little bit about his later in more detail, but what we know is that these events have symbolic meanings to people, meanings that we do not know about, and there may be people in the community who might say to themselves I completely understand what this person has done, however horrifying it is. There are troubled individuals in the community or in the region and they come and they begin to threaten other people or they begin themselves to consider and to compare what it is that this perpetrator has done and what actions that they might take.

And that is why threat assessment becomes very, very important, and I know that there have been a number of incidents that have already been prevented in the Newtown region. The reconstruction is a new beginning and it takes many years often to achieve that.

Now, there has been terror in school and community and these are just some of the over 600 completed school shootings that have occurred over the last I would say 20 or 30 years. And the way in which I became involved in this, because it certainly wasn't a career choice, was that one of the early school shootings occurred in Los Angeles in 1984, and what we began to learn about its effects on schools and children we learned because we made mistakes, and we had to learn from our mistakes.

In 1984 a mentally ill man who lived across the street from the 49th Street Elementary School, on a February afternoon as the children were coming out of the school, simply began shooting onto the campus and held the children under sniper fire for an hour and a half. And he killed two little children and he shot and killed several of the staff, the faculty and staff, and the vice principal as a matter of fact, who were trying, attempting to save the children. And what we learned is, it was said here you can retraumatize and make things worse.

So one of the things we have to do is really protect the school, the town, the city, the school district so that they are not retraumatized.

This list goes on. I didn't do -- I didn't provide all those dates. It just would have been too many dates, but I think the watershed event in terms of school shootings was Columbine. And the first lesson that was learned here is very much like what we're experiencing right now in Newtown, although I would say -- concur with those who said we've never seen anything like this before, and even though I've been to many, many school shootings and to the school districts after the terrorist attacks in New York and Oklahoma City, this is not like any other incident that I have ever experienced.

What we learned from Columbine is that it can happen anywhere. Because here is a community that is very well resourced, upper middle class, educated parents, students who did very well in school, a very high performing high school, and it happened in Columbine.

2.5

We also know that Columbine probably did the best of all of the school shootings. They had very strong leadership at the superintendent and principal level, and I was there about a week after with the U.S. Department of Education, and what they did was really a combination of their own sort of intuitive response to their community and what they knew about their community, and some advice that those of us from the outside provided.

I worked in Columbine and with the school district for two years, traveling there almost every three months to train all of their school psychologists, counselors and social workers, as well as community providers in trauma-informed interventions, and especially during the immediate and intermediate phase.

But what Columbine did in and of itself is that it provided counseling in the school with a combination of both people from the county office of mental health, local providers as well as their regular social workers and counselors in the school. And this combination of people was really quite good because it provided them with a team

that could give, could provide an overall perspective of what the school was like before, what the students were struggling with, and also some expertise externally from the school about trauma-informed interventions.

2.5

And what they did was that the teachers decided we have to teach. We can't be therapists in the school. And they created a referral system which seems sort of simple in its -- just saying the words, "referral system," but actually it has to be developed by the local school community as well as the providers in the school, about how are they going to treat children who have problems, who are showing evidence of distress.

So for some it was anger and aggressive behavior, and for others it was withdrawal, and for some it was just refusing to come to school. And what the teachers decided is whatever the problem was, they were saying to the students of course we support you, but we are taking you, hold you by the hand, walk you into the office, you're going to see the counselors and the social workers. And they did that.

And I still have contact with many of those people right now and what they, even over 10 years later, what they talk about is that when they talked with the students, and these are high school students so this is not the same as elementary, but there is some I think

connections, is that the initial conversations were about the trauma, about the tragedy, but as they began to talk and as time went on, they began to talk about developmentally appropriate issues. So it may have been that the young man was talking about I'm upset, I don't even want to be here at school because, you know, the shooting, I feel danger. But as he began to talk more and more it had to do with my mother won't let me out of the house, I'm going crazy. I have to stay at home.

Now, that's why it's so important to have people who have the experience of trauma but also to have those who are in the school who know the children.

Newtown, with all due respect to those of you who know far more than I do, I did have an opportunity about two weeks ago to talk to many, many of the individuals from the school district, and there were three of us there from the National Child Traumatic Stress Network. We might have interviewed I think about up to 70 people. The bus drivers, the custodians, the teachers, the administrators, the executive staff and the superintendent. And what the teachers were saying is -- or the principal of Sandy Hook School currently and the vice principal, is that the teachers want to be in the school, they want to be with the children, and yet they know as they are having more and

more delayed reactions, is that they need someone with them.

So the idea of a co-teacher was brought up, someone who could provide that sustained consistency who didn't have direct experience with the tragedy, who could continue with the content and process of education, but at the same time have the regular teacher who could step out when he or she was having a difficult moment. Could bring them -- sort of have that moment to gather their thoughts and feelings and then be able to rejoin the teacher in the room. Because currently they don't have that ability to do so.

We also know that the reactions to witness to violence and to surviving a massacre such as what occurred in Sandy Hook, is that there are a number, a great range in spectrum of responses, of personal and individual responses, and initially, you know, of course the science of trauma is very new, and particularly the science of child trauma, but we now know that all of these changes are not just psychological and cognitive or emotional in fact, but that it is a full body reaction that has to do with stress hormones which bathe literally every cell in the body. And this is what makes the reaction so individual and so complex, and what often because of traumatic reminders of the event, something seen, something heard,

something smelled, something physically experienced bring back that trauma again and have a whole range replayed of these particular symptoms.

Now, a school begins to recover because the students and the parents and the staff perceive that there is renewed security. And that's a challenge because it may now -- in fact, I was at new Sandy Hook, and it is probably one of the most secure places in the world. You know, you go and there's those two police cars there and then you go in and there's another sort of gauntlet, and then finally you get in and I show my passport and -- but if in fact the children do not perceive that it is safe, that's when we have to -- they're still in the victim stage and we need to bring them to the survivor stage, which is why early intervention such as psychological first aid are so, so important.

So prior to Sandy Hook I would say that most students would have lessened traumatic stress symptoms after about a year. And especially post-anniversary period, you will see the symptoms begin to subside substantially.

But Sandy Hook is quite a different matter.

Because here it involved children so early in their development we do not know what's going to happen to these children.

I talked to some of the surviving parents, the parents whose children played dead, that ran out of the room. My colleagues spoke with some of them. And the question was this child is not like my child before. My wife and I are overwhelmed by her behavior. She screams, she runs out of the classroom when there are loud noises. I mean that's survival behavior. You know, the people who survived ran out of the classroom or played dead. And the question was what will she be like when she's 9? What will she be like when she's 15? They're so early in our development, we have very little experience with the trajectory when a child has literally survived this kind of shooting.

I was on one of the boards of the Institute of Medicine and we produced a document, a publication called Preparing for the Psychological Consequences of Terrorism.

And I just wanted to show this to you in terms of the -- one of the sort of diagrams that was in the publication.

But the distress responses from this particular incident is most intense the closer we get to the actual place in the school, in the Sandy Hook itself. But these distress responses are like concentric circles and they have spread throughout Connecticut as was discussed here, but also across the country.

And there are behavioral changes, and that's why there have to be school-based services. It can't be just services in the community. I interviewed teachers from all of the schools and they are talking about attendance problems which they did not previously have. They were talking about changed classroom behavior in terms of aggression and/or withdrawal.

Peer and teacher interactions are not at the same level as they were before, and these behavioral interventions are important here, again, psychological first aid, but also cognitive behavioral interventions for trauma in schools that were created for schools are very important. And it's really a small percentage of children and families who have and show psychiatric illness, such a full-on PTSD, and those would be those who were eyewitnesses to this event. They're more at risk. It's not that a hundred percent of them will experience post-traumatic stress disorder, but they certainly will be severely stressed. And that was a message that I got from all of the people that we interviewed, and that was how do I cope with this stress of the secondary adversities as well as what is occurring as a result of the tragedy.

I'm going to skip this part of it in terms of interdisciplinary crisis teams, but one of the things that's very important to know is that there has to be a

separate crisis and recovery structure, infrastructure. It can't be the same people that are in the schools right now, or the same people in the district. Because as was said before, everyone is traumatized, and the people who provide this kind of intervention have to be in a separate structure and it has to be a combination of both people from the inside as well as people from the larger region. That's the only way that people will be able to progress in the recovery process. And that there should be training across the region, not just at the school, for future events.

2.5

And, you know, I hadn't been to Connecticut very often, but the brief time that I spent here showed, demonstrated to me how devastating this was because, you know, it's such a beautiful region, it's such a beautiful state, and the people who live there were exemplary folks, so that it would be the last place on earth that you would ever think a situation like this would ever occur, a tragedy like this.

The objective of the recovery phase is different and the reason why it needs to be in the school is because there always is a need for providers, both public mental health providers as well as private providers, but there have to be services in the school to help reestablish that sense of emotional safety and to return to the school and

maintain the school in a sense of calm routine and schedule.

2.5

There will be throughout the year and even past the anniversary date many events that we will not be able to control that are outside the school, and that there will be a need for the students and the staff to be able to process these events and their thoughts and feelings so that they can understand their own reactions to danger, to new dangers, and also to the traumatic stress that they are experiencing. And we want to provide them that emotional support and stabilization to teachers, parents and to children.

Let me talk a little bit about triage and why school mental health services are different from community services. And that is that triage -- it's like a doctor's office. My husband was a physician. A doctor, when he has his own office, it's very orderly -- sometimes, and you make an appointment, you go in, you pick up your magazine, you know you're going to have to wait for a while, and you get into your appointment and there are things, you know, the dreaded weight machine, et cetera, et cetera.

However, when there is a crisis this is like the same people have to have a different skillset; they have to operate more like an emergency room. They have to constantly triage, psychologically, emotionally and

cognitively what's happening to these students. And there will be triage at different levels. So the people who might be most reactive and most at risk are those who are in physical proximity to being eyewitnesses to the event, or in the school hearing the chaos, hearing the screaming.

Those next in the next concentric circle are those who have emotional proximity, this is people who knew the victims, knew the families, were their camp counselors, their baby-sitters, live in the neighborhood, go to their church or synagogue, all of those ways in which people interact.

There are people that we don't know about but we're learning about right now, and they've had similar previous experience. Perhaps not in Newtown, but perhaps they moved from someplace where they had what we call a trauma history. Perhaps they have been victims of domestic abuse or child abuse. They have hidden -- it's under the surface, it's sort of like an iceberg. What we see at the top of the iceberg are those who are the direct victims and eyewitnesses, but below the iceberg are those who have trauma histories; those who might have fragile personalities, those of a history of being emotionally distressed or disturbed.

So I wanted to just end here because I want to give my colleague time to speak, and I will just share these slides with you. You can have them.

But the whole idea is that Project SERV in particular, S-E-R-V, is very, very important. The federal government, the Department of Education is waiting for Project SERV from the district, and it must be applied for by the district. The money goes directly to the district and it is to provide both short-term as well as long-term, up to 18 months to pay for all of these services that I'm talking about, and it can be extended so that I know after certain events it has been extended up to four years but it's at the discretion of the U.S. Department of Education.

Let me skip the end and my recommendations.

I love to share this quote because Dr. Pamela Cantor was part of the response in New York City, and here's one of the recommendations that has to do with Connecticut as a state and the nation as a whole, is that we have to take an all hazards approach to preparing schools to be their response and recovery system with the support of the community, and that is that the complexity of our societies don't permit the establishment of working alliances within 60 days. That's the time period in which the Project SERV can be funded, within 60 days. And that the schools in New York that did best after 9/11 were those

who had preexisting relationships with the agencies in their community. They just started right out. They knew each other, they trusted each other. They were ready to go with this higher level of intervention.

2.0

2.5

It was mentioned that traumatic stress affects both victims and caregivers. I cannot agree more. That the kind of shock and despair that comes with large-scale disasters and with -- is of such a profound nature that it will require years of support at every level of our country.

What is -- it's called either compassion fatigue or secondary trauma, secondary traumatic stress, and here's a quote from Dr. Charles Figley who's one of the thought pioneers of this area, is that there's a cost to caring, and that we professionals who are paid to listen to the stories of fear, pain and suffering of others may feel ourselves similar fear, pain suffering because we care. And it's the emotional residue of exposure to working with that suffering, particularly from those suffering from the consequences of traumatic events.

So there is a federal government program called Readiness Emergency Management for Schools. It was defunded by the Congress. We need to refund it. It pays for every school -- it pays for school districts or even consortiums of school districts to receive two and a half

days of training, to look at prevention, mitigation, response and recovery; to create systems to give some 18 months to create these partnerships to train. It pays for everything. It has to be integrated school and community response, which Readiness Emergency Management for Schools does provide.

There has to be teacher preparation training, and one of the commissioners talked about that, as well as staff development for those who are already in schools. There have to be school mental health services. That was one of the recommendations of the president's New Freedom Commission, that it isn't a natural place for people to go to a clinic or to a private practitioner, that many of the problems that are confronted by the school and that affect the disruption of school need to be dealt with by a school mental health, school based mental health program.

We need training and trauma-informed and evidence-based interventions, and you have two very fine institutions here in Connecticut that can do that.

It has to be a systems approach, not one-to-one. It isn't a private practice model of recovery. It is a school systems model. It has to be the infrastructure that addresses this specific tragedy and then it can move gradually in a couple of years with the regular services that are provided.

And also lastly I think there are many excellent recommendations that were provided by the National Commission on Children and Disasters.

So I think you so much for your kind invitation to be here today, and I'd like to turn this over to Dr.

Demaria.

DR. DEMARIA: Thank you for the opportunity to present. I'm quite honored to be here and I want to bring the heartfelt good wishes and sympathy from everybody in New York and my university to people of Connecticut. We're far away, close enough but far away, but we still feel this for you and it's again something I'd like to bring forth these good wishes. And thank you, Marlene, for your fine presentation.

Again, I want to back up a little bit, and I won't talk too much about who I am except that my mom is in the room and it's nice to have her remember that.

But more pertinent to you guys, I founded the 9/11 Family Center two weeks after 9/11, and in about an 8-year period of time we served 20,000 members of the community including evacuees, children from school districts surrounding Ground Zero, and commuters. We served about 2,500 bereaved family members and children, and about 5,000 first responders. So being through the long-term process, both from the initial crisis where I was

working at the time was about 30 minutes from Ground Zero, so we can see the smoke, we can see -- and I was in Manhattan at the time working and the weeks after. So that background is what I bring here in addition to some of my other experience being a teacher at a university, and also responding to several hundred school-based disasters in my 25 years as a psychologist.

2.4

First off, which I want to start off with, which is probably the most important and it's been brought up by a lot of people, is that there needs to be an identification of the needs of the children exposed to the threatening events. And I grouped disasters, trauma, loss and violence, and pertinent to that is the process of identifying the long-term impact of threatening events in children is complicated by the different ways children process distress. No two children are alike and no two children of said ages are alike.

And part of what the recommendation I would have is that there needs to be some sensitivity training for school staff about the different ways children respond to traumatic exposure. Not that schools are not sensitive to children, but there's different ways and nuanced ways that children will express it.

Most children won't show symptoms apparently.

The majority of children when they are disturbed by issues

will internalize, will go inside rather than outside.

Roughly 80 percent in general of children who have been exposed to difficult events will keep it all inside, so it's a really subtle approach to teaching people that it's not the child who comes up to you, those children will come up. It's not the child who is not doing well in school, and we have to get past the fact that it's not going to be apparent to us.

Part of what we also need to do is specialized training for school staff about the many ways they can monitor students who have been exposed to threatening events, and again that's subtlety in the sensitivity, it's changes in verbalization, writing, behaviors, art, play, and a big area that's become more apparent is e-communications. If you're not aware of it, that children via Facebook and via blogs will leave online tributes and online dialogues of people who have died. That's a new phenomenon that we have to be aware of and we have to monitor that because it's a good way to get a pulse of where the children are.

Obviously change in academic achievement, but also with the work I've done is look at murals, commemorative and memorial research. What I've done there as school tragedies is look at what the children are writing and putting up on walls, that things are in the

community. And it's fascinating what you find in terms of what the children are wishing for. But what I've been finding consistently is typically the messages are that of attachment and loss and grief, but there's also some things that are quite disturbing. Sometimes you see messages that the children want to join obviously the children who died, in their way depending on their developmental level, but you'll also find children sharing on the murals that they can't get it out of their head; it's very hard for them to get past this. And what will happen is is that they'll keep reliving the experience. And it's to step back.

And understand post-traumatic stress, it's stress but it's caused by traumatic exposure. So it's reliving a stressful event and having adrenalin and then the brain, glucocorticoids wash the brain every time you stimulate yourself with the traumatic memory. So a lot of the children repeat this through their memorials and through commemoration. So we have to really study whether children are actually moving past it in terms of being able to integrate some way, or children are keeping restimulated, and eventually that leads to post-traumatic stress disorder.

Post-traumatic stress disorder is the lack of capacity to process the traumatic exposure, so the stress keeps occurring. And a lot of people forget it is a stress

disorder. It's not simply a disorder of traditional psychiatry. Some people believe it's a memory dysfunction, and because of that the memory keeps repeating it so much that the children can't get it out of their minds, and adults also. And that's really what we have to teach, how to look for these more subtle signs rather than just self-reports or asking the children directly.

The other thing that is a concern is that we need to develop better monitoring process where children can be followed on a long-term basis throughout their school career to protect against further vulnerability, victimization and mental health difficulties. There's been some recent studies showing that children exposed to disasters end up being revictimized in other ways. It increases their likelihood to be vulnerable and therefore victimized in later life both as adolescents and adulthood. Certainly Robert Anda and his study with the ACES survey shows that children who have a high amount of child abuse end up even having health difficulties as adults, and other dysfunctional behaviors that occur as children.

