

STATE INTEROPERABLE & EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 31, 2017
DHSES - Building 7A - First Floor Training Room

SPRAGUE: Good morning, everyone. I'd like to call the meeting to order. We probably have lost a few people because of the threat of weather. That's why it's sunny outside, but it's a little on the drafty side. So I want to welcome everybody and thank everybody for making the trip in here. I know we've got a bunch on the phone, as well. I have just a couple things to say. It seems like an awfully short quarter. It seems like we were just here, and it's mainly because of dates and all that kind of stuff. So it's been actually a short timeframe. We all survived the holidays it looks like, so that's a positive sign. Going forward, we have a long quarter after this meeting. We won't actually meet until June, so you get a little bit of rest in between. So with that, I'd like to push it over to roll call. Joann?

Board Members Present:

Michael Sprague
Charles White
Michael Primeau
Col. James Freehart
Kevin Wisely
Todd Murray (by phone)
William Bleyle
Brian LaFlure (by phone)
John Merklinger
Richard V. Tantalo
Michael Volk

Board Members Absent:

Stephen Campbell
Robert Martz
Eric Day
Joseph Gerace
William Hall
Kevin Revere
James Voutour

Guests:

Lt. Lynn Currier
Peter Zwagerman
Eric Abramson
Angelica Kang
David Cook
Larissa Guedko
Brett Chellis
Christopher Tuttle
Emily Sanderson

Joann Waidelich
Matthew Delaney
Toby Dusha
PJ Higgitt
Michael Allen
Jay Kopstein
Steven Sharpe
Robert Gehrler
Raymond Kenny
Michael Barnbeck
David Kislowski
Mike Rowley (by phone)

WAIDELICH: We have quorum.

SPRAGUE: Anybody else on the phone?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Who just showed up on the phone?

MURRAY: Todd Murray from DCJS.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Thanks. Okay, a couple things. Safety - obviously if we have an alarm sometime during the proceedings, we have a couple of exits out of here. The main thing is go out through the main lobby and then end up out front. We'll all meet in front of the building. I know everybody is busy, but your cellphones, if you'd please put them on stun, we'd appreciate that just to keep the noise level down during the meeting. You're free to go outside and take it if you need to. Ground rules, I'll just read through those. Board members attending by videoconference shall constitute presence at such meetings for all purposes, including quorum. The participant must make notice of their location pursuant to the Open Meetings law. If by audio conference only, the member will not count as present for quorum nor permitted to vote. Guests or persons having relative knowledge or information may attend and speak as part of the agenda upon acceptance of the meeting agenda by the Board. If a Board member is unable to attend in person or by videoconference, his or his designee may attend the meeting and vote on behalf of the member unless they are an appointee not representing a state agency. Approval of the minutes of the last meeting.

MERKINGLER: I'll make a motion.

SPRAGUE: Motion made. Just a minute -- any adjustments or changes to the minutes?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: We have one. Linda Messina was not on the list from last month and she was here, so we want to make that amendment to the minutes. Any other comments?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. Motion to second?

BLEYLE: Second.

SPRAGUE: All those in favor?

ALL: Aye.

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Carried. Very good. Okay. We have an agenda in front of us. Do I have a motion to accept the agenda?

BLEYLE: Motion.

SPRAGUE: A motion made by Bill. Second?

VOLK: Second.

SPRAGUE: Mike, thanks. Any additions or deletions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. All those in favor?

ALL: Aye.

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Carried. Alright. We'll move right into state of the committee reports. Sheriff Gerace, are you on by chance? I guess we'll put you on it, Brett, 9-1-1 Advisory Committee.

CHELLIS: 9-1-1 Advisory Committee has not met. Mostly it's been a working group, Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) working group under the advisory committee. We all have a report under their working group.

SPRAGUE: Just to add to that, what we are going to do. We'll talk about the last -- the last meeting, but it's been so short and there are a lot of things going on. We're going to go with the 9-1-1 Advisory Committee to get together and actually review some of the definitions in the PSAP grants. We'll talk about that more, but it's going to be coming up not too far down the road. I'm getting those done, so that will probably happen on the alternate weeks of the Tuesday 9-1-1 meetings. And Brett will talk about the NG working group. They've been meeting every other Wednesday -- or Tuesday, so in the opposite weeks. We'll try to work on the 9-1-1 Advisory Committee for that. NG9-1-1 Working Group. Kevin, do you want to say a couple words?