So some way we need to stop the process of losing where these children come from. After 9/11 I was amazed when I went to certain school districts three or four years afterwards and they didn't know who were the 9/11 children in the building, who lost their parents. And a lot of

times when we would share and talk with the children and they would disclose they were from 9/11, their fathers died, they watched it on television, the teachers would say, oh, that explains a lot. But somehow because of our need to in a sense protect the child's privacy, the child's medical record, so to speak, ends in June and the following year it's a fresh start with a new teacher without a sense of that history.

But I think with at-risk children, children with the high degree of exposure such as we're talking about, Newtown, I think it puts the children in a very vulnerable place. So somehow we have to balance tracking children with protecting their privacy and confidentiality and their right to self-determine, but we also have to keep in mind that sometimes these kids need to be watched because it does explain a lot of things that will emerge later on in their development.

Child bereavement and loss, grief and loss are common experiences in childhood. School is an ideal place for helping children experiencing loss and their disruptions in attachment. And I'll go through quickly because we, you know, we're short on time. But obviously we have to educate not just in regards to a tragedy or a horrible event like the Newtown shooting, but we also need to help schools better understand the grief and loss

process because it happens all the time, whether it's through divorce, whether it's through suicide, whether it's through violent events. Children go through this a lot, and they really do become fairly proficient in it. It's almost like it should be embedded in curriculums and not just put aside after something bad happens.

And the other things, and it results to some research that I did, I surveyed social workers in about 50 high schools, and I asked them what are the key bereavement practices that you should follow if you're working in a school district, and they were able to identify them.

Roughly 70 to 80 percent said they knew what they had to do. Then I asked how were you able to operationalize those practices in your school districts. We had answers of less than 20 percent, less than 15 percent, less than 30 percent. So there's a disconnect between the state of the art knowledge and the operationalization in school districts.

So something is wrong here a little bit, and I think we need to figure out why isn't the work being translated. And that's part of what we'll talk about in a couple of seconds is the dilemma between academic progress and psychological wellness, and oftentimes it's a tension there that often comes into play. But we need to start thinking about how to empower school districts to focus on

things and to not necessarily move past things when they could be potentially damaging the children much more in the future, especially as I said before about increased risk for vulnerability and victimization.

2.5

Memorials, commemorative activities and anniversaries, certainly it's early in the recovery process as Marlene talked about following what happened in Newtown, but we need to start thinking about the whole process about this is going to helpful because memorials and commemorative activities and anniversaries, they're powerful but they can also support or hinder the healing process. And from doing a lot of work on memorials and commemorization I can tell you that you need to establish clear guidelines of what to do and what not to do, and I can give you examples of what has been done that's what not to do, but I'd like to give you some suggestions about what to do in terms of helping schools think out and other communities in Connecticut think out what to do.

First is the memorials or whatever is designed are sensitive to needs of children and not based primarily on community, public, political or artistic agendas. And I know that this might not be the right building to say that in, but it is important that we don't forget the kids. They should be steering it for their needs, not necessary for other agendas. And that's my wish, you know, say put

Christmas wishes down, this is my Christmas wish here in the legislative offices. But I think it's really important to not forget the kids in this process.

2.0

2.5

We need to empower and validate the children to their active involvement in the planning. Let them know this is for them, not for us, although we may need it too but that's a different memorial that we need to create.

Allow children and families to decide whether they wish to be part of the memorialization process either through their participation or witnessing of memorial processes. Now, the reason I bring that up is we had one school where there was a child who was murdered by the child's father, and in the school district the mural was put up right in the main entrance and children were coming in and every day at school they would see the memorial. And one child -- I was there in the school -- said I don't want to see that every day. And then what happened when the child voiced that, the child was targeted for bullying by other children. And the child, well, you're not sensitive, you don't care, et cetera.

We decided to move the memorial to a place in an inner courtyard where children could elect to go to to pay tribute and if they wanted to, and we found that the amount of behavioral disruptions in the cafeteria, the amount of fighting among the children stopped significantly. And

there were about half the children would go routinely to this inner courtyard.

Sometimes we think one size fits all, but for certain people going to a debriefing, talking about stuff is really helpful, but there are a percentage of people that that doesn't work, and the same thing with children. Certain children like to approach right away, certain children like to temporarily avoid things. So you've got a structure or setting where children if they don't want to think about it don't have to think about it, but we don't need to necessarily precipitate a continual exposure to things that may trigger them and may cause this post-traumatic stress.

The other thing that comes about, and I haven't been back to Newtown to see, but spontaneous memorials happen also in the community, and they're a little bit dangerous because I've also done surveys of those. Those are the things you see on the side of the road, and oftentimes you see a lot of drug paraphernalia and alcohol there. It becomes a place for children to get high, to disassociate and disconnect. And that's not such a good idea especially if the suicide or an event, a violent event is near train tracks. You don't want the children there being somewhat impaired. So unless you do proactively

design a place for the children to be, they will develop these things throughout the community.

There are tools, there are experts that can advise schools. I think the schools need us to do that. And the other thing, any time a memorial is done, you've got to let adolescents and older kids be together. You can't separate them in some way. Oftentimes events are more parent based, but you got to let the kids be together with themselves. It's a very important part of that process.

The other issue, and I think it's really important for the commission to realize, that many schools have difficulty developing the practical experience necessary to independently enact or maintain an expertise in school crisis response. To cut to the chase, you need volume and you need experience to get good at anything, and if you learn something once doesn't make you an expert. And I've been doing trauma work for 25 years and I'll hear people say I went to a course over the weekend, I can do post-traumatic stress work. And I'm like, a course on the weekend? 25 years of supervision, gray hair and training, it's a little harder than that.

A lot of people think this is a quick solution, so to expect any school district to somehow get up to speed and be running with experts in the field right away is a

huge learning curve, especially when you're dealing with the ongoing needs of children.

2.4

And I think Marlene brought it up, we have to set up a parallel support system and not assume that you can bring people up to speed. I think we want everybody to be up to speed, we want to turn all schools into experts and trauma -- but you're not going to have that much experience, and there are people and experts around the country who do have that as an expertise who can lead with valuable advice. So my goal is don't spend resources training everybody expecting that they'll have that expertise because there's a large learning curve. Train well to make sure that they can identify and they can be sensitive to the needs, but train them all to know they can bring in somebody who can provide that and bootstrap some learning for them so they don't necessarily have to relearn everything because the learning curve is so long.

And the other piece of it, and I've seen this again and again in school districts, is you have to provide relief to schools involved during the crisis period to manage a bunch of children, adults, parents in a community and to manage a disaster response is two different activities. You can't do them both.

And first responders know that very well. You have an incident commander and then you have somebody who's

operating more as the house commander. You don't have people doing both jobs. You can't. But somehow we think that the same person can do both jobs, and there's budgetary issues, but you almost need a disaster czar to come into a district and to manage all the disaster work in concert with the schools, but not necessarily expect the schools to do both jobs. It leads to burnout, it leads to high teacher turnover, and also leads to future school disruptions.

I've heard a lot of times, and again I've responded to a lot of schools, and the key things that always disturb me is when a principal, superintendent says let sleeping dogs lie, or they appear to be doing okay. It's really a minimization of really what this did to the children, and I know you guys are very sensitive to that and I don't want to prolong the talk on it, but there are a lot of things that go on under the surface and there has to be a balance between educational attainment and also the emotional adjustment of children.

So somehow that has to be balanced in a fair way, and it has to be brought to the table, but somehow we have to realize that these kids have been wounded and you need to take care of them even if you don't see the wound right away. And again, that's important to kind of keep in mind.

And I think you should mandate prevention interventions. Don't wait until it happens. Mandate prevention interventions that are at best go to just teach children coping skills. You don't necessarily have to go through the narrative, you don't have to have them process the experience, but teach them how to better manage stress, and a lot of good prevention programs are really good stress management programs for children, teaching relaxation, teaching ways to cope with the arousal that they're experiencing so they can feel better.

2.5

But also part of prevention is the monitoring process, because the other piece of it is the children at five now will be six next year and their brains change dramatically. And true, other issues related to how much adrenalin is in their system and what that can do to the brain, but they're a different child. They're a different child at seven. They're a different child at eight. I know I have two adolescents and they're teaching me how much I don't know about being a parent every day, because I thought I had it mastered when they were kids but now they're in a different zone. And I'm sure I'll learn more when they become young adults too, but we can't assume that that child is going to stay the same and you can't assume that the child is going to interpret what that meant to have lost a friend, to have seen violence, and to see

parents who they rely on for safety be impaired and what that did to them.

And again, I've worked with traumatized people for years and they'll report that they didn't realize what happened to them when their father shot himself in front of them until they were 15, and then it came to them and they suddenly connected what actually happened, and then they felt this whole disillusionment and anger and rage.

So anybody here who is certainly in psychiatry, mental health, knows that there's certain times trauma doesn't come out until the mind is ready for it.

The last couple of slides, and I'm talking quickly because I know we have a Skype presentation, and I'm also from a big family so I talk quickly so I can get my points in because I had three older brothers growing up.

Threatening events cause children to feel vulnerable, leading to problems with their emotional behavioral self-management which disrupts social relationships.

If there's a threatened problem with attachment, for whatever reason, either adult is not there, not available, what happens is the children get afraid, and when they get afraid they tend to rely on very primitive coping responses. So there needs to be ways of ensuring that all communication to children is monitored for

consistency and openness. Kids can spot a lie a mile away, and kids and spot when you're not telling them the full story. You can't -- you think you're protecting them but it never works. Even young ones can figure it out. But somebody has to monitor what goes out to the kids in a consistent fashion.

School staff needs to maintain emotional and physical availability for children during and after crisis. Kids will report that my math teacher won't talk to me, he keeps sending me to the guidance counselor because he gets upset when I bring up about my dad dying. But they've just suffered another loss, so you have to make sure the teachers stay in the game. They're there for their children as much as they can emotionally and physically, and it's a very difficult process and that's where supporting teachers as much as possible -- who are heroic, I really believe that teachers in the district have been heroic at this point in time to stick in there and do that work, but we've got to support them much better than sometimes we hadn't.

The other part is the access to external people.

It's a diplomatic mission and it's really very difficult at times. But when you bring outsiders into a school district, they're foreigners, they're strangers. If they're there enough then they're integrated, but when

they're first there they're still strangers. And for children who are threatened by lack of security and vulnerability, it can be very scary for them. So you have to manage who comes in, who they're with, and I always recommend that any time a stranger is in a school until they become part of the school family, they're always escorted even on one-to-one discussions with children because you don't want to create the scene that they're vulnerable and other people could have come in and out. And that applies to everybody, law enforcement folks, teachers, superintendents, people from the state. You can't be a stranger in the school.

I always, when I come to a building, will refuse to walk the hallways with the principal unless, you know, he's aware that that's going to scare the kids and I'm a stranger. So I stay in their office. Not because I don't want to be seen, but at 6 foot 2 I stand out and the kids notice it and they also get more frightened because I'm not used to being in their building.

And that's really it and I got it done in time for the Skype call. And again, Marlene and I will talk more later and address any questions you may have. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Thank you both very much.

2.4

We're just going to get set for the Skype call now, and everyone who's on the commission please jot down your questions. We'll have a longer discussion after lunch. Thank you.

For the information of yours, we'll be speaking to people from the Aurora Public Schools, John Barry, who is the superintendent, and Francis Pumbar, who is the recovery coordinator for school system.

(Pause.)

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Thank very much, John. And are you with Francis as well?

MR. BARRY: Yes, I have Francis with me here also, thank you.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Thank you. John, if you would like to give us some information about your experiences through the Aurora Public Schools, I think based on the technology right now we'll be happy to listen to your every word and then see how the question and answer comes later. But we'll listen.

MR. BARRY: All right. Well, I can hear you perfectly now. Thank you, whoever changed the volume, that was very appreciated. Very helpful.

Well, first of all, any time we have these crises (unintelligible) and they are horrific events, but one of the things that I will stress is that there are two major

facets to the efforts that go on. We want to be dealing with not only the issue of the safety and security, but also the mental health side on the recovery. So let me go through some of the processes that we went through.

First of all, I think it's important in this day and age, and it is an unfortunate circumstance that superintendents and the schools around our country have got to be dealing with this issue not on a happenstance basis but I think nationwide I believe it needs to be done on a formative and deliberate matter.

So we have two approaches. One is the proactive preparation in the essence of trying to get ready for a potential crisis. Of course, we never knew that Aurora was going to be hit like it was with the theater shooting. And then the second part is how you do the recovery in the event after you do have a crisis like this. So let me just describe those two facets and I think that will be enough to generate some questions on your side to be able to get you what you need and so I can answer those questions that can help you.

On the proactive preparation side, since 2006 we have set up what we call an incident response team. Now, embattled in that is a group of people that are recalled in the event of a crisis. Now, this can be anything from a lockdown at a school because we have a burglar in the

neighborhood to, you know, tornado alerts to some power outages.

2.5

When we have this process, when people come together, we have deliberate capabilities to connect folks. So everybody gets on a webinar, everybody gets on a telecom, including the police and the fire, and we have folks that come to us inside of the incident response team that all have deliberate jobs. Everybody has a checklist. We practice this every year with a full-blown exercise in our community.

What I mean by a full-blown exercise, it's a real scenario as best as we can get it. For instance, let me give you an example. A student has a father who is court ordered to stay away from his family. The father wants to see his son. He gets on a bus when his son is on the bus, he hijacks the bus. Now, he had a gun -- this is all scenario, this is one of our practice scenarios. So then we bring everybody together and so forth and so on.

The major part of that practice preparation is the relationships we build with community service organizations, police, fire department, mental health units. The crisis recovery folks that are endemic inside, usually police departments. You establish these relationships so that in the event of a real crisis then you have that to fall back on. If you're waiting to

establish those kind of connectivities after a crisis, then I think you're going to be way behind the 8-ball.

2.4

What we try to do in these exercises, it involves sometimes 200 police, 50 fire department personnel. Our school district, you know, depending on the scenario it might be multiple schools, it might be -- certainly our incident response team, and that allowed us to go through a learning process that got better and better every year and unfortunately, like I said, this is probably a reality for school districts around the nation. We have to have that capability whether it be mother nature or be shootings and things we've seen both in Aurora and most recently in Connecticut. So that preparation in these full-blown exercises once a year has helped us.

We also do another thing where we do a tabletop exercise every year with all our principals, with the police department and the fire department in our professional learning and conference center, and we go through a number of scenarios in the course of three hours. It can be everything from mother nature to an issue of a distraught parent inside of a building, to a real live shooter to somebody who is mentally deranged and is making threats against children and our staff.

So we go through the process of valuating how the police sitting at the table with maybe a table full of six

principals, the fire department would be there, the mental health person would be there, and trying to brainstorm how you would react through these scenarios. So this is the tabletop exercise that we do once a year. So you've got a real exercise with full-blown scenario and real actors that are playing victims and 200 police and 50 fire, as well as you have the tabletop exercises. So those two efforts allow us to develop those relationships, work through some of the problematic concerns that you have in the course of going through a scenario.

So again, concentrate on the preparation for a minute, it is the issue of the ability to have a system, a process, checklist, technology that are all combined to be used in these preparation elements.

So let me transition now to the recovery. In the event of the shooting that we had on July 20th, one of the things clearly that you have to do in my opinion is again be as proactive as you can. Obviously you're reacting to a crisis but you need to be proactive in your response as much as possible.

So we divided it into phases. The first phase was the first weekend. The role of a school district now I think is becoming more and more necessary in meeting the needs of a community, whether it be a shooting inside of a

school like Connecticut, or a shooting outside of the school like there was in Aurora.

2.5

So we opened up four high schools within 24 hours. One was opened for victims and witnesses to come to where the police could help people and we could provide some medical assistance as well as mental health assistance. So I'd say within 12 hours we had -- well, you know, within one hour of the shooting we had the high school open and people were gathering there.

We opened a second high school -- if you remember in our case the perpetrator -- I won't even honor him by saying his name, was -- he booby-trapped his apartment and that forced an evacuation of three apartment buildings. So we opened a second high school to be able to take those families that were evacuated, in partnership with the Red Cross. Again, another relationship that we had already built.

We opened a third and a fourth high school within 24 hours so we could have victim advocacies, psychologists, sociologists, different kind of mental health groups that came together and that we had established relationships with. So that was the first weekend. That was phase one.

Phase two was that -- this was a Friday morning when the shooting occurred. By Tuesday we entered phase two, and this is our ability to be able to get ready for

school, which started 10 days later. So we already had students showing up at schools to be able to register and certainly sign in if new families were coming. So we set up a website. We started preparing teachers for dealing with students. We established a communication network with the schools to make sure they were kept apprised of what school students that we knew were in the theater that night. We had 156 students, family or staff were in the theater that night of the shooting. Those are the immediate impacted people, but clearly the second order, third order and fourth order.

And our role in all of this is not to be first responders. We are not first responders, but I will argue that we are second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth and on responders because of the needs of the community. So the second phase was getting ready for school to start.

The third phase is when school started, and by that time we had prepared everything from extra substitutes for teachers if they needed it, to scripts for teachers to use for grade-specific children, even as early as kindergarten. And that shocked a lot of people. They said are we really going to talk to children who are in kindergarten about this situation? And the advice we got clearly was to do that.

2.0

Now, Dr. David Schonfeld was one of the key people, and Dan -- Dan Nelson's name escapes me -- these two remarkable individuals were allowed to come to us from the Department of Education. (Unintelligible) Duncan personally called me on the second day and said how can we help. We asked him for grant money, we asked him for assistance and he provided these two amazing individuals. David and Dan were absolutely essential I think to helping be that proactive that we wanted.

And then we also had them communicate to the entire school district on a webinar telecom about what they had seen in other crises. It was very helpful. So that was phase two.

Phase three is when school started, like I said, and that carried us through November. And we had a lot of group town hall meetings, communication processes to make sure people kept informed. We contacted every single one of the 156 who were in the theater to make sure that they understood -- and of course we had funerals to attend and we had students and adults who were wounded, and we had a lot of second order and third order impacts. So we went through that process in phase three all the way up until what we characterize as the holiday season, like around Thanksgiving to the winter break and the New Year.