WISELY: Sure. I'll start off, and then I'll let Brett go into his presentation. Folks, I just want to update you on that. I've asked the OIEC team, Mike and Brett, to start to bring together some of the information that you folks have been working on as far as the NG working group, the workshops that we've had, the working group that's come together and talked about developing -- the developing of a state plan. So we continue to work through that. They prepared some information and documents for me on a potential way forward and our state involvement and coordination of working together. I'll be taking that information and reviewing that with the executive chamber in the near future and the leadership to really articulate what I think a lot of us have been talking about, the NG9-1-1. I know yesterday Merklinger and Mike and the OIEC team are on the panel with the NYSAC meeting to talk about NG9-1-1. I know that the Commissioner will be talking in his testimony today about NG9-1-1, First Net and communication. So it is a -- we continue to highlight that as being a very important aspect of what we do. We appreciate all the feedback from the folks that provided and partnered with us, and we still look to continue that partnership as we build out that way forward and bring NG9-1-1 to the State of New York.

CHELLIS: Thank you. The working group has been meeting pretty regularly. We've been moving forward. We have been continuing with the technical assistant services through the Office of Emergency Communications contractors that we've been having on board and working on drafting language for the NG9-1-1 plan. We have a draft vision statement to enhance, and I wanted to go over this with the Board so that -- to present what the working group has come up with and give you a chance to give any comments on your thoughts on the vision statement here. The opening statement of it is to enhance and expand 9-1-1 services in New York State by developing a collaborative framework necessary to facilitate funding, building, and sustainable operation of an IP-based NG9-1-1 system using NG core services, protect the human life and property, and maintain public safety. And that is in one sentence the goal of the working group and the plan going forward. To break that down into bullets, the division system will leverage current and future communication technologies to

meet and exceed the public's expectations and needs. The NG9-1-1 system will provide the public with an uninterrupted, efficient, effective and equitable access to request emergency services via multiple types and forms of communication. Well, that bullet is to pick up -- we don't know what future technology is and we try to design part of NG9-1-1 to define the backbone and framework so that they can accept any IP-based technology as it's going forward. Next, the NG9-1-1 system will provide interoperability and fail-over between and among the PSAPs and other ESInet at the regional, state and federal level. Interoperability is key in NG9-1-1, and the ability for one center to be able to back up another, and if the system senses that PSAP cannot take a call, either by overload or a malfunction in the services, they can automatically direct per the plan and program to an alternate PSAP. Interoperability with our neighboring states, regions within and so on is very critical in the design. Number 4, the Emergency Services IP Network for the ESInet will be standards-based with open architecture, and will comply with the NENA i3 Standard. That's critical in order to have the interoperability. The i3 standard to NG9-1-1 is like 225 is to the LMR, so it's the common denominator that makes it all interoperable. Number 5, the ESInet will serve as a network of networks, and be adaptable, flexible, scalable, secure and accessible with a robust infrastructure to support all system and network requirements. The build-out of the NG9-1-1 system and the migration of the state's public safety answering points to the NG9-1-1 capability will be a cooperative and collaborative effort among all stakeholders. Now that goes back to the idea of the working group. We have thirteen counties, four state agencies all represented, and the City of New York. So we consider the stakeholders critical so that the system is designed with the operation that the PSAP most in mind in the end game and in the design of the network. The NG9-1-1 system will help establish the foundation for taking New York State's 9-1-1 capabilities to the next level by assuring that all New York State PSAPs achieve a minimum standard level of service statewide. That goes back to our goals to the whole 9-1-1 committee moving forward and the direction in working on the standards and updating them to make sure that our PSAPs in New York are ready to service the public's demands. Okay. Any comments or questions on this vision statement from the Board members?

SPRAGUE: You have it in your handout if there's any questions, or if you want to study it more, feel free to and field the questions back.

CHELLIS: This is a draft. Nothing is finished until the plan is finished, so this is our draft moving forward as we go to build the plan. Also going on, we have a legal review in DHSES and the Department of Public Service. Both teams, our legal teams, have been working on drafting regulations in their respective areas to facilitate the move from Enhanced 9-1-1 to NG9-1-1, and we're going to take into consideration the constant evolvement of technology with that. So our legal teams have been busy and so is the Department of Public Service. Do we have Mike Rowley on the phone from the Department of Public Service?

ROWLEY: Yes. I just joined.

CHELLIS: Mike, if it's okay with the Chair, I'd like to recognize Mike for a couple minutes to update us on the Department of Public Service's efforts in this regard.

SPRAGUE: Okay.

CHELLIS: Mike, go ahead.

ROWLEY: Great. Thank you. Just a similar track that we're taking here at the PSC. We're reviewing the requirements. I wouldn't necessarily call it a legal review, but it -- we are looking at some of the -- the costing and the funding mechanisms that we have in place and that have been in place for several decades now. And mainly that was to provide recovery of cost to local exchange carriers in the delivery of the 9-1-1 service to -- or 9-1-1 calls to

PSAPs and how the selective router system was going to be spread -- the cost for it to be spread among the different local exchange carriers, and then what services would be billed to PSAPs or counties really. And a lot of that is based on the legacy regulation that we have and the legacy providers that are -- that were the only ones around several decades ago. So as we move now to a more IP-based system, some of those segments in the system, including the selective router and the trunking, are obviously going to change. That's going to change some of the methodology and the costing mechanisms for the local exchange carriers that are squarely within our jurisdiction, but obviously there are other carriers that are -- and originating service providers that are not in our jurisdiction. So that's where I think the legal review is looking at -- well, how do we incorporate them into some of the methodologies that we have now? Is it even feasible? Should we be looking at a different type of cost sharing and cost recovery model? Is the current task which is a target accessibility fund, capable of doing that, or do we have to come up with new ideas on it? So that's what we're looking at right now. We're also looking at the jurisdictional issues. And a lot of it is going to revolve around what the -- I don't think we're going to wait until, you know, the model is built, but we probably want to have some idea of what kind of scale are we looking at, what kind of regionalization is going to occur, what kind of -- you know, I think we're going to have to get out of this model that has cost being assigned to counties and individual PSAPs, because that's a little bit unmanageable and hard to fit into a plan. So that's the things we're looking at. As we -- some of these services are going to be migrating off of the selective router system. I think there's some concern about how that's going to be -- you know, what costs are going to be passed on, direct cost versus costs that are shared. So we're definitely looking at it, and we hope to -- we hope to have something relatively soon. And I think we're talking with Brett to even have some of the target accessibility fund administrator come in and explain some of these things.

CHELLIS: That would be great, Mike. Thank you. Any questions for Mike?

(No response.)

CHELLIS: Alright. Thanks Mike.

ROWLEY: Thank you.

MERKINGLER: One thing to consider. Maybe Angelica could advise us on it. As we move forward and these calls start getting routed -- if I'm just having a busy day in my PSAP and some calls get routed to a neighboring PSAP or vice-versa, the first thing I want to know is about the legalities with that, and who is responsible for -- if we take that call and something goes wrong with it. So I think when we look at whatever that legislation is going to be when we get to that piece, if we could somehow address that so I'm not having to go and do inter-municipal agreements with ten or twenty or even every county in the state theoretically, because my calls could be sent anywhere. If there's some way to address that in our statutes. Maybe there's some sort of variance with the mutual aid for -- if I want to ship a plow truck halfway across the state, maybe there's some kind of variance in there, some kind of language that would apply to the 9-1-1 piece.

CHELLIS: That's a great point, John.

SPRAGUE: It may even to be the point where we have to look at what the intent of this impact is with -- that load sharing, and that would be an accepted --

MERKINGLER: Exactly. And I think we're all in favor of that. We see the benefits of that. We have to somehow address the legal stuff that goes with it.

CHELLIS: Alright.

KOPSTEIN: Would we be looking at the General Municipal Law that covers some of this stuff, put it in there. It might be the appropriate place to put it.