Well, of course, that's tough enough for a lot of people, but certainly in the aftermath of having folks that are hurt and injured, and of course if they've lost anybody.

Now, to make sure that we haven't a worst nightmare whether it was suicides or those kinds of things, I don't know if you know much about my background, but I was 30 years in the military. I retired as a 2-star, I was three years as a vice president for an international corporation called SAP, and now I'm in the seventh year as superintendent. I know how people react differently to these circumstances, and our worst nightmare was the holiday season where people were going to miss their loved ones or obviously reflect badly on the circumstances. And that carried us through really the sixth month point of the shooting, and now we're in the phase, the final phase where we would say for this year will carry us to the one year anniversary.

So I hope this kind of gives you an idea. I can give you all that information, what was specifically done in every one of those phases. We can provide all that information to you, but the main point is it's a credit to the district and the camaraderie, the community integration that we were able to get right off the bat within the first

2.0

12 hours all the way up until now that I think has made a difference in how our city has responded.

2.0

2.5

Our mayor has said very clearly that this will not define our city, this shooting. But I think what really has defined our city is the reaction that we had on it.

Now, we hired a crisis coordinator, and that's Francis Pombar, and I think that was absolutely essential for us to be at (unintelligible), because everybody's got their jobs to do in the normal course of a school district, but having Francis here allowed us to be able to set up all of these organizations, connectivities, events, brainstorm these ideas, get feedback, particularly from the community as we went through.

So I'll just end up by telling you we've had everything from a football player going into a fetal position on the backfiring of a car; we've had teachers who have gone catatonic because one of the teachers was actually at Columbine as a student years ago. We've had parents call me at 1:30 in the morning because I gave them all my phone numbers. There have been issues all the way across the line that people have reacted to this differently. And as David Schonfeld will tell you, some people react right away and crash, and some people are up/down, up/down for maybe weeks, months and even years.

1 Some people hold it in for months and then they finally 2 crash, and some people are able to handle it fine. 3 So we don't know who they are all the time and 4 we're trying to send in those safety nets to be able to be 5 proactively involved to help them. 6 So I hope that helps give you an idea of how we 7 prepared for the crisis, not knowing that it would ever 8 happen and praying that it would never, to the issue of how 9 we did the recovery efforts, and both of which I think are 10 realities for our school districts and our nation today. 11 CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Thank you very much for your 12 comments. Can you hear me? 13 MR. BARRY: I can hear you fine. Thank you. 14 CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Yes. Okay. 15 I want to open up the -- give the opportunity for 16 commission members to ask any questions, get into a 17 dialogue with you, and you should now that Dr. Schonfeld is 18 with us in the room, so he appreciated your very thoughtful 19 comments about him. Your glowing comments. 20

MR. BARRY: Everything I said nice about him, you know, just don't let it go to his head.

21

22

23

24

25

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Ouestions? Comments?

A COMMISSIONER: Just a quick question regarding the exercises you referenced. You had mentioned two types of exercises, a full-blown exercise as well as a tabletop

exercise. Could you elaborate on that full-blown exercise who was involved? Are we talking students or community volunteers?

2.0

2.5

MR. BARRY: Yes. This is a six-month planning process. The scenario is devised without the persons knowing it who are going to be involved. The example I gave you was when a farther hijacked a bus. So let me go in a little more detail.

It involved over 200 police because they were in the process of getting SWAT teams and those things together, so they were able to exercise their processes and procedures. Also the fire department was involved in some of these scenarios, not all of them because they didn't do direct -- but obviously being prepared for any injured students, things like that.

Let me use another scenario and more apropos insofar as shootings in a school.

There were three people who came in and took over the school. They shot some of the -- this is all scenario now -- they shot some of our staff members. Obviously a lot of school staff and students exited and escaped, but there was a cornering of that. So we go through the process of, one, trying to answer the questions who, what, where, when, why. We are connected to the police. The police have a representative come to our conference room in

the IRT, a fire department representative comes to our conference room in the IRT. They're our connectivity. As well as we deploy someone to be onsite with two computers and a laptop so we are connected on a webinar, so everything we see in our conference room they see, as well as having our police and our fire department representative in the room.

2.4

In the course of the shooting obviously the police are going to do their -- they're going to surround the school. We've evacuated some students. We have to have a secondary evacuation site. We had to go through that process. So we had to set up transportation and get buses that were outside the immediate area of the threat to take people to another location.

So we were in a serious conversation about communication with all of our representatives in coordination with the police, not separately. So anything we ever run by our communications office that goes out always go through the PIO, through the police department.

In the course of this effort we are identifying students that are not accounted for so that we can be able to give that to the police (audio skip) particularly in their negotiations.

We have cameras inside our school and outside our school that are made available to the police. Either they

see it from the representative in our conference room or it is on the webinar. We also have a GIS map that we prepare, global information system map that plots the school, the recovery site. We draw a one mile and a 3-mile circle around the area of interest. We'll shut down or lock down schools or our administrative buildings that might be in that containment area.

2.5

We freeze all the buses. We have Zonar on our buses that allows us to be able to figure out where every single bus in the district is. So we freeze every bus, pull them over until we figure out where they are in regards to the area of incidence. So if they're inside the circle, we get them out. If they are programed to go inside the circle and they're outside right now, we tell them not to go in. So it allows us to get some control over that so we don't put additional students at risk, particularly in an area where there are armed culprits and police running around.

We have a capability of giving information on an incident log that we give to the police every 30 minutes. So in other words, as we go through our process we've got a scribe who's typing all this information, so if we have a school, a name, a child, anything like that, we don't have to be on the phone, what's the name of that kid again and where did he go, how do you spell his name. So we can

shotgun that stuff by either email or fax to the police so they have that information, or it's an ongoing dialogue.

2.0

We also provide them pictures of the students that we know are of interest or of our staff who are of interest that might still be uncounted for.

In the course of that secondary evacuation site we have police around there, we have help, but our main job there now is to have the students (audio skip) so they can be accounted for, and then the parents come to the theater (sic). So then as we start joining parents and students together, the conversation might go, Mrs. Smith, your son is ready to be picked up, and then we can join them back together. It's organized, it's set up, we have laptops, we have tables, we have water, we have food. That is all at these different sites to be able to accommodate them.

But the other conversation might be, Mr. Jones, please come with us. Your son has been injured. He's been taken to Hospital X. So we give him that information, coordinate that with the fire department and their information on anybody who has been injured.

So it's a rather -- it's a six-month planning process. We have actors that play victims; we have actors that play the bad guys. We have real live principals obviously, and administrators who are reacting to this situation.

So it uses that allowance to develop those relationships, work through the brainstorming efforts and be able to do it. The same thing could be applied for a tornado, let's say, or a fire. We had fires in Colorado, down in Colorado Springs. These are realities that school districts are not separate institutions that are divorced from these kinds of efforts in a community. They're an active participant.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Thank you. Other questions?

Dr. Bentman.

COMMISSIONER BENTMAN: Hi. In your rehearsal you made the decision not to include teachers or students. Do I hear that correctly?

MR. BARRY: I'm sorry, ma'am. You have to repeat the question.

COMMISSIONER BENTMAN: There are no real live teachers or students involved in this real time rehearsal.

MR. BARRY: Well, actually we do. We ask for volunteers. Some of our kids who are into drama and those kinds of things. They can get the makeup on and those kinds of different situations to show as realistically as we can people who are injured or traumatic. They are given cards to act out in some cases. Some people will be hysterical, and we exercise the process of (unintelligible) tell them to deal with that. To everybody who is a parent,

angry, you know, that shows up at the door, I want my kid,
I want him now, and I'm sorry, you can't go into the area
as you alone.

So, you know, so schools are also involved in the practice and they're part of the scenario as well.

COMMISSIONER BENTMAN: So my question actually is for all of your teachers and all of your students, what has Aurora decided to do in terms of education or practice for the teachers and staff, the grown-ups in the school, and what have you decided to do at the various school levels to involve the children in any kind of lockdown rehearsals.

MR. BARRY: Okay. Let's talk about the staff first. One is we do have -- one other thing I failed to mention, every school has a tabletop every year. So the school gets to sit down and go through with their staff to be able to exercise. And so far as the students are concerned, we have cards that we all carry around, and this is another reality of the word today, and in that card it has the lockdown procedures.

And we have four basic things that align with the national threat assessment. Green is normal risk and not a factor, continue operations. Yellow is potential risk where all the exterior doors -- they're always locked anyway. We have all of our schools locked and you have to be buzzed in at any level, elementary, middle and high

school. But exterior doors are double checked to make sure they're locked. High traffic doors must be monitored. All interior doors will be locked at yellow. Bells continue to ring and students continue to go back and forth between class, and lunch periods continue.

2.5

If we go to orange that means that all those procedures are in place but they don't leave their classroom. They can leave the classroom to go to the bathroom, but that's it. We most recently had an 8-hour lockdown for a robbery suspect that was in an apartment building very near to one of our high schools. We went into orange and stayed in orange for almost 8 hours. So food was provided, students were allowed to continue to learn in the classroom, but every door was locked inside and out.

And then if red, we go into red, then all the students are on the floor, lights are out, blinds are closed, doors are locked, and they're up against the wall so they couldn't be impacted if somebody shot into it.

And then we have a reunification exercise every year where we practice our procedures on evacuating a school to another site. So that puts our processes and procedures in place for desks, tables, laptops, food, water, those kinds of communication elements that go out to parents on where to go to reunite with their child.

So the answer to your question, besides the district-wide tabletop we have, we have tabletop exercises for every school and we practice these lockdown procedures with our students every year. So, unfortunately we have some that are recurring anyway because of real live circumstances like robberies or a shooting in the neighborhood, but those are a reality that we have to deal with every day. I hope that answers your question on how we involve our students and our staff in every one of our schools.

COMMISSIONER BENTMAN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: John, thanks very much.

Very, very insightful about the practical realities of developing a program and then testing its validity based on real exercises.

The card system you used is a representation of a graduated system threat awareness and threat management. I love the fact that it's codified, you don't know it until you look at it and use it and that memory lapse often is helpful.

Is that particular credential carried by all the school staff members? Is that what you were saying?

MR. BARRY: It is. It's given to every staff, it's posted in our school sites, you know, so people can refer to it.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Yeah.

MR. BARRY: And every school not only has those (audio skip), but they also have a particular room or area of the school where the leadership would go to as a safe site to be able to make decisions, and they have of course this information posted. So everyone does have it either posted or carrying it in their own wallets or purses.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Yes, so you have a multi-purpose space that is used for a whole number of things but predefined and identified in the school so that when an event like this occurs it's equipped with whatever technology you need located in the school so it's appropriately secure, accessible to emergency responders and not to an aggressor, and that's been sort of thought out as part of the school planning and design process or retrofit process.

MR. BARRY: That's all correct, and in addition to that the police know where those sites are in every school.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Yeah. I also heard you mention the use of video surveillance. I know it's very obvious, but in those tabletop exercises I'm assuming that sort of situational awareness remotely conveyed to EMS and PD, very, very helpful in the success or the intended

success of that tabletop. That information is found valuable, correct?

2.0

2.5

MR. BARRY: Exactly. In fact, we record all of those cameras. So we've had incidents, for instance, in that scenario that I just mentioned to you where we had some live shooters in the school, while the police were showing up they started going to different places, and we could rerun the recorded videos that we had for this site to kind of track what part of the buildings they went in. So it was easier for the police to kind of figure out where they were in the building so they could take their appropriate process, tactics and procedures that they use when they go through.

We also have a capability, you know, in any incident you're going to have press all over the place and helicopters or anything, so we record on TV four different channels from our Incidence Response Team. This is typical of what you have in your home. You just do your DVR recorder. But we can record four stations so we stay on top of that as a case in point.

So embedded in our Incidence Response Team is everything from multiple screens that we can switch to because I might want to watch cameras on one screen and then we have a GIS map up on another one, or we want to bring up the Zonar for the buses, all of which when we do

that is on the webinar. So anybody on the webinar, it could be the principals that are in lockdown that are not affected directly by it, or certainly the principal if they're in their secure site. I don't want to describe it as kind of a lockdown vault or anything like that, but it's an area where they can manage their situation as best they can, if it's allowed. You know, sometimes it's not allowed because of the circumstances.

But we've got this technology integrated even to the point where in our Incidence Response Team -- I was in the Pentagon on 9/11. Phones don't work obviously when crises happen, cell phones in particular. So we have hard wire phones and we have hard wire internet connections for our computers inside our Incidence Response Team. But the value of that when everybody is on the webinar and the telecom, their situation awareness is kept up, you don't have to repeat it. We go through processes where our communications go out to parents or the board of education or the mayor or the police and the fire department to keep them apprised.

So this is a -- we learn something every single time and we always have a debrief after we finish, whether it be tabletop or these full-blown exercises. So we continually upgrade our processes and procedures, we get

smarter and smarter in our ability to do that. This is unfortunately the reality of the world.

2.0

know other members of the commission may have a question.

There are those, and I understand this, who have an aversion to video surveillance in schools. It obviously serves an incident command and situational awareness benefit, we know that, but have you had pushback or what has been the general response from your school districts about the use of video surveillance schools? Has there been a concern about that from a technology perspective, an oversight perspective that people find psychologically overburdening or has there been, as we find in some cases, people who are happy it's there because they recognize its security significance. I want to stay agnostic on that subject and hear your opinion.

MR. BARRY: Yeah, I think if anything, it has been reassuring for our parents. And it is also reassuring for our staff members to know that when something happens in a school that there is (audio skip) to provide assistance. They're not alone. And that's particularly — I can't tell you how many principals in real life circumstances where we've had lockdowns because somebody is in the neighborhood that police are pursuing and it just happens to be right at release time, which is the worst

time that something like that can happen. So now you've got parents that can't pick up their kids because we're still in lockdown or you've got buses that can't arrive and you've got delayed sports events, I mean all those things. But when you have an organized communication network that assists the principal in managing this, even to the point of giving them -- we have robocall systems, a system we use is Connect Dead (phonetic) where it can go out to all the parents, but we provide them through our communications prepared scripts that we work on and massage and had it to them and then all they got to do is just record the message, or it can come from me as superintendent in some cases. But having a crisis coordinator also has gone a long way to be able to give us that extra help to be able to react to these situations.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Thank you very, very much for your time. Is any of this documented in a form, since you've put an awful lot of effort into it, you obviously have a pretty high fidelity process that leads to a pretty mature solution. Is that something that the commission here might be able to take advantage of? Do you have a booklet or a hard copy on this of some sort?

MR. BARRY: We do, and most of it is on our website.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: It is.

1 MR. BARRY: We've been sharing this with lots of 2 other school districts around the nation. So, you know, 3 plagiarism is only legal in the publishing business so we 4 try to make sure people --5 COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Thank you very, very 6 much. 7 MR. BARRY: And we've learned from other school 8 districts too, so we've adopted a lot of lessons learned 9 from Columbine and even the other incidents that have 10 happened in Colorado to be able to be helpful. 11 CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Chief McCarthy? 12 Superintendent Barry, can COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: 13 you tell us, do you incorporate Run Hide Fight training as 14 part of your lockdown procedures, and if you do, how do you 15 modify that for the lower grades? 16 MR. BARRY: I think I missed that last part. What kind of training during lockdown? 17 18 COMMISSONER McCARTHY: Run Hide Fight as part of 19 your lockdown procedures, a response training for the 20 students and the staff that might be threatened directly 21 and appropriate reactions that they could take ranging from 22 running away to active engagement. 23 MR. BARRY: Well, what we do, you know, we are 24 required by law to have so many fire drills, tornado

drills, and then of course now we have evacuation drills.

Those aren't required by law yet but we practice those to the point where, you know, students are told, you know -- of course the young ones where we have elementary are going to be (unintelligible) hopefully by adults. But we do have a process, we have exercises and procedures where students are told where to go on the reunification site.

Now, the problem is if you've got teenagers, they're going to go in all different directions. I mean the reality is they're either going to try to get to their car and drive away or they're just going to run. And we've seen in circumstances when there have been real live shootings, you know, the traumatization of an individual, contrary to what they see on TV and movies, it was absolutely incredible to hear the reactions of students who in the theater that night to say the reality of something like this is so much different than what they saw on TV or in the movies.

So preparing them as much as we can, be specific obviously, to tell them where to go helps, but the reality is they're going to go all different places and we're going to just to our best we can to go through a process of accounting for every single one of our staff members and our students as quickly as we possibly can.

Of course, fire drills, we have procedures where they all assemble outside, the teacher has, you know,

they're assigned, I mean the kids know where to go, but in the event of something like a shooting you can expect people to just panic really and be able to go in all different directions. But we do give them process and procedures on where to go, but we also know the realities then can be different.

2.0

2.4

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Dr. Forrester?

COMMISSIONER FORRESTER: Superintendent, thank you. Just a very quick question.

I'm wondering if other cities in Colorado have similar plans as you do. Was this -- it's sort of a three-part question -- was this in response to Columbine as a statewide effort, and then finally who pays for this and how do you -- was there special funding put in place that has continued year after year?

MR. BARRY: No, this is not a statewide thing. This is something that I instituted when I first arrived here only because of my background. As a commander in multiple situations we had what we call air operation centers, the Army has their own, the Navy has their own. In the case of mine I just knew, you know, that I didn't want to be unprepared if we ever did, God forbid, have a Columbine. So we've been doing this for six years.

Money, I would say this is a rather cheap operation to run. The challenges to practicing and the

time and the man hours that go into the preparation as well as the execution of the training. I would say that we had the advantage of when I got here we had a bond that was passed. We actually used interest money on the bond so it really wasn't the taxpayer money. It cost about \$250,000 to renovate our conference room that, by the way, the superintendent used to be in the northwest side of the school district. When I came here, you know, we already had major buildings in the center of the school district, so I just moved my office to the center of the school district where 90 percent of our admin buildings are anyway. It was just an old tradition that the superintendent was in another place.