SPRAGUE: I really don't think that there's anything off the table at this point. We're kind of looking at all options and what fits, what doesn't fit, what's the best way to go. I think legal is really looking at all of the things.

CHELLIS: A couple weeks ago, the Deputy Commissioner, Mike and I attended a meeting with ITS, and I wanted to point that out. It was a very productive meeting. We discussed a collaborative working relationship between DHSES and ITS on the NG9-1-1 project. We talked quite a bit about the GIS SAMS project -- SAMS, Street Address Mapping Project that ITS has been doing for, I don't know, five or six years. They pretty much have been building street address points, center lines, and they're now looking at response areas and quadrants for the entire state, collecting information from every county. Moving forward, that is going to be a critical component in the NG9-1-1 system. And wherever the core management services rise, we're going to have to dip into the GIS database, mapping database for everything from call routing to providing response information and so on to the PSAP. So with that, you know, they have at least a snapshot from every county is my understanding. Some of the counties have an interactive updating process with the SAMS system, and the goal is eventually to get every county doing this interactive regular update. Bob is here. I don't know if you have anything to add to that. It's very critical to the project moving forward. Eventually that all has to be bounced off the MSAG, Master Street Address Guide, in our system today that the database works on to make sure there's no discrepancies before you can actually do a cutter. So all this is a very critical part on what we'll be working with ITS on. Also, the ITS has built a statewide inventory of fiber and other connectivity. They've agreed to work on continuing to update that, provide that -- be able to provide that to the working group and us moving forward. ITS also brings networking expertise skills, as well, to the working group. So it's a productive meeting. We attended two presentations by vendors. Airbus setup a presentation in Rochester at their carpenter shop in Monroe County to basically present their services that they are now going to be providing. They have gotten a tariff approval from the Public Service Commission for CLEC status in New York State. What that exactly means and what they can provide in terms of NG9-1-1 is something that they have to discuss with the Department of Public Service. They've apparently conducted at least two other presentations we're aware of. Mike, did they do one in Westchester?

VOLK: We had one in Nassau County, which included Nassau, Suffolk and Westchester.

CHELLIS: I knew they were doing one down there, as well. So it was all three combined, probably a similar presentation. We also attended one in Steuben County that Director Hopkins in Steuben County hosted at AT&T/West. West is the former intra-radio company you may have heard of using the 9-1-1 route. They have combined with AT&T to provide a Next Gen solution, so they also did a presentation. Due to restrictions and so on and the legalities with the RFP process, we basically had to attend and listen, but couldn't really engage in a lot of discussion moving forward on services because that would be part of the RFP process. However, it was interesting to see that these companies are actually starting to go out and seek regions, counties or states to actually provide services moving forward. So some of this is coming together. Okay. Any questions?

ROWLEY: Can I interject? This is Mike Rowley.

SPRAGUE: Go ahead, Mike.

ROWLEY: I just wanted to be recognized. We also have been meeting with Airbus, as they did receive certification. You know. But I will say that we are still reviewing what that actually means, because -- you know - at least for the 9-1-1 funding, local exchange companies and competitive local exchange companies, their services are a little bit different. They're more on the transport side and serving the PSAP and not retail customers, and the funding

mechanisms are setup mainly for companies that are providing local exchange service to retail customers. So part of this whole review -- I mean this is what's prompting our review of tariffs. We've been working with some of the PSAPs also that have asked questions about this. So we're still looking at that and how it fits into the current methodologies, but we did -- I think we probably saw the same presentation you did. Thank you.

CHELLIS: Thank you, Mike.

SPRAGUE: Anymore questions for Brett or Mike?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Brett. Thanks Mike. Alright. Let's move over to CIWG.

KOPSTEIN: Good morning. I'm going to do SAFECOM, CIWG. Brian is going to have a presentation on this issue. I don't know if he's going to do it here. Brian?

LaFLURE: Yes, Jay.

KOPSTEIN: Are you going to do your presentation here, as well, or just CIWG?

LaFLURE: I can do whatever you ask, Mike. Originally, I suggested that we do it in the CIWG first, but it's probably going to be the same group. So either way, Jay. It doesn't matter.