So when we did that we used some of that money to renovate our conference room. I really (audio skip) conference room. Of course it serves as the conference room for the superintendent, and even redesigned the office of the superintendent to be a break-out room the Incidence Response Team. So it was a deliberate planning element that we had an advantage on.

But I would tell you that what I've just described to you is not overwhelmingly expensive. Most school districts have telecoms and webinars, most of them have their ability to have connectivity with cameras in

2.0

their schools. If they don't have them for all the schools that might be an issue.

You know, the issues of having a GIS map or a Zonar put on buses, a lot of schools are already moving in that direction just for the security of the kids, not because of an incident like this. And then they all have their data systems for their pictures of their staff and they all have their data systems for pictures of students as well as contact information.

So the true challenge is just integrating them, practicing, establishing the processes and procedures and then being able to exercise them on a recurring basis.

COMMISSIONER FORRESTER: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Dr. Schonfeld?

COMMISSIONER SCHONFELD: Yeah, this is David Schonfeld. I just wanted to add for the commission's benefit, one of the reasons why I asked you to join us, because there have been a number of schools that I have responded to when there have been disasters and crises, but what's unusual I think is what he's describing in terms of his preparedness and response also was applied to the recovery phase. And that is extremely unusual.

So I spoke with him and was out there in less than 24 hours, and when I arrived we were immediately briefed with lists of all of the students that had been

mapped to the schools' victims, siblings, their names, geocoding, they knew -- and I've been in school districts that have dealt with major events and months later they're still talking about how they can screen to see who was This was within hours. And there was incomplete impacted. information initially but they kept building to it. And I think he probably didn't emphasize as much of what he's doing about the recovery, but he recruited a recovery coordinator from out of state who works full time on making sure that they have a continuing ongoing mental health response, and they're thinking through the mental health system for the whole school district so that it's not reactive and there's ongoing training, and there's real thoughts about groups and building relationships with community partners.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

So he has a background that's unique but he has applied it to a thoughtful and coordinated response that includes the recovery, which I think is quite unusual and might be a lesson that we can share with other people.

MR. BARRY: And that's what the superintendent meant to say.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: We just want to hear a final question from Representative Lyddy.

COMMISSIONER LYDDY: Thank you. Just two quick questions.

First, how do you handle staff turnover, substitute teachers and visitors in the school with regards to these drills and the preparedness of those individuals?

MR. BARRY: That's a great question. I mean we are a mobile society, and of course in any organization, whether it be in military or business and now in schools, people are going to turn over. So that's why we have these recurring training exercises every single year. The tabletops at every school, the district-wide tabletop and then the full-blown exercise that allows us to keep people current and trained.

Insofar as the children are concerned the effort is, again, there's normal processes that they go through for fire drills and tornado warnings and things like that. So now this is just added on top of it to be able to allow us to keep them well informed, even as young as elementary.

So we have emergency guidelines in our subpackets so we have checklists for each one of the persons sitting around our incident response team, and as I said, every time we have a -- we call them a hogwasher, lessons learned after every one of these exercises -- so we keep updating and modifying that. So even if you're cold in the sense of not being trained, you are able to be able to walk in and refer to the checklist.

1 Substitute teachers know that a lot of times when 2 they come to schools they don't know the process that 3 they're in, procedures of a particular school district, but 4 we have those guidelines that allow them to do it. Plus 5 they've got the help of people who have been there for a 6 while, we're (audio skip) on experienced individuals who 7 have gone through these training exercises to be able to make up for people who are confused and obviously may not 9 be familiar with the way we operate. 10 COMMISSIONER LYDDY: Great. Thank you very much. 11 Actually David Schonfeld answered my other question, so 12 thank you.

MR. BARRY: You're welcome.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: John and Francis, out of the view of our camera, thank you so much for giving your time today.

MR. BARRY: Let me give you a look at Francis here so you just see who this guy is who's done this great work.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Hello.

MR. PUMBAR: Good afternoon.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Thank you very much for contributing and giving us so many ideas. And we will look for the links to your website. We probably have them already and we'll be posting them on our online site so

that any viewers through our public television network can check out the links as well. We do appreciate your time today. Thank you.

MR. PUMBAR: Thank you.

MR. BARRY: Any further help with that, please don't hesitate to call on us. This is something we all have to share on in this, like I said, a reality of the world.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: We thank you so much.

MR. BARRY: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: For members of our commission, we'll take a lunch break and plan to start promptly at 1:30 when we go into a question and answer session, and then after our question and answer session we will be talking about commission logistics, future programming, the charge of the governor. So we will break now until 1:30.

(Recess.)

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: I'd like to call this afternoon session of the Governor's Sandy Hook Advisory Commission meeting to order.

We are continuing how with discussion, question and answer with Dr. Wong and Dr. Demaria. Thank you so much for experiencing life in our capitol today and being

available. And commission members, thank you for having held your questions before.

Do we have immediate questions or you may want to remind us about some of your topic areas so that we can provoke our questions?

DR. DEMARIA: Sure. One area that Marlene and I were mentioning that was up on my slide I didn't talk about was the gifts that are brought into a district, and it becomes a burden of gifts that come in, tickets to events, et cetera. And both found that that is very disruptive to the return to normalcy for the children, and it also causes a degree of competition for the gifts. So oftentimes — and we had this after 9/11, there are crates and crates of teddy bears and people giving tickets or, you know, opportunities to meet different celebrities.

And we find that it's a bad practice because what happens is it typically causes division rather than palliative reactions in the children. And what also happens is the -- it's sort of making a special celebrity of something where you want the children to resume normalcy, you want them to go back to their normal lives as best as they can, albeit it's a new normal.

So it's one thing that I would just caution any district dealing with a disaster to have a set policy

2.0

regarding where those gifts go and where those donations go because, again, it can become a burden.

2.0

2.5

Marlene, do you want to comment on that too?

DR. WONG: I think it's part of the recovery
environment that is so difficult is that there are special
roles that need to be played by people. When they say
outside, it doesn't mean outside the region or the town,
but someone outside the school who was not a direct witness
or a victim of the event itself who can provide guidance as
well as a barrier, kind of a buffer, if you will, between
the other recovery efforts, the mental health recovery
efforts, because there are other aspects such as gifts.

For instance, we know that for every large scale disaster starting from the hurricanes down in Florida, that the first thing a district has to do is open up a warehouse because the gifts will come. But also to begin to articulate a policy for how gifts will be dealt with from the very beginning so that -- because there will be outreach, people will approach the district with all sorts of things, and the policies have to be articulated in advance, otherwise it will be a source of increased conflict which -- and unnecessary suffering. I mean I know that sounds terrible, but those kinds of very generous offers from the outside can often became a part of the conflict that continues within the system itself.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Bob? Oh, go ahead. Bob, I
saw you --

2.5

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: No, that's all right.

COMMISSIONER BENTMAN: I have a few questions.

My first has to do with the balance between attention to resilience and attention to trauma, and we talk a lot about attending to the experience of the trauma, the overt symptoms of PTSD and the other sorts of manifestations in children and adults of having been a party to this.

And my question to you as experts at this is how do you balance the attention to folks that are not suffering so much, the overexposure to the, I don't know, to the focus on trauma in some ways restricts their return to normalcy and it limits their own strengths and resilience. So I'm really curious about how it is that you structure things to manage that.

DR. DEMARIA: It's an excellent question, and it really comes to the point that the dosing of trauma exposure will lead to resiliency. The overdosing of trauma exposure will lead to symptoms. It leads to it not being out of our life.

When we work, for example, with children who are grieving, grieving is different than depression. Grieving comes and goes and it's triggered and it will come up as a rush and you process it and then you're about to move on a

little bit but then it moves on. If there's a continuing exposure to the traumatic stimuli, and oftentimes post-disaster or post-violent episodes it's constantly there being reminded. What happens is the children have a chance to escape, they have a chance to have the adrenalin drop down and they don't develop the mastery, so to speak. So it's almost like an inoculation model. A little bit helps you gain mastery; too much can overwhelm.

And I think to your point it's well taken, not every child needs the same exposure, not every child necessarily needs to be protected. It really depends on who the child is, but we need to make sure that the children and their families, and the teachers also, who also get overexposed, have a chance to be away from it.

And I think it's how you structure both interventions, it's how you structure memorials, anniversaries, and we have to be very careful that one size doesn't fit all, and the same memorial that might be touching for 60 percent of the people might trigger 30 percent or 40 percent of the children too.

So how do you figure out what the child needs and how do you allow the child not to think about it, not to see it, not to talk about it. It could be very important and I think your question is really sensitive to the issue

of it's not always putting a child in the situation, it's sometimes letting them avoid the situation at times.

2.5

DR. WONG: I think this is where your regional experts come in, because it is a matter of monitoring just as you would any other -- from a public health perspective. You know they're at risk but not everyone is going to actually come down with whatever that condition is. So you're triaging, you're looking at how the children are reacting and you're looking at what groups you might need to target your interventions with. But I think that knowing about trauma, just information, especially with adults, is a very helpful thing so that they can also be your eyes and ears in terms of who might need the more targeted intervention.

DR. DEMARIA: Just one more piece of it. It's part of the timetable that often is not talked about and we certainly saw it after 9/11. There's post-traumatic exposure, post-traumatic stress, there's the building of resilience, but for some percentage of people there's post-traumatic growth, and certain people will get stronger after being exposed. It's the end result of the resiliency model, and there's been a number of different research studies talked about how a life-changing event, even if it's hard, can make people more aware of important things to them; family, community, spirituality. And certainly

from working with a lot of first responders I can tell you that one way they respond to adversity at times is they come home and they give their children a hug, you know, because it reconnects them to the fact that this is really what's important.

So as disorienting and as painful as traumatic events are, sometimes they alert us more to our own humanity and they make us better for the exposure, although that's obviously just one piece of it. But a good number of people report having had really life-changing moments and experiences after having gone through something very painful.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: Just to review, I saw Bob, Dennis, Ron, in terms of questions, and then we'll go on from there.

architects we spend a lot of time trying to understand the relationship of space and child development, and we know there are very, very formative special relationships that make children lean better or we think we make them learn better. But you notice every time there's been an event, a traumatic event, the school is closed, and someone decides to repaint it or hang signs on it. I don't know that that's really done very scientifically.

2.0

Is there any data, is there any study -- and part of our responsibility is to provide some codified recommendations that will lead people in the future so that if in the event there is an event and there is a recovery process, we can do something formative with the real estate that was the location where something happened. In part because you want to reconstitute it for the purpose for which it was made, but what I'm hearing is maybe it's sitting out there as sort of an ugly reminder and even if it isn't reconstituted as a school, please do something to it so it doesn't restimulate these very terrible feelings.

What kind of advice or information would you give us or would you suggest as a location where we could go so that we don't have this consistent reminder of, hey, this happened here and we, one, would prefer to use that space again for a wonderful event or experience, and two, if not that, so it doesn't reconstitute those feelings.

DR. WONG: I don't think there are any studies that address your specific question, but I can tell you that in most of the school shootings before there was a change in the environment, whether it was just painting everything, rearranging furniture, to the other extreme of rebuilding or remodeling, if you will, a whole section of the school, is that students and teachers refuse to go back. They just wouldn't go back in the building.

And it was so powerful, the physical reaction, that in order for the school to move forward they had to do something with that structure, whether it was the cafeteria at Thurston High School, you know, where the students gathered every morning before school started and they sat together and they socialized. I think it was like a rainy day or it was a period where it was -- of course in the Northwest it's always a rainy day -- but the shooter came in, Kip Kinkle, who was a student from that school, came in through the double doors in the back and he simply shot down 26 kids and killed 3 of them, and the kids wouldn't go back in the cafeteria again.

So they didn't tear it down but they did repaint. It was metal furniture; they repainted it. They made it smell different, they made it look different. They moved the furniture around and the kids came back in. So that's all I can tell you.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: I think what I'm hearing, and I'm going to turn it over to the other commission members, is whatever you can do to make it look like what it wasn't before.

DR. DEMARIA: Yeah, because you want, again, it's a question of dosing. I think it was brought up before.

You want the children to be able to choose when they want to face it and when they don't want to face it. But if

it's the same building, the same space, even if it's just tidied up a little bit, it still will trigger the same memories and the same associations. And for certain children going back and facing their fears is going to be helpful, but for some children it's going to just add to a re-experiencing. And for teachers and for first responders, et cetera, it just adds to the continued stimulation there, especially since very school has its unique personality. Every school has its unique setting, so the children will be able to identify it a lot more.

2.4

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: While we heard the

Commissioner of Education say it's always wonderful to have
swing space, it's a terrible thought to think about
legislating it. In every school district do you want to
identify another school so that in the event you have a
terrible experience you have another place to go? Because
what I'm hearing from a mental health perspective you are
going to reinvent the experience for an undetermined number
of people for an undetermined amount of time until a new
generation comes along, and that's really kind of a toxic
environment. That's what I'm hearing. And what we do
about it as architects may not be particularly effective.
Thank you very much.

DR. DEMARIA: Just one other piece to that too.

It's not just -- if you keep the same space where a tragedy

occurs, you do attract your interested community voyeurs who want to see the space, want to take their picture next to the space. We've seen some very difficult, difficult situations where victims or survivors will be at a space and people there will be posing for pictures. Certainly at Ground Zero we saw that for a while. It was a big tourist attraction. People would sit and take a picture next to a girder, you know, I would see it and I'd be surprised and I'd have to calm a few of my fellow first responders down a little bit.

But again, that happens also, so it becomes a tourist attraction, although you wouldn't think it is, but people still are attracted to things that are horrific and scare them. We think that it might be their way of somehow finding mastery to it or somehow attaching to it. But you do see that quality to sites where there has been mass tragedies and mass shootings. It sounds strange but you do see it oftentimes and you want to protect the children from that type of exposure also.

COMMISSIOER McCARTHY: I have a couple of questions, very different questions. The first is we have received testimony suggesting alternatives for fortifying our schools, making them safer. We've also heard concerns from educators about climate and environment. And so we're going to have to balance those two issues, and certainly I

think there is a psychology behind that, and I'm no psychologist, so I'm asking a question from quite a bit of ignorance, but what is your perspective and maybe some experience where school systems have done it well and where school systems have done it poorly and what the differences are?

And while I have the microphone, I'll just tell you my other question. The parents in Newtown are significantly involved in the whole gun debate, and your conversation this morning about retraumatization, I think immediately of them reliving the moment. At the Vice President's testimony or program yesterday they testified quite movingly. How do we support them? And I would imagine it's therapeutic for them; it's a mission that they are on quite responsibly to their families, to their lost children. How do we as a community support them and is there anything extraordinary that we need to do or do we assume that those support mechanisms are being delivered in Newtown by the appropriate agencies?

DR. DEMARIA: Just to talk to the first point, and it's a great question because there is the perception of safety and security and then there is safety and security in a building. And the question is whose perception are we gearing safety and security to; would it be the child or would it be the adult? Would it be the

parent or would it be someone from law enforcement or somebody who specializes in making sure that things are very safe?

And I think to your question, taking into consideration what the children perceive is safe and what the children feel is enough to make them feel secure I think is most important. And I think any school district where the children have been through a lot -- certainly Marlene can comment on this also -- it seems if the children's perceptions and what they feel to be safe is put as a priority, I think it's a better steering tool than sometimes having a lot of experts talk about it. really child perception, and a young child's perception of safety in my experience, and Marlene can comment, is often due to the safety provided by adults, not necessarily safety provided by space. It's when the adults are consistent, available, open and act in a way that lets them feel that they can always go to them for security. the primary factor.

Adolescence it may be different, but for children especially separation, being in a place where they're frightened and without an adult there who consistently can be available just in case anything happens I think is paramount. And if you want to comment on that?

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. WONG: I do. I think with respect to school safety your comment about balance is so important, because as I understand it the principal at that school was just exemplary in terms of what she had done to prepare the school to make it safe.

2.0

2.5

And so if we look at all hazards, the hazard in this particular situation was a very troubled young man and it behooves other members in the community to think about how to improve and prevent this kind of -- this kind of attack, if you will, that did not fit in with any other kind of school shooting.

And my understanding, and believe me, this is from 3,000 miles away, is that the school really did put into place many, many of the safety measures that at the national level was recommended.

So there are some things that are external to the school that involve the community, and here is where we need to do a better job everywhere because you can see that these incidents are occurring in many places, including at Aurora, and they're not being perpetrated by people inside the school. Now we have a new sort of phenomenon of the young disaffected sort of loner, bright but very troubled young man who perpetrates a mass shooting. And to me that -- I mean I don't know how much we want to focus -- I think we need to focus on school safety, but it has to be

balanced with the other, quote/unquote, threat that I think currently exists within our society.

2.0

2.5

DR. DEMARIA: Now, in terms of the second part of your question about the families who may feel very strong about a position in any topic, the loss of a child is one of the more intense grief experiences that anybody can experience. For those of you in the room or who are listening, you know that it's indescribable and certainly an experience we as parents and we as adults do not want to face the loss of our child for whatever reason.

That intense anguish sometimes needs focus and sometimes that means creating some type of legacy, and sometimes it means making the world a little bit different, and as a tribute to the person who died or was murdered in the situation.

So the question is is that outlet for them can help them go past very dark periods of the grief process which -- and traumatic grief, we know death by violent means is much more difficult to process, to get over. It takes a lot more time. So the companion fact of the death of a child plus the death of your child by violent means is a really difficult, difficult process. And I think anything that will give the people in mourning a sense of purpose, a sense of helping make this world better or undo some of the dangers in the world that led to this horrible

event I think is laudable in terms of what the families are doing, and I think we should provide them outlets and support them in whatever way they want to voice their opinions.

Marlene, you want to --

2.4

DR. WONG: Well, I want to go back to that first point again. You know the young man that shot Gabby Gifford, here's another example of it's a community issue because he was a young -- he was enrolled in the community college and he was a threat to fellow students and teachers. And they expelled him and they thought, wow, what a relief. And he went out and he still, you know, he shot a little 10-year-old girl and shot Gabby Gifford.

It's a community issue and it is not just about that one institution.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: We have Ron and then Alice.

COMMISSIONER CHIVINSKI: Hi, Marlene.

We had spoken briefly in the lunchroom and I thought it was important enough to bring it up here. You had mentioned in your presentation that there was interviews conducted with 70 of Newtown's dedicated staff. What insights can you give us from those interviews? Please elaborate.

DR. WONG: Well, I think that the first thing that struck me was that there was no -- I'm going to go

back to what Dr. Demaria as talking about -- there was no in-house incident commander and there was no external, sort of incident -- there's an in-house commander and an incident commander external to the school. And I think what happened was that it prolonged the period in which people were seeking some sort of, you know, knowledge about this overwhelming incident that challenges all of us who even have lots of experience with these kinds of situations.

And I think because of the -- I don't know, it's just something that really is important for all school districts around the country, not just in Connecticut, to have the opportunity to plan for, whether it's man-made or natural disasters, so that they are quickly able to shift over and make those important decisions that need to be made right away. Because the difference between a crisis, a crisis organization and one that is a part of everyday That's why the superintendent from life, it is top down. Aurora was so amazing. He's a two-star. And for good or for ill, there's a leader, that leader makes the decisions and it is not a time to talk about, you know, well, should we do this, should we -- to have a sort of a conversation. It is that someone who has some idea of what the road that needs to be traveled will be able to make those decisions

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

rather rapidly, and if they're not it causes lots of other suffering. It causes longer term suffering.

2.5

COMMISSIONER FORRESTER: Great. Thank you both for your presentation. It could have gone on all day I think in some ways, and we have a lot to learn from you.

I have just a couple of questions and I think I want to highlight your idea of around it's a community issue and, you know, what happened in the school, but also what happened in all the years of the shooter's life to be able to -- you know, that led up to what happened that day.

I think that one thing you mentioned a lot is the skills of a multi-agency team sort of -- you've been using the terms inside and outside, and I wonder if there's been written or protocols around team development, team conversation, the leadership of those teams because I just have to say that my experience is that leadership is really the most crucial thing. And we don't have a lot of two-star generals right now available for work I don't think. Maybe we do. But I think that it's very critical and I wonder if there's some guidance or manuals or trainings that you've done that you could share with us.

DR. DEMARIA: I think my position, and Marlene may differ or agree, I think it's really hard to bring people up to speed right away. And my experience has been that competent people bring in experience to the position

they're in. Certainly the superintendent of Aurora being in the military, and you can tell his thinking has been honed through incident after incident.

So I think it's a great idea to start to develop people within your system who have that capacity. It just -- tabletop experience is different than a real life experience, and I think to not have that person who has been exposed under fire, to suddenly expect a transition, that it's a really hard thing.

The good news is that there are two-star generals around the county, not figuratively. But I think there are people who can come in and can bring people in. And I think the best way for a district to learn how to manage and learn would be go to those people in other districts where they're not necessarily part of it but go through the process, see it, see what the responses are. So sort of an apprentice program in real life situations rather than try to train up people and get them ready for a disaster where a real disaster is very different. From people who are first responders you know that being in a real fire or being in a real fire fight is very different than a tabletop exercise or something you plan for.

So I think development is a long-term process, but I think actual real life practical experience is

2.0

important, and there are a number of good and available experts who can come in and provide that role.

DR. WONG: You know what I found in every situation is that there are natural leaders within the district and they emerge. And I think that the leadership can -- if they can trust that that person can be the head of this crisis and recovery period of time, that that works very well. And I think what happened with Dr. Schonfeld and the superintendent in Aurora was that he served that function for the superintendent. He was a natural leader. He was already there.

And I know that in Newtown, and everywhere, every district in Connecticut there are natural leaders. And it might not be the person that you think. It could be a teacher who has certain kinds of experiences whether it's in the military or whether they are just natural skills that that person has that would be an excellent leader.

I think it's a delegation of authority. It means trusting that this is the person that has my full support and that is the person who is going to lead us from this point on.

COMMISSIONER FORRESTER: I'm sorry. I just have one other part of the question or a little different. The leadership that happens after a terrible event like this, or the training and the staff development is very

important. I'm wondering, I feel very responsible for also the other children in other cities all over Connecticut, and certainly for us in New Haven who witness or experience traumatic grief, that happens to be the largest thing that brings kids to our agencies, exposure and traumatic loss.

How have you seen it influence change across the state? So it might have happened, something might have happened in Columbine, have you seen states really take on this and do training for all schools within the state or have you seen the change in New York maybe or in LA?

DR. WONG: That's a good example. I think you should start.

DR. DEMARIA: Oftentimes the attention that these events bring to light, unfortunately they're learning moments because we learn about how vulnerable we are. We also learn about how much we need to learn and know, so I think it can become the fulcrum to start to introduce a widespread curriculum change and a widespread education, so the potential ripple effect because the State of Connecticut and the country has deeply been moved by this. And as leaders in the process of this I think the country is looking on this commission for a guidance about how they should act in their own districts because this is such a touching event.

But I think after 9/11 what the event caused people to do is not only look at security issues but look at post-traumatic stress. I think that in schools right now it's identified better. I think there's more sensitivity and there's much more development of mental health professionals. So the spread of affect within New York City was obviously pretty large.

2.5

The problem is as you get further and further from the epicenter whether people are going to identify it as a need, and New York City is obviously an unusual place as is every city. And I think sometimes people will distance themselves from it because they don't want to make it seem like that could happen here. And I think that that's part of the challenge, is to get other cities to realize, yes, it could happen in our city, but use this momentum to try to bring about sweeping changes in terms of educating about grief, educating about trauma, educating about more support for teachers who have to deal with children who have been traumatized, which can be very draining.

DR. WONG: I'll talk a little bit about the research that my colleagues at Rand and UCLA and I have done since 1998 about urban violence because it's a different kind of violence. It's more repetitive violence; it's generational violence. Although the outcomes are

similar, they're not exactly the same. But what we found is that students who have been exposed to life-threatening violence before fifth grade have higher rates of expulsion, suspension, they tend to not graduate from high school, they have lower reading scores, et cetera, et cetera.

2.0

2.5

This is a hopefully one exposure to a horrific experience. As I said before, we don't know what the outcome of this situation is going to be and how these children are going to -- how their developmental trajectory will go. But, yeah, it behooves us all, and particularly those who deal with a lot in urban areas where there is a lot of violence to realize that if children do not do well, if they are not provided with intervention and they continue to be exposed to violence, that that seems to be one of the factors that has to do with school dropout and failure.

So the zip codes with the highest rates of crime, violence, gang activity are those same zip codes where the kids just don't finish school. You know, there's 50 percent, 60 percent dropout rate. We know that they will have short-term effects, but as one colleague said, risk factors are not predictive factors because of protective factors. And this community has so many protective factors, so many. I mean that's the hope that you have, is that you have, you know, family supports and this

commission and all the work, that's the excellent services.

There are lots and lots of protective factors in

Connecticut that don't exist in other places.

2.5

COMMISSIONER LYDDY: Thank you. Your presentation today was quite enlightening. In some areas it was like the ah-ha moment like, oh, of course, that makes a lot of sense, but why aren't we doing this now? And so we have kind of two processes moving forward; the recovery process and then the we just need to do better process, meaning we need to prevent things like this from happening again and we need to intervene earlier and we need to be able to identify, track and treat people for mental health.

And so, Dr. Wong, one of your recommendations was school-based mental health centers. I'm wondering if you can elaborate on what that would look at in terms of both the recovery effort but also earlier intervention, easy access to treatment services for youth, and maybe give some examples of where you see that being quite effective and where maybe it's not so effective.

DR. WONG: Well, I can talk about Los Angeles
Unified School District because it has had a mental health
service in the school uninterrupted since 1933. And it is
funded entirely by the school district, so all of us -- I
was a teachers union member for 20 years and I was an

administrators union member for 10 years, so it reflects both when I was in the schools working as staff and also when I became director of mental health.

2.4

2.5

So that was the commitment that the school district, Los Angeles -- and there is no other one in the country like that. Other places in the country have some sort of cooperative agreements in which the services that are provided in the schools are enhanced by co-location of community providers in the schools as well, and parents know that they will be able to access these services at the school level and the school provides a space as well as time for them to come in and to receive treatment.

I would say that the second is the most common of all, so you have some very fine social workers and counselors and psychologists in the school, but they're not working together. In fact, I even heard guild issues, you know, well, it should be just us or it should be just whatever. At all schools they need to come together, assess what the needs of the schools are and together as a unit think about here's what we have as resources, how will we deploy them or apply them to this particular school family, to this school community. That's what school mental health is about.

They also serve as members of the crisis team so that if something does happen often, I would say 80 percent

of those 2,500 to 3,000 incidents that occur per year in Los Angeles have to do with people coming from the outside imposing onto the school. There could be a gang shooting that comes onto a campus; a robbery that comes onto a campus; a car that runs into a school; a domestic issue that comes into the school. It disrupts, external events disrupt school more than any other, you know, more than the issues of school reform and sometimes I think that teachers get beat up because of other factors that have nothing to do with teaching and learning.

But this is entirely possible and it would mean though everybody looking at how they could configure their current services and how they're provided so that it can be unified and operate in an entirely different way.

DR. DEMARIA: Just one other thing to keep in mind. There was a fascinating study done years ago about children with mental health issues and what happens in schools. And they asked the children that identified as having an issue what did they do with that issue, and they said they typically would go up to one or two people in the school at maximum, and depending on their response to those people they would either seek or continue not to seek mental health services. The two people were a cafeteria worker and a janitor, and I think on the list was a

teacher. The school psychologist, school social worker was typically not listed on the priorities.

So rather than just training our support staff in a school, I think it behooves us to also remember that the primary I think school mental health people are the teachers even though that's now where they -- I'm not giving them another mandate in a job, but in the classroom they see the kids a lot more than a school psychologist. And when I worked in the schools as a school psychologist my best eyes were the teacher; has his behavior changed, what have you noticed lately, what's happening, there's parents coming in to meet. They're the eyes and ears because they can give you a degree about whether the child is veering from normalcy rather than me just going up to the child, are you feeling okay, and the answer is, what, What's been going on? Nothing. What's happening at fine. home? Everything is okay. I mean -- and that's kids. It's wonderful to be a child psychologist at times.

But again, teachers are the eyes and ears. And I think we need to teach, in addition to having in place school mental health, I really think we need to support teachers more, give them tools, and empower them also to feel that what they see and what they are observing are really invaluable to the school process.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: We have David followed by Patricia and Wayne. David?

2.4

COMMISSIONER SCHONFELD: I wanted to follow up to one of the comments that you made where you were asking about really systems to prepare schools to be better able to deal with these issues in terms of in training. So I actually -- after 9/11 I was living here, so worked the first weekend with a number of the people that were already here to do the first training on that weekend on how to get mental health workers in the state prepared to deal with 9/11. And that work continued through the mental health agency and DCF and evolved into the DBHRN unit that did respond to Newtown. And I think that that's an unusual success where a system was put into place and this training and services continued to be provided, and now we're talking about how to improve it, but most states actually I don't think have that.

I'm going to also say that for schools we participated in providing training through the RESC, the Regional Education Service Centers, after 9/11 on how to do school crisis response and that was offered in all of the RESCs. And the attendance was not a great deal and that didn't continue.

And so part of the issue that we need to think about is what recommendations can we make as a commission

because these windows open and then they close. And so we have an opportunity not to be reactive but to be thoughtful and to kind of talk about how we can set systems in place so that the training and the programs are put into place and they're sustained.

2.0

2.5

And so I don't know whether it's a question to the commissioners or whether it's a question to both of you about we have an opportunity now because the commission is being asked to make recommendations, and there aren't -- they don't, we don't usually get this opportunity where people say we're concerned about this issue, what recommendations can we put into place for the state.

So do you have any particular recommendations about how to set up systems or what those systems should include, or what the components are or whether the commissioners have some thoughts we can discuss later about how do you operationalize it for the State of Connecticut. Because we have a lot of good ideas of what to do and I think the hard work for us is going to be now how do we take those ideas and actually make them implemented.

DR. WONG: Well, I think it would be important not to recreate the wheel, and as I said earlier one of my primary recommendations was really to lobby -- I'm not supposed to use that word, lobby, right? Okay. Well, anyway, lobby the federal government to re-fund the REMs,

the Readiness Emergency Management grants, because they do pay for districts to initiate all of these activities that you talked about. The, you know, the trainings. It pays for the fire engine to come up and be part of the rescue, whatever training exercise. It covers all of that in the prevention, in intervention, in mitigation, in response and recovery to help create those teams. Because, you know, that's -- it's sort of two processes.

On the one hand there are things that need to be done right now, but on the other hand this longer term plan about preparation and prevention, that can be funded and has been funded and the training is in place. The curriculum is there, the trainers are there; it's ready to go.

The other program that needs to be -- I'm sorry, yeah, it needs to be re-funded is Cops in Schools. So if there are parents in fact that want to have armed people in the schools, it should be people who are law enforcement and are trained with guns. And the Cops in Schools program was funded by the Department of Justice. Again, three and a half days of training. It took law enforcement officers from the community who wanted to be in schools. Often it was men who were about to be retired or young officers who had children, they wanted to be in the schools. They knew

that they wanted to contribute something to the prevention of crime and prevention of juvenile delinquency.

2.0

2.5

But it's a three and a half day training on mental health, all the things that they don't get in the Police Academy. Well, maybe they get that -- I don't know if they get that in Police Academy. But mental health, diversity, child development, all of those issues, and they're already trained with weapons. So to me those are two big pieces that could be done right now and should -- and you know, this is something our country could definitely contribute, not only to Connecticut but to other places as well.

DR. DEMARIA: Just one thing to add. It's like when you make a recipe, it's always how much of what ingredient you put in, but someone has to have the recipe. There are a lot of important ingredients that are out there, it's just how do they get mixed together in a way that sustains a good training experience. And the wealth of information from organizations and experts around the country is there, it's just the orchestration of it. And I would say, David, that I would encourage somebody to be put in charge of that coordination. It should fall to somebody to make sure that all the pieces that are being done, all the trainings, all the efforts are coordinated, otherwise the meal never turns out the way it should.

And there's also competition among experts too.

You don't want that to happen because that would sour the whole product at the end too. So I think the resources are there but I would talk about a central coordination person or group that makes sure that everything is being seen in oversight.

DR. WONG: I think a comment I also want to make is how difficult this work is because what we know is, you know, when I hear people talk about schools or implementing programs, they think that it's very easy to do. And I think school districts are some of the most complex political organizations in the country. So that what existed previous to the crisis or disaster is very important to consider in terms of whether it was open, closed, and then the impact of trauma can also close a system or it can open a system. And I'm not making any comment about here or anywhere else, but it's just a dynamic that we all have to be aware of because it is not a simple process. It is a very difficult process.

CO-CHAIR EDELSTEIN: We have Patricia, Wayne, Denis, Kathy.

COMMISSIONER KEAVNEY-MARUCA: I heard Dr. Demaria earlier say, make a comment about we need to keep the teachers in the game. And it's not just in situations of crisis where the teachers are so important in assessing a

child's mental health status, you know, changes in their behavior and whatnot. But in this case it seems as though the teachers in Newtown are experiencing PTSD from being part of that school, and grieving. They've lost their principal, they've lost colleagues, they've lost children. So they're bombarded with these emotions that are, you know, according to your description of the reaction that the human body makes to these stressful situations, could be happening at different times, having different reactions to different things.

2.4

So I'm anxious to hear what you think we could do to support them, what kinds of structures should be in place, because if the child, if the parent, you know, the child wakes up and the parent is getting him ready for school and the child has a meltdown, the parent can easily say, you know, stay home today. We're going to take the day and we're going to do something distracting.

Teachers have a limited number of sick days.

They have a responsibility they feel to the rest of the class, and many times they'd probably just go into school rather than stay home and take care of themselves. So what kinds of -- what suggestions would you have to help with that?

DR. DEMARIA: I think your point is well taken.

I think a teacher following a traumatic event is both a

victim and a caregiver, and it's hard to be in both worlds and oftentimes teachers will neglect their own needs and sometimes put themselves into a position where they're not being available for their own family or for their own wellness. And it's a big risk because the other part of that is eventually the teacher, if they're impaired, will not be as effective in working with the kids; the kids will pick that up; they'll become symptomatic; they'll be harder to manage; the teacher will be more stressed, you know, and the cycle just gets out of control.

2.5

There's one model that Dr. Sandra Bloom had written about, the sanctuary model, and she did a very fascinating thing. She worked in state psychiatric systems and she found that over time you put anybody in a system working with traumatized individuals, they become traumatized themselves, and the traumatized person ends up ultimately becoming a person who traumatizes others.

So what happens is climates or organizations change and the sanctuary model, and I used it in my slide, is really about making sure that the environment that the teachers work in still maintains itself as a sanctuary for them also where it provides nurturance, where it provides chance for wellness, whether they're also attended to in terms of their needs because if they're out of the game then they can't be there for the kids. And your point is

well taken though; you can't just focus on what the kids need. You've got to work on who is the person, who is the immediate person that the children look to. For a child their teacher is up there in terms of a star athlete or movie star. That's who they interact with, so you've got to keep that person fresh.

2.5

But the strategy is to provide chances for wellness opportunities for the teacher to get emotional support, but also to make sure that the environment that the teacher works in is conducive for them feeling replenished, supported, nurtured also. So oftentimes the intervention is both at the teacher level but also in terms of the culture that exists in that building, and the opportunity for the teacher to give input into how to change the environment to make sure it's also a sanctuary for them also.