KOPSTEIN: Alright. We'll just wait until CIWG then.

LaFLURE: Very good.

KOPSTEIN: Alright. SAFECOM and NCSWIC meetings will be held in May and November. P&CR, which is basically Public Safety Communications and Research, will be in June. Invitations have gone out. SAFECOM right now is looking into friction. Essentially the meeting here is -- because there is no standardization. They're looking to create some standardization on encryption. The SAFECOM power points are going to be revised for new technology. We are currently working on definitions of what public safety grid means. People specify, but there is no definition. Every manufacturer has its own definition and most of them are for their benefit, not ours. There will be new grant guidelines coming out from OEC this spring. There will be a two million dollar communications grant for rural areas, although I haven't seen the specifications on that. Maybe Chris can bring that in later if you have knowledge on it. There's also going to be an emergency medical communications grant coming out. I haven't seen paperwork on that yet. Priority services, Next Generation notifications, restoration of land lines after any type of disaster, is on our planning. Just published today, dated January 10, the cyber security framework draft, version 1.1. I sent it to Joann for distribution to whomever the director feels is necessary. And last but not least, if you're looking for funding, OEC or the federal government is still operating under a continuing resolution. So there will be no new funding until there is a new budget.

TUTTLE: I have to be recognized. I have to be recognized. Hi. This is Chris Tuttle.

Regarding the grant that Jay just spoke about, the rural emergency contingent medical grant for 2.3 million dollars was awarded to a southeastern state. There was only, I believe, three applicants for the grant. It is not known if this will be a one-time grant or a recurring grant, so more to follow on that. The 2 million dollar state comprehensive, I don't have any information for the group at this time regarding that, but I will get something for the next meeting. The only other two issues or points to bring up for the good of the order is on June 13th and June 14th in Erie County, there will be a Canadian/United States interoperability working group meeting. This meeting is being held in the State of New York at my request after my nagging for several years to get the proper people in the area where the problems occur the most. I would highly encourage anyone who is available to attend this meeting to attend it. There will be an open forum for you to provide not only success stories and challenges, but for those officials on both the Canadian side and the United States side of secretary level or executive

level from the federal government to hear your concerns. So once again, that's June 13th and June 14th. It will be at the Erie County Training Center. More particulars to follow as they become available, including an agenda. Right now, target June 13th. Usually the second day is closed meetings. So I'll get more information out to Mike for distribution to the Board as it becomes available.

KOPSTEIN: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Any questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Thank you, Jay. Thank you, Chris. Okay. Public safety and broadband, Matt Delaney.

DELANEY: Good morning, everyone. Public Safety Broadband, or FirstNet, is wireless, a nationwide network for wireless broadband data for first responders primarily. It was initially a data network. It was not a voice or replacement for LMR. So about two years ago, this Board formed a public safety broadband working group. We met -- last met on January 12th via WebEx. We had twenty-six attendees on the bridge. We provided updates on FirstNet procurement and state evaluation plan -- The next meeting date is to be determined by the working group. It will be dependent on the FirstNet award. I'll talk about that here in the next couple of slides. So FirstNet is nationwide; they are a federal entity. They issued an RFP to build a nationwide network last year, last winter, with a due date back in May. It was an objective-based RFP, looking for the best solution to develop and build this nationwide network. It was not for technical specifications. It was rather fifteen or sixteen high level objectives. So it's a closed procurement. However, three bids were submitted based on media reports. It's possible to have more, but there's been no information there's any more than those three. Those were AT&T wireless, Rivada networks, which is a coalition primarily led by Mercury, and pdvWireless. There was originally a targeted date of around November 1st or thereabouts for first step, to make an award and announce who would be the bidder, the winning bidder or partner to build this nationwide network. Just before November 1st, FirstNet announced that there was going to be a delay, but they hope to make the award by the end of the year. In October, pdvWireless released a press release saying that they had been notified by the federal government they had been removed from the final evaluation process. They have been disqualified, so everyone believed that left AT&T and Rivada network. However, at the beginning of December, we learned that Rivada had also been disqualified from the final round of evaluation, leaving -- which presumably leaving only AT&T to make it to the final round of evaluations. Again, it's possible there are more that we don't know about, but there's no indication of that. In fact, AT&T filed a filing -- a Securities and Exchange Commission filing. I'll get to why in a moment. They basically said they were the only remaining bidder that they were aware of. So in the beginning of December, it came out in the news that the Rivada team had filed a legal complaint, an objection that they had been unfairly eliminated from the competition. Basically they were challenging the fact that they had been eliminated from the final round of evaluation. The award has not been made yet. There was not a bid protest on the award. It was actually a pre-award protest that they had been removed from the evaluation process. There's like a series -- there was a series of evaluations and they had not -- neither Rivada nor pdvWireless had made it to the final stage of evaluation. So AT&T appears to be on track for the award, pending the outcome of the legal. And I can't emphasize "appears" more -- more strongly than that. I mean, there is no official word on that. That is solely based on the fact that we believe they are the only remaining bidder. All the media reports, the industry reports, they are the only remaining bidder. However, until of course FirstNet makes the award, or depending on the outcome of the legal case, depending on what happens with Rivada's legal action, they may or may not