DR. WONG: I couldn't agree more, you know, and I think we -- what do teachers need to feel cared for in this environment.

COMMISSIONER SANDFORD: I think one thing that we've heard today, and I'm going to speak to the emergency response component and the idea of a special team. I think, Dr. Forrester, you had asked the question a few minutes ago. And I don't think we've really tagged it yet, but one thing we heard from the superintendent is

relationships, relationships, and relationships. And the fact that the four commissioners who sat here this morning I think today was evident that they had a much better relationship today and probably work together better now for all the citizens in the state than maybe they did before the Sandy Hook incident.

But I'd like to come back to your question and say that we have in the State of Connecticut an incident management team already in place, and it's run through by connected to the Connecticut Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security. Currently there are four teams in the state. There's five regions in the state, the state is broken down into emergency preparedness regions. Four of those regions have teams. The fifth team is working on forming it together.

I think the good news is that the teams are there. What we need to do is to bring more assets to that team. Right now the teams are made up of fire, law enforcement and emergency medical services because typically those are the ones that work together at the traditional incident that we think of. And these came about in Connecticut because of 9/11. They actually came about because of many, many fire departments sent firefighters to New York on 9/11 and when they came back we realized that we needed a system.

The system is very sophisticated. They have already identified in the state assembly points, where they're going to assemble before they respond to a particular incident. I believe the fire chief, Bill Halstead, in Sandy Hook actually activated a portion of the Connecticut regional incident management team that he needed. The regional -- the incident management teams do not take over an incident. They report to the incident and say to the incident commander, police, law enforcement, school official, it doesn't really matter in that unified command who is in charge, but when they need help this team arrives.

2.0

And we've talked about donations coming in, that's something that an incident management team could actually pick up and run for a community. There's many, many components that need to be brought in.

The good part of it is the training is all there. It's all been developed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA. They have the courses, they're available, they're run right here in the State of Connecticut within the region.

There's a downside. The courses are not three hours long. Some of the courses are 30, 40 hours long, and you need to take a course and be at a certain level in the system and then graduate to a higher level. You know, we

see these fires out West, they manage those fires in a similar way and you have to work your way up within a system. So it does take that time to develop that expertise. You don't become a two star overnight, you know, and run a large incident.

DR. DEMARIA: Just one thing just to add to what you're saying. There's an expression that the bride and groom shouldn't meet at the wedding.

COMMISSIONER SANDFORD: Right. Exactly.

DR. DEMARIA: And I think you don't have people who are going to be responding to a disaster together not work together before crisis.

COMMISSIONER SANDFORD: Yeah, you don't want to exchange business cards at the incident.

DR. DEMARIA: No. And I think your system seems like it's to that point, is people are working together before the incident, not at the incident. And there's a difference in that and if that's not happening, that's a better model to make sure --

COMMISSIONER SANDFORD: They are for fire and EMS and police. Where the hole is is that we need to bring the educational system into that. We need to bring the mental health system into the -- it's already there, the structure is there, the training is available, and we need to connect

those up. And I think Dr. Forrester might give us some guidance as to where we need to go.

COMMISSIONER FORRESTER: I'm sorry -- thank you. I also want to remind you of the clergy. You know, at the death notification teams it was a state trooper, a clinician and a clergy member, and I haven't heard much about yet around their secondary trauma, which I think has been extremely high. Many of them lost members of their church, young children in families in their church. So I think we have to keep that in mind.

I think that emergency response is -- and it's wonderful to hear we have that already. I think to add another layer around child development expertise and child response, you know, frankly DBHRN from what I saw as of December was primarily an adult response, even though perhaps it started as a child response. But we were called in as emergency mobile crisis teams from DCF but we had never been part of DBHRN before. Maybe there had been one or two representatives from DCF on the Hartford end, but in general there had been no practice runs from a child perspective.

And so here we have an example of really needed the additional layer of child expertise and family expertise.

DR. WONG: I just want to note that I was trained, I went to what I call FEMA camp a couple of times, and also taught there. So I'm well aware -- it's an excellent, excellent training. But REMs is patterned after that specifically for education, and it encourages reaching out to the community and joining forces, coming back to you and saying we want to be part of that team. And we have a parallel kind of training. It's not as in depth as for emergency responders, but it's kind of the education version of that program.

COMMISSIONER SANDFORD: We've had a number of schools in Connecticut apply for the REMs grant and very successfully received the funding. Unfortunately, in addition to adding the funding to the REMs program I'd like to see the program enhanced where the money that goes to a particular city can be used on a regional approach. Like the City of New Haven and I believe Stamford and a couple of other communities received the REMs grant. New Haven received about \$800,000 I believe. They hired some expertise, some experts to come in an write their plan for them which, you know, is -- it's difficult to do that, write a plan for somebody else.

They did a couple of exercises, the grant ended, and it's like, okay, we got it now. You know, I think that's one of the problems with REMs. It needs to allow

the integration into the incident management system; it needs to allow that. So maybe in addition to funding it it also needs some updating to allow, you know, to reach outside of the community.

DR. DEMARIA: Just one other point just to -related to what you're talking about. There's different
cultures in terms of professionals. The law enforcement
culture is different than fire culture; the mental health
culture is different than law enforcement culture. And I
think part of it, and I don't want to get into first
responders since I've worked with them now for a while
since 9/11, but I can tell you a lot of mental health
people don't understand first responder culture, and the
advantage of including them. And teachers also is a
different culture too. The advantage of including
different cultures together, you'll start to cross over to
each other in terms of understanding better their roles.
So when you're in a situation it's relationships, but it's
also understanding culture too.

I'm from an Italian/Irish background, I couldn't tell you there's two more different types of people in the world in terms of the way they celebrate events and do things. And I think it's the same thing with different cultures too. So it's not now do we outreach to a group,

it's how do we get to understand that group so we can talk their language, so to speak.

2.5

So collaborative ventures are excellent for forming relationships but also for cross fertilizing both areas in terms of really understanding each other, because their languaging is very different and I find that sometimes I have to translate between the groups and I think we need to do that before the disaster crisis happens.

COMMISSIONR McCARTHY: Yeah, the only thing that I would like to add is regarding incident management teams and some of the school readiness training. I think it would be helpful if we had a representative from the Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security, preferably the deputy commissioner or maybe the director of Emergency Management join us so that we can understand what the status of the programs are in the State of Connecticut and if they need to be invigorated or re-invigorated we can encourage them to do that and make that part of our recommendation with some input from them.

COMMISSIONER FLAHERTY: Just one very quick question. I know we heard earlier, I think it was from John, that some of these initiatives don't cost very much money or they might be things that school systems are doing already, but I'm wondering if either of you have any

recommendations in terms of things that you think are a bare minimum that school systems should be doing in these regards. Because I always sense that there might be some school districts that say, you know, this is another mandate or unfunded mandate that we're being told to do. So are there at least any minimum -- one, do you think there should be mandates or bare minimums that folks are required to do to make sure the kids stay safe. Thanks.

2.0

2.5

DR. WONG: Well, I guess in California there was a school safety legislation, so it did mandate several things, and I'm not familiar with safe school legislation here in Connecticut. But it did require every school to have a safe school plan, and it didn't cost money and it was incumbent upon the superintendent to bring together stakeholders to discuss what the risks were for school safety and to come up with an overall plan not just for the district but for each school. And that would include, you know, I think the template is there, you know, what kinds of -- it's sort of again an all hazards approach. It was sort of the predecessor to REMs and it was the idea that every school should have a safe school plan.

So what are they going to do about security and safety; who do they call upon; what are their resources.

Do they have an in-house school resource officer; have they reached out to the police department or a local law

enforcement agency; what do they do about communication with parents should they be a sudden event; where do the parents -- it really gets down into detail. Where do you pick up your kids, you know, and it's based on lessons learned from certain events like school shootings. Parents do not come to the front of the school; you block all of the emergency vehicles. Go to the rear of the school. And have a gate where there's a reunion gate.

But it gets very specific and there's lots and lots of templates on line. But also it goes through each of the phases, so there's response, who's going to be your responder, have you made contact with community agencies and federal agencies that can support you, and do you have a crisis team. And does that crisis team meet every quarter. Do they know the other person. That's a zero budget item, at least in my district it was zero budget because I never saw any money for it. But, you know, you could put together a crisis team and it helps people to work together in advance of an incident.

And it could be, I mean tragically, for instance, there are suicide attempts in school districts, there are suicide completions. There are all sorts of other kinds of unfortunate -- the rigors of daily living that occur and impact a school. Those are the kinds of things that crisis teams can address, and it demonstrates a caring about the

children and the teachers and the community that is a zero cost item.

2.0

DR. DEMARIA: Just one other suggestion to that is for the state to identify a program that they consider to be a center of excellence regarding the management of crisis and disasters and let that be a model for the other school districts for them to -- and I think there is a competition among school districts, and to know the center of excellence who has all these procedures worked out, who has all the processes done, who spent the money to bring in the consultants, and have that be the showcase for the state. You don't need to have every district start from ground zero themselves. They can all model somebody who has the plan down and have that one district then have some minimal funding to help other districts and share the wealth, so to speak.

So sometimes I know it's picking one of the children versus many, but sometimes that's not a bad thing because it can inspire the other districts to strive to get to that same level of expertise.

COMMISSIONER BENTMAN: A couple of questions.

The commissioners all talked about the impact of external folks in the disruption of a whole host of things, and so I wonder what you folks have to say about both the people who -- the national experts who come to offer help but really

are more intrusive than they are helpful despite their wishes, and the media. That's my first question.

2.5

DR. DEMARIA: Well, to put them in the same breath is really hard, but the national experts and the media, maybe I'll try the national experts first.

I view a school as a home, and you don't invite a stranger into your home unescorted, and if they are in the home typically they've been empowered not to be a stranger anymore. And I think the problem is that sometimes people will have access to the school, and we talked about school as a sanctuary, I think any time someone is in who is not identified, who is not with somebody who is familiar, it scares children and it disrupts the school functioning.

So I think that the use of outside people is not a bad thing but it has to be done in certain set ways. They have to be there on a regular basis; they have to be there at scheduled times; they have to be with somebody who can help make sure the students, if they see them, just let them know that they're with somebody they trust. And they can't just wander the building.

For example, if you have a consultant, it could be an expert on post-traumatic stress, walk through the building, if the children see a stranger that they don't recognize as part of the school staff, that's going to scare the kids. Unless in an assembly this person is

introduced, the person is brought around to the school and introduced as a member of the new school community. It's a way to really decrease a lot of that fear and anxiety. And I think it's a nice model.

2.5

So I think external people are invaluable resources for the school, but I think there's a way to bring them in in a good way. I've seen with schools in a way that just scares teachers, scares the students and creates a lot more disruption.

So I usually use the home model. It's a hospitality manual and you bring them around.

Media, I've had dealings with the media because we had all these 9/11 children for so many years, and I can tell you every anniversary I get the same phone call: Can we interview one of the kids. And my answer is always no. Well, can you give us a crying parent? No. And they said what can you give us? A boring psychologist talking about sensitivity to victims, and I would get the hang-up. But it was the same thing for as long as I ran the program.

So we need to I think protect, and I think we also need to be careful, and it was one of my points in the slides I didn't get to, we need to advise parents about the internet with their kids posting things, posting things on blogs, posting things on Facebook, because a lot of children will post things and it's not safe. You can pull

that. And a lot of reporters now are digging through websites and blogs to get information and quotes from victims also. So they're going at it different ways.

2.0

2.4

So educating parents that a child is vulnerable, their defenses are not there, they're open, and it's oftentimes children will regret what they say.

There was an interesting study that just came out recently. They found that children who are interviewed by the media do suffer more temporary adverse distress than children who don't get interviewed by the media. It doesn't mean necessarily those kids will develop post-traumatic stress disorder, but it tends to, and this is what this article -- I don't know if Marlene is familiar with it too, but the article talked about the fact that it does distress children, especially after a traumatic event.

And you'll always get the reporter hanging two blocks away from the school ready to interview a child, but parents need to be educated and I think we need to be more alert that there are -- and I'm not saying you should push the media away. Remember, we talked about windows of opportunity. We do have a time to teach the public about the issues that we're facing, but I still think we need to protect the children.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: I don't have a question,

I just want to support and compliment Commissioners

McCarthy and Sullivan. I think the notion of there being a well-structured incident management system here in Connecticut, I certainly take their word for it. And the notion of it becoming perhaps enlarged in its scope, the one thing I've heard consistently is we tend to, as law enforcement folks, look at our carbon fiber body as that which is most important as a first response. Whose leg is broken, whose eye is out, whose face is burned, who is shot.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But what I hear is that the process of mental healing, which is just another part of our carbon fiber being, is hurt simultaneously within the same second that our body is affected. And the notion that we respond with firemen, police and EMS to treat the broken bones and putout eyes and gunshot wounds maybe would be in a school environment supplemented well by a very close -- I won't say instantaneous because there are things law enforcement and fire department need to do in order to secure a scene and make it safe. But the notion of including and enhancing the team, as Dr. Schonfeld and yourself have said, to expand its intellectual resources to include people I'll call it in the public health or mental health sector, which is what I hear advocating, it just sounds like it makes all kinds of sense and I'd like to compliment the two commissioners for bringing the subject up.

And maybe more importantly, as Commissioner

McCarthy stated, we can all have great ideas, but the

people who run the program, if we don't get the right

people who manage that program and they don't hear who

managed that program and they don't hear the rationale

behind, we won't get that kind of support that we need

which is, hey, look it, fire, EMS, cops, they're there,

that's their job. Well, wait a minute, we've got something

else other than our carbon fiber body to worry about. We

have these little kids who are in a position, and teachers

and staff and the responders themselves who are potentially

affected.

So I think Commissioner Sullivan's idea is just a great coalescing of what I've heard you folks and others today advocate for, and I hear Commissioner McCarthy saying, without saying it directly, if we're going to make that happen we need the people here who manage that program to hear that, and hear that message as well.

So it's less a question and more, if you don't mind, sort of summary of a lot of things that I've heard today that I think make very good sense and I appreciate the forum and the opportunity to say it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHONFELD: This is more a comment and I'd appreciate everyone's response to it. I hear a lot of trying to figure out how we can do this without it

costing much money because it's an unfunded mandate and it will be expensive. And I was actually on a state commission here after 9/11 that was set up to talk about how to promote recovery for children after 9/11. And the comment was made, yes, we have to figure out how to work on school safety issues, and this is now more than a decade ago, and they said but we don't have the funding yet.

And so my comment was, well, in the middle of the meeting I said, well, to be quite honest my children are now in a public school here, and so I'm going to go home and protect them until you find the funds when it's time that you're going to make sure that they're safe because I don't really feel like leaving them there saying we're not yet ready.

And I will say now even though I've moved out of state and am visiting now, that I'm not sure that we've made a great deal of progress and if we keep waiting for the money it could be a very long time, the lifetimes of many of these children.

And so the concern that I have is that on the National Commission on Children and Disasters we talked about the fact that the Homeland Security money can be used for preparing schools. But they have to invite the schools, and mostly they do not. They retain the funds for their own internal resources, and that's something that the

Governor and others in leadership positions in the state could help to readjust. Because I started doing training with people in the State of Connecticut on school crisis back in 1991, but it was always voluntary. And invariably the people who would come didn't have the release time. It's hard for the school system to absorb the salaries of people to go for 30, 40 hours of training and ongoing meetings when they're pulling teachers out of -- with having to lay off teaching staff because they don't have the money for that and they're getting rid of the art teacher and the specials program.

So this does cost and I think we have to decide as a commission and then recommendations to the state about whether it's worth that cost, and then where the cost is going to come from. So I just -- I caution us a little because I think we are all used to doing this on a voluntary basis and offering our time, but that doesn't go to scale. And so there is expertise but the expertise is not broad enough because it's main -- I would like your opinion on it, but most of the people that do this work are doing it on a voluntary basis, and in light of full disclosure both Tom and Marlene are part of the National Center for School Crisis and Bereavement on the professional advisory board and they donate their time.

So the issue is it's very hard to sustain a national effort that will have maximal impact if it's on a voluntary basis. So I don't know if you have any comment to that or does that reflect your observations or are you seeing more funding going into this?

DR. WONG: No, I think it won't sustain. It definitely won't sustain the longer term effort that is needed here now. It just won't.

And there are invisible wounds. I really loved your statement, Bob, I thought that just put it all together very succinctly. But I think it also goes to show that our reporting lines are very still in silos because, you know, are there any mental health folks in terrorism, Homeland Security? I mean and what happened in LA, just because we have economies of size, is that they pulled me out of the mental health service and I reported to the chief operating officer along with the cops. So we had to work together every day, we were in the same meetings. We knew what was going on with them, we knew what the risks were, but they also would call us immediately and we'd work together on the ground in the schools.

So I think reporting lines are really important and it provides truly an integrated service. It pulls together that, you know, that mind and body dichotomy that

2.0

is evidenced in the way that our bureaucracies are organized.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Well, I think as a commission one of our responsibilities is to listen to your subject matter expertise and then to go through legislation or through the legislative body and make fundamental recommendations. And I think that there's always the issue of credibility and cost, and after working on the World Trade Center site for 12 years in a very distinct capacity, I got to a particular point which I can't impose on the commission because we all have our individual opportunities to voice our opinions. But I see the benefit of the commission in creating an adequate focus on this based on correctness, subject matter expertise, conscience and appropriateness. And one of the things I learned in the 20 years of working on counter-terrorism events, should it ever happen again, the notion of funding not being available, not an argument you want to make in court. is absolutely not a discussion.

And I know that one of my clients is looking at a 600 million dollar lawsuit as a result of that which fortunately was dismissed as a result of a law. But I think our responsibility, and I'm certainly not challenging you, David, I'm advocating exactly for the subject which we're talking about which is putting together a series of

very, very appropriate well-founded recommendations that make great sense, and then let, with all due respect, other people figure out how to fund it. I think that's one of the emphasis and one of the responsibilities that we as a group have. That's just my opinion.

COMMISSIONER CHIVINSKI: I think I've seen that somewhere before. A couple thoughts, and then a question.

I've heard for the second time now school is sanctuary, and a classroom is a sanctuary. It's a little bit of a different direction. I had meant to ask this question to Commissioner Pryor. I did manage to speak to him over on the side. But we're rapidly approaching the month of March here, okay? And a lot of times the classroom isn't a sanctuary or doesn't appear to be a sanctuary specifically when there is state mandated educational testing. It resembles more of a lockdown environment, okay? And that's just a fact. And that can be a very stressful thing.

Commissioner Pryor did state before the

Commission that one of the forms of local relief that's

been requested after much debate in Newtown was for

educational testing and that they were currently going

through -- check my notes -- a process to obtain them. And

one of the things I asked Commissioner Pryor was where is

that process. Because yesterday after the Western

Connecticut State University event attended by our senators from the state, Vice President Biden, Governor Malloy, a lot of teachers contacted me, both on the way back and then when I was at school trying to grade papers late into the afternoon. Because there's a lot of anxiety.

What Commissioner Pryor told me was that it's going to have to go through a legislative process, okay? And I bring that up because we're less than two weeks away from taking the test. So although I have no reason to believe that that's not going to happen, we're talking about 10 days. So if it does occur and there is testing in these situations where this has so greatly affected these communities, what can we expect to see as educational professionals?

DR. WONG: Based on other large scale situations, probably decreased scores.

DR. DEMARIA: Part of the biological ramification, and I don't want to get into biology, but what adrenalin does is it tends to take a lot of blood flow from the extremities and the head tends to be one of the extremities, and part of what it does is it pulls the blood back more to more of the primitive brain, but the frontal lobe where a lot of decision-making, planning, logical -- which is really important for school -- usually doesn't get fed. So highly stressed kids and adults just don't think

very well. Their brain is not being sufficiently nourished because the blood flow is just not there. It tends to be, you know, in more primitive basic survival modes a little bit.

2.5

And there has been studies of glucose, glucocorticoid levels in the brain and academic performance, and it's been shown. So you would argue that if the children are still in a state of stress because there's no sanctuary for the school and there's no safety and the children are not brought down, and I think even if it was there it's still going to take a while for those adrenalin levels to get down in the system. You would argue that from a biological basis purely, their brains are not functioning the way they should function. And I think we all remember that, going back to the events of 9/11 I tried to balance a checkbook three weeks after and I couldn't add, you know, you don't add numbers. Your brain just doesn't work that way.

So these kids are awash in this and their families are and their community is. And that's what's so unique about this tragedy is we're all or everybody surrounding it is awash in stress and adrenalin. So both the teachers who've been victimized too and the children, their cortical functioning is not going to be the same.

It's just the way it is. So you can expect, as Marlene is

saying, that academic performance, especially higher order stuff, would probably be not as well.

COMMISSIONER LYDDY: As Commissioner Rehmer stated, their office was flooded with best practices and experts and people who really wanted to contribute to helping Newtown and the state recover.

Now, there's no process in place to vet those proposals or truly understand where those proposals are coming from or what the validity of them are, of those proposals are. So do you have any ideas to what best practices to vet, best practices would be for a state?

DR. WONG: I want to say that Connecticut did not get the benefit of the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools at the U.S. Department of Education. And there was one undersecretary who has been the primary resource to all schools since Oklahoma City. What happened was that that office was cut and all the people who had the depth of experience and information who would have in other situations stepped in and provided you with that kind of guidance are gone. They've gone to other agencies. And the head of that department retired.

So this situation also reflected that delay in being able to have that individual and his staff be here on the ground, knew all the guys in justice, knew all the educational folks, knew all the school safety officers

across the country, would have been able to help you to sort through and guide you on this -- to guide you and navigate this amazingly complex situation. Because people come out of the woodwork and -- I mean in Oklahoma City somebody came and said, oh, what we recommend is that we get all of the kids out of the school and we'll throw rocks at this wall so that they can express their anger. There were people who wanted to give massages to all the children. I mean people come out of the woodwork and school districts deserve more. They do. And it's just that this happened, it got defunded, it go all the people dispersed to other agencies, they're not together anymore. And I think that you suffered from it.

2.4

COMMISSIONER LYDDY: Thank you for I think your candid response. This is, being from Newtown, absolutely horrendous that we wouldn't have that opportunity to in the state, quite honestly, have an opportunity to fully vet what's happening and where we should be going and, you know, we're shooting from the hip here.

DR. WONG: I also want to say that there are good people there who really want to help you and they're just waiting to help you, but they don't have the same depth of experience as the person who was there before.

COMMISSIONER LYDDY: Sure. Okay.

DR. WONG: I mean 30 years of experience really.

COMMISSIONER LYDDY: Thank you.

DR. DEMARIA: One other alternative would be, albeit this resource was a valuable one, is to form a committee of people who are not related to the people offering services, people who are knowledgeable in the different professional disciplines, people who are knowledgeable in the proposals that are coming in and help advise the district or the state about which proposals seem to be more viable, but it has to be almost an independent committee of people not vested. It's an ad hoc, and it's a way to bring in some experts, but obviously it's not the same as having an established program.

COMMISSIONER LYDDY: Great. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER BENTMAN: This is a question around your expertise with children and trauma. There have been a lot of conversations about the inclusion of security drills and the involvement in not only of the establishment of integrated groups to kind of guide this. The superintendent of schools from Aurora would be an example.

I'm curious about your sense of the impact on children of various ages, both grade school, middle school and high school ages in terms of their -- not participation as actors, but participation in certain kinds of drills in relation to preparation for events, some of which may be

quite rare, and what the impact of that preparation is in terms of scaring them rather than keeping them safe.

2.0

DR. WONG: I think that there are drills that can be instituted that don't go straight to the school shooter scenario, but that build children's skills that don't frighten them, but they need to understand that they must attend to what the teacher is saying to them. And I think that is really for most situations the thing that is most problematic. And what does it mean to have a lockdown?

Now, you don't have to have an active shooter outside, but what is a lockdown?

And you know, I think that that color-coded system, I mean that's one way to approach it, but when the teacher -- for instance, in elementary school, just the teacher saying, well, this time we're going to do this. There are different kinds of drills, and we're going to do the fire drill first and then maybe we'll do one where we have to say in the classroom, and maybe one where you have to lock the door, you know, but here's we're going to do all of these different things so that the skills are built one upon the other without going directly to the school shooter.

I've seen this happen in Japan. I was a consultant for Kobe and the Hyogo (phonetic) Teachers Union, and they did that very gradually after the Kobe

earthquake and did it very well without scaring the children. But they did have a very frank discussion with them and I was there when -- I was quite actually taken -- I was shocked and surprised and learned a lot when during one of the drills which they had on a regular basis, you know, the kids walked in and they lined up in as straight a line as I've ever seen, and they put their heads down. And then they sat up and then he principal said, you know, thank you for doing this. This is a very important thing. You must take actions that will preserve your life. And one of the things that will preserve your life is listening to your teacher.

2.0

I mean they were just straight out honest. I don't know that I've ever heard anybody say that to an American child. Certainly not to my children.

And that's the problem with lockdowns. We had a lockdown once where there was an active shooter, it was a gang guy that was running through the school. And clearly this one school did not practice what a lockdown was and what it meant to the kids because in the middle in all of this here comes Pizza Hut and some guy saying who ordered the pepperoni pizza, because some kid on a cell phone got hungry and decided to order a pepperoni pizza. It was just astounding. So, you know, now we have the poor guy who puts his life in jeopardy.

But what is a lockdown? To preserve your own life. What does that mean? It doesn't have to be a scary thing, but it has to be a serious thing. Listen to your teacher.

2.4

DR. DEMARIA: In terms of recovery from posttraumatic disorder, I think giving children the belief that
there is more mastery skills that they attain to feel safe,
and giving their safety to them as something they can
control, giving them some sense of that, can be very
empowering for kids. Don't forget, they're vulnerable to
being victimized and that's a scary feeling and the adults
around them couldn't protect them, and that's another scary
thing.

So number one is having a drill will show that the adults can partner with them to be safe, but they can assume some responsibility to make themselves feel safe also in the future.

So you find with victims when they can do things, for example, a rape victim taking a karate class, you know, it's not that that would have prevented -- could have prevented, but it gives them a skill or something to give them the sense that they could do something to protect themselves.

But number two, something to keep in mind, who is doing the drill, you know, and are the people doing the

drills people who are sensitive to where those kids may be and are sensitive to what those kids are going through.

And there's a fine line between a drill that's helpful and a drill that's going to be laughed at by the students. So it's also seeing what the children feel ready for, and that's obviously taking a pulse of what the teachers and the students are ready for. So the drill has to have a little bit of urgency to it but not enough where the children feel overwhelmed.

And I think since it's been so soon after this traumatic event has happened, I think the children would be a little bit hypervigilant, hyperactive for any strong drills. It might be a soft drill, a little bit more distant as Marlene is suggesting. But again giving children mastery in ways for them to take part in their own safety is a good thing, and the same thing for teachers. So I don't think that's a bad thing; it's just a question of the sensitivity about what they're ready to be facing.

Thank you. I'd like to thank my two doctorate students who came here, Dr. Conti, just (inaudible), she's over there. And Nicole Nydell is still one of my students studying with me. So they came along to support. And I want to thank -- I told them I wouldn't embarrass them.

Thank you very much. I'm proud of them too.

(Dr. Wong and Dr. Demaria exit the room.)

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think at this point I'm going to ask Michael (audio fades). And we have some housekeeping after we get through with this.

2.0

2.5

MS. WAGNER: So most of you I haven't got a chance to speak with yet, but my name is Natalie Wagner and I'm deputy legal counsel to the Governor and I also help staff the commission. So to the extent that I can be helpful to you, just let me know.

MICHAEL: So we don't really have to play a role in this conversation. This is mostly amongst you all, but we wanted to start blocking time in the agendas to allow you to have a conversation, talk a little bit about the substance of what you've been hearing, and give you a chance to discuss meetings going forward.

A few of the thoughts that we think are important for everybody to keep in mind is obviously that March 15th date and to make sure that the conversation focuses on how you fit the substance into the report, and also a conversation about the upcoming meetings and what items that you would like to see in these upcoming meetings.

So, I mean with that regard we can answer any questions you want. Obviously you've received from us the letter from the governor from yesterday and the information that was accompanying that, so hopefully if you have any questions in the future we can certainly answer them then

after you have some time to let it sink in and read through it more. I know that you got it with everybody else, so I want to make sure of that and answer any other questions on process that we can.

2.0

2.4

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Thanks for coming. Is it possible to have a representative from Homeland Security attend and testify relevant to some of the discussions that we had today regarding planning, and they will affect some of the recommendation so we're not recommending something that they already have in place and/or could modify to meet some of our goals.

MICHAEL: The State Division of Emergency
Management? Yes, we could find that.

COMMISSIONER LYDDY: Michael, the Governor's letter yesterday was very, very upfront, but it also took some preventative measures in terms of making sure something like this doesn't happen again, and a lot of our focus so far has been on kind of the recovery piece and kind of how to address a tragedy. So I'm wondering as a commission is our charge to look at both preventative measures and kind of the recovery, or is it just recovery with this other kind of gun piece to it? I'm just a little confused.

MICHAEL: I would leave that to Mayor Jackson as chair.

COMMISSIONER LYDDY: Okay.

2.4

MICHAEL: I mean we're just here to help with the supporting of it. We don't want to drive the agenda or any conversation. So Mayor Jackson could certainly take that on and I know Bernie can also help with that as well.

COMMISIONER FLAHERTY: The question, the biggest question I have is in terms of the FOIA. I know I keep harassing kind of with the emails in terms of what discussions we have that are open, like is this even being filmed now, or is the camera off? You know, if emails go to just some people on the commission, are those open to discovery, and I'm hoping maybe you can answer that question. That would be great.

MS. WAGNER: Yes. So for some of you who are less familiar with participating on a public agency, I mean as a commission charged by the governor you are essentially a public agency for purposes of Freedom of Information. So any emails that you send to one another having to do with the business of the commission are subject to a Freedom of Information request.

You are being taped by CTN right now. I don't -to my knowledge it is not on CTN at the moment, but it is
available to people.

Any discussions that you have over email as an entire group, to the extent that they diverge from just

setting the agenda, it does constitute a meeting. So you should try to steer away from having substantive discussions as a full group over email because there are requirements in Freedom of Information that meetings are noticed to the public so the public can have a chance to witness the discussion. So any discussions that you have as a group over email that are substantive in nature are essentially a meeting that has taken place without notice to the public. So you should try to keep your commission-wide discussions of substance to the meetings.

Yes.

2.0

2.4

COMMISSIONER SCHONFELD: Just a comment, having served on the national commission, I understand the Freedom of Information Act, but I don't think it requires that it be videotaped. So it would be possible for us to set up a time for us to talk as a group here without it being videotaped where it may be open, although I do remember our commission meeting for periods where it was not open to the general public, but I would think at the very least, at the very least like this meeting, if it wasn't being taped I think we could talk about and have a fruitful discussion and not feel that it's -- that the public attention is intrusive, but it would still be open.

So I think the idea is that it has to be open but I don't know that it has to broadcast.

MS. WAGNER: Yes, that's correct. So the CTN cameras are pretty much here because we are in the Legislative Office Building and they're available to us, and as a resource to the commission and to members of the public it's being recorded so that, you know, you can go back to it, so the members of the public can go back to the meetings. But certainly there is no requirement that they be recorded.

However, it is different than federal commissions where we can't deny access to the public. So to the extent that the media or the public wants to come in and record, that's different than us, you know, requesting that something be recorded.

COMMISSIONER SCHONFELD: I would imagine that they can come in and observe. I don't know that they have the right to come in and record. Is there -- I'm asking for the clarification.

MS. WAGNER: Well, I honestly don't know the response to that. I can certainly look into it, but I doubt that there would be anything that -- you know, except to the extent that -- I don't want to speculate about it, but I think that to the extent that media is welcome to come or we are required to allow the media to come, I doubt that we could bar the media from recording. But I can

certainly look into that and let the commission know more about that at future meetings.

COMMISSIONER SCHONFELD: Again, I think if we indicated to the media and to the general public that we have four hours or five hours of testimony and then there's one hour that's open to the public but it's to cover the general business of the commission, I don't know what we would -- I don't expect that there would be a lot of media wanting to come in during that one hour.

A COMMISSIONER: I sympathize with you, but there are media who just because you said that would want to come in.

COMMISSIONER SCHONFELD: Well, but again -A COMMISSIONER: Believe me, that's how they
operate.

MS. WAGNER: Yeah, to that point or really more to your point, Connecticut's Freedom of Information laws are broader than most any other state. So there is very little that a public entity can or should or, you know, depending on how you feel about the issue, do in executive session. It's very limited and I am happy to send out the areas that can be discussed in executive session. They mostly have to do with personnel, hiring of personnel, things like that. So I'm not sure that any of them relate to the business of this commission.

So to that end, most discussion, if not all discussion of the commission, is available to the public.

2.4

2.5

COMMISSIONER CHIVINSKI: Two questions. Did I hear that if I sent out, let's say, an individual email to a commission member, so let's say Alice or Dave here, that that is FOI-able as well?

MS. WAGNER: To the extent that it relates to the business of the commission, yes.

COMMISSIONER CHIVINSKI: Okay. And the second question, we were asked at the last meeting by our chair, Scott Jackson, to forward recommendations. You know, hitting the reply button versus the reply all, I'm hearing that it's FOI-able either way. Is there a preferred way to funnel those requests? I mean, I could copy it at home and hand in an envelope or I could hit reply all or I could just hit the reply. Is there a preference about how that information is funneled before we all look around in a room like this and say yea or nay to any particular recommendation? I know you don't want us -- we shouldn't be talking about them and have enraging conversations, but what's the process?

MS. WAGNER: You mean in terms of setting an agenda?

COMMISSIONER CHIVINSKI: No. In terms of we were asked for recommendations by the chair, preliminary

1 recommendations on an individual level, how we provide 2 them. 3 MS. WAGNER: I would just recommend that you ask 4 the chair, ask Mayor Jackson what he would prefer. 5 COMMISSIONER CHIVINSKI: Okay. 6 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: (Audio not picking up voice.) 7 MICHAEL: (Inaudible) you'd have to ask Mayor 8 Jackson. 9 CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Okay. The mayor is not here today, but I understand on the 8th we're going to have a 10 section on emergency management, on the 15th we're supposed 11 12 to be discussing the draft with the governor for our

email and see if he and Terry and I can get together

(inaudible) so we can get something out by the 15th (audio
skip) what, around the 20th or something.

preliminary recommendations. I'm going to (inaudible) and

A COMMISSIONER: I assume the recommendations will be only on things we've discussed.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BERNIE: Yeah. Oh, I don't think we're limited to that. I think if there's a consensus that we should recommend something that hasn't been discussed, but I think we're going to have to look for consensus on any recommendations we're making. But I don't think we're limited. I think if somebody has an idea that the rest of say, you know, we didn't think of that but, boy, that's a

good idea, we should recommend that, I don't see we're precluded from doing that.

2.0

A COMMISSIONER: I'm trying to -- I'm trying to interpret your response. It seems so carefully crafted there -- I'm teasing, I'm teasing, Bernie.

Because how can we recommend it if we haven't discussed it.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: All I'm suggesting is that if some unknown idea is floating in somebody's mind here that we have not yet discussed and they bring it up in a meeting and somebody says, you know, we ought to throw that in, I don't think we would not throw it in if there was a consensus from all of us -- well, not all, but a consensus that it's a good idea to put in the report.