end up back into multiple bidders until the final round of evaluation or an entire change in the structure of the evaluation process. So the award has not been made yet, so anything could happen. The Department of the Interior, which is conducting the procurement for FirstNet in terms of the procurement arm of the federal government doing this, agreed to hold off the award until at least March 1st. So that puts us between January and February. There's a series of motions and counter-motions in the filing, where the federal government or Rivada can each file motions, and then their replies to the motions and so forth. It's basically all the field -- it's pretty much the entire case has been sealed for competitive -- you know, they're not disclosing competitive information in their filings. And so we don't know -- other than the schedule and some minor details, we don't know the specifics on what may be in play in terms of the evaluation or the protest to that. So basically this is the last time for the legal review. The Judge will make a ruling, so they agreed to at least March 1. Of course, that could change. If the Judge rules that more information is needed or that this is going to go on further, the March 1st date could still be delayed further. What happens if Rivada is successful, so then there's a more detailed final round of evaluation. If they're not successful, if there's a change in the procurement process, if there's a fundamental issue with the procurement, all of that could change. However, in the meantime FirstNet is continuing to prep for the implementation phase. So they're continuing to do work. We actually met -- we had a statewide contact meeting in Arizona back in December. They briefed us on what they've been working on with implementation, and they are ready to basically hit the ground running once the award is made. So this is the initial implementation roadmap. This is how it looks to us and to FirstNet earlier this year. So we thought the award selection was going to occur in November and they would release the draft state plans probably in the May timeframe, final state plan in August, Governor's decision November, and then implementation of the first milestone would be five years, with a milestone required by the bidder in August 2018 going to 2022. However, this is of course now a bit delayed. So we know that selection and award won't occur until at least March of 2017. Then we think -- this is really a lot of estimation and guesswork here -- the draft state plan by July, the final state plan September, Governor's decision December. We know for certain there will be ninety days in between the release of the final state plan and the Governor's decision due to mandated legislation. Other dates could be different. The original plan was that there was going to be six months between the award and the delivery of the state plan to the state. Could they -- could FirstNet and their winning partner negotiate something shorter to get going quicker? That's certainly a possibility. That's not -- there's not a mandate in the legislation that that has to be six months. Could the implementation model of the bidder be quicker? Could the bidder be proposed initially or could it be negotiated to account for some of the delay? That's certainly a possibility. We don't know if the bidders are doing work in the case they are awarded. We don't really know how much progress is occurring right now. So negotiated milestones may still be different and that's why it's in red. And I think the red pen sticks out for these dates, at least until there's an award. Once an award has been made, I think we'll probably have a much better picture of what will happen, but this is really the State not know what will happen before March. So we have been working on an evaluation plan. So once the state plan is delivered to New York, we'll have ninety days to evaluate that and make a recommendation on whether to accept it or opt-out, and that's ultimately up to the Governor. So we expect the draft of the state plan to be delivered at some point before the final. We are waiting for FirstNet to provide a little more detail on what that draft could be in terms of how much time before the final, but we expect them to review it, make comments and maybe require -- hopefully we will have the opportunity to at least find some real issues or real standout problems to request a revision. And then when we get the final state plan,