COMMISSIONER FLAHERTY: I think the biggest problem is we have not had time because we don't have sufficient time to have a discussion and figure out if we have consensus on things. And I think part of the problem is, and I don't know if this is something you and Terry want to discuss if you're going to have discussion with Scott, but maybe we try to have that the first hour (audio fade). If we had discussion for an hour in the morning before we get started instead of the afternoon, because sometimes people have to leave during the course of the day.

And the other question I have (audio fade), the Virginia Tech panel had their own independent counsel and we able to meet with their lawyer. I mean I don't even know -- and I'm assuming there was significantly different (audio fade). I don't know. Is there a possibility we could get our own independent counsel (inaudible). Are you allowed to meet outside the building with counsel to think about whether we cannot meet at all outside the building, so potential things that we're not sure we're going to recommend so that we can figure out what the consensus (inaudible).

MS. WAGNER: I can't speak to Virginia Freedom of Information laws.

COMMISSIONER FLAHERTY: And I don't expect you to give advice on that. I'll make it clear. I don't expect you to give advice on Virginia law because I'm not admitted to the Virginia bar either.

MS. WAGNER: Sure. And I would have to look into -- I have been in touch with some individuals that were involved in the Columbine commission, but not anyone who was in touch with the Virginia Tech commission yet. And I was aware though just by looking at their report that they had, you know, I think a dozen lawyers at some point from Skadden Arps, the second largest law firm in the world, that were assisting them. And they had a very short

timetable that they turned around a report. And I think that's something for us to talk to them about. What was it that the legal counsel did for them in their process; whether they were providing legal advice or whether they were just assisting them in developing their report. And to what extent Virginia Freedom of Information laws played a role in that I don't know, but certainly that's something that I can look into for you. Okay?

MICHAEL: Just to say, because we're going to excuse ourselves. We don't want to be -- this is your discussion to have. We were just here for the initial technical questions, I mean Mayor Jackson with Bernie and Terry, we want to defer everything on questions to them. I just wanted to make sure that Natalie had a chance to talk about any of those questions you had. And we're certainly available any time, if you have any questions you can ask us then. But not being part of this commission we don't want to take on this part of the discussion, we want to allow you as the commissioners to do that.

COMMISSIONE BENTMAN: I have a framework question. After the 15th do you anticipate that we will continue to be meeting, and if we will, will our charge be different? How often will we be meeting; what will be the duration of those meetings, and even -- I don't know would be more helpful than a kind of a -- we're living in a kind

of a blank space and even I don't know but we're considering the following would be more helpful than the blank space that I feel that we're currently living in.

2.0

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we should be prepared on continuing. I think we've gotten into such a depth of things here that there will be definitely a reason for the commission to continue its work, because while we may make some preliminary suggestions to the governor, I think there's a lot of stuff that we've had here that we haven't even had time to truly absorb and ask the ideas how to approach it. So I would expect we're going to keep in place.

I asked Terry to get a hold of Scott -- he's out of state -- to see if the three of us could get together this week to deal with this issue of when could we start discussing things. I'll be very candid with you. I spent 35 years in public service in the State of Connecticut, FOI is what it is, it's not going to change, so we're going to have to have those discussions in the open. There's just no way around it. Because even with your lawyer -- I'm not an attorney --

COMMISSIONER BENTMAN: That's helpful.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I'm not an attorney but I know that I can't even meet with my lawyer without certain kind of reasons, and we don't want to invent reasons here

that don't exist. So I would look forward to this as a public body, we're going to be in the public. If you have thin skin, be prepared, because we're going to have discussions where somebody may get their feelings hurt.

We're all here for the same reason, we all want to do good things, and we'll just get through this. And I think everybody has something to contribute. We all come from different disciplines and if we respect that, we'll be fine. But you're not going to get away from FOI.

2.5

COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: As the subject matter experts testified today, they have never done this before in the circumstances that they were placed in, and we find ourselves in that same environment. And it's certainly I consider a no fault environment, we're struggling with some very difficult issues that have not been tread on before, certainly not in the State of Connecticut.

I would ask when you and Scott -
CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Pull your mic up -
COMMISSIONER McCARTHY: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.

Maybe I should talk into it? See, that's exactly why I don't want to be on TV.

When the three of you get together I would ask that you consider removing the -- when we get to a work session, and I hope that we do get to a work session that we can spend the better part of a day in public but in an

environment that's more conducive to discussion. This may be great for a legislative action, but as a committee and when we get to a work session and we're talking about it, I think it would be very beneficial to be at a conference room table to discuss. And it's an environment I think that we're all a little bit more comfortable with and I think it would lead to a better discussion. Thank you.

A COMMISSIONER: (Audio fade.)

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And maybe even if necessary add a couple of days to our schedule before March 15 so we can have -- just set aside for those type of things.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Yeah, I'd like to second Commissioner McCarthy's suggestion. I just have a general thought, you know, for all of us. And I suppose there always is public exposure, but the exposure I think we run which is a greater risk is recommendations that come from individuals, because then they represent a person's view. And it's better to have a great deal of creative contention

A COMMISSIONER: Oh, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: And, you know, bore into all the different subject matter expertise that's on the council. And if that creative contention is public but out of that comes the consensus developed solution, while there may be some sense of embarrassment as a result of

commissioners arguing amongst each other, although we might call it something else, at the end of the day what that shows is an extraordinary commitment, answers that are agnostic and free of ego, and I think that's the commission's responsibility.

2.5

So I love the idea of meeting in an environment that's a little more conducive to that kind of discussion format, but the notion of a creatively contentious discussion that leads to a series of, you know, mature recommendations I think is really what's being expected of us.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Yeah. And I will also ask that -- well, I could email, but maybe for the next meeting if you are looking for any particular presenters to be invited or any particular subject matter, maybe just put that in a little note that we can give to the chairman at the next meeting, and then we don't have to worry about sending it around in email because there may be people you think of that would be beneficial to us to hear from.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: One last thought. I'm on my own sort of taking on a little bit of responsibility by codifying anything that has to do with a safe and secure school design. If there's something that any one of you think about I'm sort of data mining the FEMA requests.

I've got Mr. Mahoney's information. I've gone through and

I'm going through the AIA presentations, and obviously my questions to some of the other subject matter experts are very focused on the environment of schools and what makes a great school ecosystem. I'm staying away from specifically opining on the expertise of the emergency responders or the public health or the mental health professionals.

If you have something that you've heard, if you have an opinion about what makes a great safe school place, that can be a two dimensional space that isn't enclosed, like more buses drop people off, or an environment, feel free to pass it on to the commission chair, but if you copy me on it I'm creating a master list in anticipation that the discussion we talked about, which is that creative contention in an appropriate environment, I'm going to try to as a scribe service keep track of those and throw them out and say here are the 44 recommendations I've heard about creating great safe schools. I'm happy to do that. I can do it more successfully if those of you who created — at least make sure I'm copied on that email.

This is just sort of an housekeeping issue. I'm happy to do that; I'm excited about doing it. I don't expect that everything that everybody sends to me is going to be codified in some sort of a recommendation that we all agree to, but that's the process I'm starting in order to

make that happen. Unless someone has an objection to it on the commission.

COMMISSIONER BENTMAN: I think a safe school culture is a day in itself, and safe school culture as it integrates with some of the other topics that come up. I don't know that -- I mean I have opinions about that, but I think it really deserves the same kind of expertise that we've seen here before.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: That's fine. I'm simply offering unless there is an objection, if someone says I think we ought to lock doors on classrooms, I write that down. If someone says I think video surveillance would help situational awareness for emergency responders, I write that down. If someone says every school should have a threat assessment done which is achieved by qualified multi-disciplined professionals, I write that done.

Unless anyone has an objection, I'll take on that position and I'll perform that service.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: No, that's good. That's appreciated, and we have thoughts, we can give them to you, but if you're willing to do that that will save us trying to make up 28 individual lists.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Well, I think others may inherit the model of doing that for issues relative to safe school culture and mental health; others may do it for

emergency response and emergency management, but I think, you know, I sort of did this terrible exercise -- I'm going to get crucified for this, I sort of color-coded people by discipline on the committee, so some of you are yellow, orange, green and blue. And I won't tell you what that means, I will say --

2.5

A COMMISSIONER: (Inaudible) to be red.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I assure you whatever it means it will not be the worst thing I've been called in my life.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: I'm going to just give you an insight as an example. Commissioner O'Connor, McCarthy and Sullivan ended up -- and Sandford ended up to be blue because they're in the emergency response and law enforcement community and have focused their efforts there. Well, I can change that.

A COMMISSIONER: Glad you didn't color me yellow.

COMMISISONER DUCIBELLA: But my sense is that these different disciplines have a handle on expertise that needs to be cross-pollinated with the intellectual expertise of others so that the eventual recommendations are in fact the benefit of a lot of different intellectual insights. But I have a sense as we move forward toward a document deliverable, that those various entities or areas of expertise are going to have to be codified somehow to

turn into some kind of a deliverable that has some kind of meaning that can turn into something that can go to the governor. So I'm just offering up my service on my one-fourth piece in that one particular colored area.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Very good.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHONFELD: Just a couple of suggestions for people to consider. The first is from having been on commissions, and on the National Commission on Children disasters in particular because it was a similar topic area. It is a vast topic area. So I really think that we should be spending some up-front time talking about what it is we hope to accomplish and what are the topics.

So even while I was putting this session together, I made the -- and it was a unilateral decision with Chris' involvement, but not with the whole commission that maybe another session would be on mental health issues more broadly in the community because I didn't think we could do the school at the same time and get this depth of discussion.

I don't actually have the authority to say that

-- and I don't even know the timeframe of the commission to
know that that will actually ever occur. So I think that
for us to be able to plan what we're going to do in each

session, it would be nice to have a sense of what we are hoping to cover in the different sessions. And it's also really important I think to develop committees that start to break down certain areas and then can do what was already suggested in one area, but not have it be a person by person but maybe a committee is going to take on school security, and then you divide up the tasks within the committee.

And, you know, personally since I live in Philadelphia, it's really hard not to know the schedule well ahead of time. So I'm just apologizing to people that I have personal commitments on Fridays for the next four or five weeks, so that's one of the reasons why we tried to fit this one in quickly. But I'd also like to know how I can participate remotely, and if it's not going to be through email it's going to make it very difficult for me to comment on drafts of reports. And the other thing that I would say is no matter how many good ideas there are in this group or that we hear from outside experts, if we don't have a well-written report, that it's not going to be useful.

And so that I would really caution us of developing new ideas all the way up to March $14^{\rm th}$ and then having a report due March $15^{\rm th}$. And to really have a well-written report, even a draft due March $15^{\rm th}$, it's more than

a term paper, it's more than a thesis. So this should have already been started. And so we might want to think about whether that deadline is feasible or whether our initial report isn't going to be a report with recommendations but more an outline of what we think the commission can do.

2.5

I think there needs to be some meta-cognitive work done to think through how we're going to do this because it's a huge undertaking.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think what we need to do,

I have to get a hold of the chairman and as soon as

possible schedule a day for us just to have a day of

discussion on where we're going.

COMMISSIONER BENTMAN: We have two reports that we began this commission with. One, the report from Columbine and the second was a report from Virginia Tech. They're works of art. They are the most -- they're really extraordinary documents, simply written, carefully crafted. They don't overstep, they don't seem to overstep sort of the bounds of sort of fantasy and they're extraordinarily dignified, and they are dignified even in relation to the shooters.

And it would really be embarrassing if this commission can't put out a report that somehow belongs in that same company. And, you know, the folks who talked to us first, the ex-governor of Colorado, the person who ran

the Virginia Tech commission, I mean they cautioned us don't let people push you faster than you can go. And I really feel that I can't -- I not only can't tell where we are, I feel rushed by forces outside of this room.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I don't think anybody should feel rushed. The governor is not beating us in the head with a baseball bat. We may be able to prepare a very brief report on what we have decided are the critical areas going forward, something of that nature, and tell the governor we're not quite prepared to do something in depth. All we can do is be honest because I agree with you, we don't want to put out a report that stinks, in plain English.

So I think we just have to follow our hearts and our heads here. And I don't feel any pressure at all. You know, if I'm not home by 9:00 o'clock, I'm 70 years old, my mom's not going to yell at me anymore, you know, so we're not worried about it. But we do the best we can and that's all that can be expected of us. And if we are not prepared as a group to submit a real report to the governor by the 15th, then maybe we just submit a brief report saying we've been listening to so many experts, these are the areas that we feel we need to work further on, and if there are some areas we can make some short recommendations, we do so.

2.0

A COMMISSIONER: I thought I heard the governor forgive us that deadline.

A COMMISSIONER: Yesterday?

A COMMISSIONER: Yesterday. Oh, from the commission? I'm sorry. I thought when he appeared and when he opened the commission he was very clear that this was not to be rushed and the 15th was --

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I believe he said that we should not feel any pressure, proceed accordingly, and I'm sure that this deadline is not a hard and fast deadline.

A COMMISSIONER: Absolutely.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Unless we try to make it one.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Yeah, I think there's another issue. We have just received, or at least I know I did yesterday, a request from the governor for opinions about some of the legislation that he's anticipated posing. So there's the original, quote, charter of the commission which we're all struggling with to get our handle around as Commissioner Schonfeld has said -- I think we've got some meta-thinking to do to make sure we know what this report will be to satisfy what the request of the governor had in mind when he set the commission up. That's A. But B, we have some very, very specific questions that have been put in front of us that I assume he's looking for the

commission to opine on fairly succinctly. That's kind of task two.

2.4

So there's two issues that I feel obligated as a commission member to respond to. One, what was our original mission charter. We'll listen to people, we have to come to consensus. I think the notion of the report being highly mature is absolutely essential. Other people in the country are going to be doing exactly to us what we've been doing to Virginia Tech, to Aurora and to others.

And then secondly, what's the process for -- and I mean literally what is the process expected for response to the governor's request for opinion. Is that an oral discussion; is that a written response issued by the chair of the commission? I'll plead ignorance about knowing how the commission is supposed to respond to a very specific request from the governor. I don't know what that is.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: The three questions are specific to guns.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Yeah

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: And we're having an all-day session next week on guns. The three questions are not that complicated.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Yep.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: One of them we may not even be able to answer. I am going to contact somebody in the

insurance industry because the question about should people having insurance, I don't even know if they'll sell it, but there is blanket association for all the insurance companies and I'm sure if I give them a call, Bob Kehmna, they can probably help a little bit answering that question.

The other two questions are not that severe. The first one is a little hairy because the behavioral issues probably take longer.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Do you imagine, and maybe you'll ask the chair, having a session specifically on that where we all listen next Friday and then caucus and then publish a response to that?

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: We may be able to. The first question we may not be able to answer that quickly because it deals with identifying behavior criteria. That's not all going to happen in one day. I don't think that anybody here would believe we can write that kind of criteria that quickly, so that may be a question that goes down the road for an answer. The governor asked the question; he didn't say have it to me by tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER DUCIBELLA: Okay.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I think we all really need to take a deep breath because we're probably putting more pressure on ourselves than is necessary. The governor

originally said he would have liked to have a preliminary report by the 15th. That was to dovetail with the legislature because they have committee deadlines, we have to get bills out. However, the legislature doesn't end on March 15th. There are other ways you can get bills done. Is it a short session or a long session this year?

A COMMISSIONER: It's a long session.

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Long one. So we're good until the beginning of June, actually, if there was something real critical that we wanted to get in there, there's still a way to do it.

I don't think that's as important as it is to write a good report giving the governor the best advice we can at the time we feel comfortable giving it. So I think we need to take the pressure off ourselves, don't get excited, and just let's take this one step at a time. I'll get a hold of the chairman and we'll try to get a session going. We'll just talk about where we're going to go from here, who's actually going to report, all those types of things.

COMMISSIONER CHIVINSKI: At the last meeting when Scott asked us for recommendations, I inferred, and you know, you shouldn't always do that, that the recommendations were going to come before the final reports, possibly in sections. So I don't know exactly

what he was thinking or exactly how he intends, if he intends to submit this piecemeal to the governor.

2.0

2.5

CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: I can't speak for Scott, he's not here. I can only say that he is -- I've seen Terry give me that he's looking for is anybody who has any recommendations on to subject matter or presenters, to let him know. And I've suggested that we give it to him and hand it to him at the next meeting and avoid the email quandary. And that's all I can tell you.

And I'm going to tell you, he's the chairman, we have to give him some authority also because we may give him 38 things that we think important, he's going to have to decide how to prioritize things, that's why he was appointed by the governor. We have to go along with that.

So I think we just have to be patient. I think the most important thing now is let's get a meeting where we do nothing but talk to, at or through each other, however you want to describe it for a day, get our act together and then proceed accordingly without feeling any pressure.

I'm not speaking for the governor, but I have no problem if he was sitting here I would say the same thing. I don't see him having any advantage to put pressure on us when he wants a good report and he wants the best thoughts of all these minds sitting at the table. He didn't put us

1	here just to give him something quick and dirty.	He wants
2	something thoughtful, meaningful that he can work	with.
3	Okay. Anything else before we adjourn?	Okay.
4	A COMMISSIONER: I make a motion to adjo	ourn.
5	CO-CHAIR SULLIVAN: Motion to adjourn.	Seconded?
6	All in favor? Aye. Out of here.	
7	(Hearing adjourned.)	
8		
9		
LO		
11		
12		
13		
L4		
15		
L6		
L7		
L8		
L9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>	
2		
3	I hereby certify that the foregoing 229 pages are	
4	a complete and accurate transcription to the best of my	
5	ability of the electronic sound recording of the meeting of	
6	the Sandy Hook Advisory Commission (SHAC) held on February	
7	22, 2013 at 9:30 a.m. at the Legislative Office Building,	
8	Hartford, Connecticut.	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14	Suzanne Benoit, Transcriber Date	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		