we would do a thorough evaluation. That would be what the recommendation is based on. So we'll do evaluation goals. We have executive summary, obviously pros and cons, different areas for improvement, and opt-in/out recommendations. So to look at it, we decide, here's the plan that's delivered to the State. Here are the pros of it. Here are the cons of it, areas where it could be improved. It could either be something that occurs prior to accepting it, or at some point as part of a negotiation, or just a suggestion to FirstNet or their partner to approve adoption of this. It is -- even if the State were to opt-in; nobody is required to use FirstNet. So the partner actually -- the first RFP requires the partner to make adoption milestones and have a certain number of users on the network, and there's actually penalties if they don't. So we would hope that they would be -- you know, are properly incentivized to get people to use the network. Therefore, they would listen to our suggestions and maybe take those into account to improve the experience of the network in New York. So how will New York State's plan be evaluated in a little more detail? So we've identified fifteen topics of interest based on the state plan template in the RFP, create small subject matter expert teams to review and evaluate each topic of interest, and then working with NYSTEC, who is our contractor. Every state received a federal grant through outreach and evaluation work support for broadband, so we hired NYSTEC to do that. They've worked with us for a couple years now on it to facilitate each team's effort and then also offer a report based on that. And what we hope to do is really gather individual -- we have a survey. If you have not taken it, it's on our website. And basically we're looking for people who have expertise in certain areas who can tell us, or sit with the little teams and look at a specific area of the state plan and provide a recommendation or a comment on it. But this is only an evaluation. It's not a procurement review. The state is not doing the procurement of FirstNet. We are only receiving the state plan that we can opt-in or opt-out or do nothing on. Again, it's not a contract. It's simply a letter saying yes, we think it's a good idea. We are planning, in this process, to do regional town hall meetings. We are going to travel around the state and engage at a more local level and receive -- sort of brief out on the plans in a day, day-and-a-half meeting, and brief out on the plan, and then have some sort of facilitated discussions to start to get people's input, especially in areas that might be of a particular concern or interest. So support the effort. If you haven't taken the subject matter expert survey. It's a quick survey monkey. It will take you about ten minutes. It's just looking for people who have areas of expertise that will help us create those teams and evaluate the plan. That's all I have on that. I think maybe hopefully -- our next meeting is not until June. Certainly my hope is that there is an award and we have good knowledge on what the plan will be and all the details, but I think I probably said that in one of the previous meetings. So I think you have to wait and see. Any questions?

BLEYLE: Matt, at what time is it in the state plans that they come up with estimates as to what the cost for participation will be?

DELANEY: One of the elements of the state plan will be the surface plan -- actually they're developing -- they've -- FirstNet is working on, and their partner access will be providing a portal essentially and there will be two pieces of the portal. There will be a state-specific phasing function that will be confidential information on network design and so forth, and then there will be a public phasing portion of the portal, much like if you were going to Verizon or AT&T's website and look at the plan and the devices and the coverage area. They'll essentially be back for FirstNet. So for the public phasing portion, you'll be able to look, and look at the different plans. Will there be limited data? Will there be different data plans? Will there be specific ones for machine applications, telemetry, fixed devices or just mobile? What phones will be available? What modems -- all that stuff would be in the state plan, but also in that portal that will be available essentially for customer browsing. Anything else?

(No response.)

DELANEY: Thank you. As always, we have public broadcast via tv.ny.gov is our website. That's where we post information, our news, and the survey monkey is on there.

SPRAGUE: And take the survey. Thanks Matt. Okay. State Agency Working Group. Brett?

CHELLIS: We had a meeting on January 19th. A lot of good came out of that meeting. It was a good representation of state agencies and attendants. Most of the agencies and members of the working group were present. There was good collaboration on identifying areas where the agencies can work together to address our challenges of interoperability both on the LMR side, and CAD systems has become more and more friendly. We're dealing with a lot of challenges, everything from different counties, and different PSAPs use different CAD systems. The agencies, like a lot of the state agencies that work across the regions, are interacting with those CAD systems and receive their calls, most notably the State Police, but some of the other agencies are, as well. And so being -- tying into the different CAD systems along with the router is something. We're also seeing an issue with CAD in the GIS mapping world. Not all the CAD systems tie completely with the NENA i3 standard in terms of their mapping yet, and I say yet. I'm not sure whether it's even a requirement that they do eventually, but I hope that the pressure will be on for them to come up to that, because right now I know some of the county's GIS departments are frustrated because they have to have the mapping all laid out in one way for the CAD system to work, but in order to work for the same project, they need to meet the E-911 standard. They have to tweak everything into what's going to be the national standard. So hopefully the CAD world will -- it's very proprietary at this point. We're hoping that at some point there will be a commonality between the need and the drive, the pressure, to come to a common set of plans. I don't know. Bob, do you have anything to add to that? I can get you recognized.

GEHRER: Sure. I just have a little bit. As you said, Brett, this community and others bring some pressure to the vendors. They need to start adhering to the NENA standards for data. I believe it's going to be absolutely necessary. As you said, they're slow to adopt them right now. I don't know any that have the option. And in the long haul, it's going to make everybody's work harder to maintain those systems -- if you've got to be tweaking the data like you mentioned. So that's an important thing for work groups to maybe get that word out in the future. Thanks.

CHELLIS: Thank you. Another thing we discussed quite a bit was the sharing, and I was asked again to put together the updated inventory of fiber and other connectivity. A lot of it has been funded through state grants, but there have been a lot of projects where counties have built both fiber or microwave connectivity to surrounding counties within their consortium and outside of it. It's kind of all coming together. So there is discussion as to how can agencies, state agencies that are operating within those regions and within the counties to take advantage of any of that in terms of connectivity with our own interoperable use with the counties amongst themselves. So there's quite a bit of discussion along that line, as well. So it was a productive meeting.

SPRAGUE: Any questions, comments? Any questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. Channel Naming and Use Working Group. Matt Delaney.

DELANEY: Just one thing that we do have that's in your packets, too, EMS guidelines. So we -- one of the first guidelines that we issued several years ago was EMS mainly. There were just some minor changes. We brought to your attention that 155.205 is often used as an EMS channel in New York, so it was just NYMED205. The guideline does not do anything other than provide the standard name for that and the definition that's used as the EMS

channel. With the guideline, it is the hope that it will just sort of recognize that this channel is common in many EMS vehicles, and by having the same name, perhaps it will better recognize that incident. We've actually seen two vehicles in a different area have the same channel in common. We did also add for all the -- channels a PL -- for transmit. This is to be consistent with the recommended channel loading guidelines. So we had issued a guideline last year for recommending a minimum channel for programming every radio in public safety, and we had actually put a tone on those. It wasn't an EMS guideline, it's actually a -- used several years earlier. It's only on transmit, so it does not -- there's no recommendation, and in fact it's recommended don't program it on receive, simply because there's such variation across the state and local plans for tone that certainly if you're using carriers -- state carriers - - it's the most interoperable because there's no confusion in having a different tone, but this could pave the way for future CTC -- so if you were getting interference in an area, you could apply or receive -- especially a base station and point -- there's a standard in the guideline. And then what we've recently done with 9-1-1. We added that as an option. In that case, that was basically the standard for many years, so there was -- the expectation is that probably was pretty widely used at that point. First I want to clarify the guidelines that these channels are often not licensed for non-EMS use. Some of these channels are local government and other public safety, so they may be used by non-EMS users. And if they're licensed for that, that's perfectly legal. So as long as they're in compliance with the FCC rules, nothing in our guidelines supersedes that -- Updated letterhead and formatting. I just refreshed it. It was several years old. And overall, I would call these minor revisions. As I mentioned, this is one of the first guidelines, so this is just cleaning up a few things. There is a -- in the packet, there is a resolution, an adopting resolution to update the guidelines, so we'll have the Chair ask for a motion for the recommendation to update that.

SPRAGUE: Okay. I'll entertain that motion.

MERKINGLER: Motion.

BLEYLE: Second.

SPRAGUE: Mr. Bleyle seconded. And we brought this up at the last meeting to come up with this resolution. So you have in front of you basically the resolution that just encompasses everything that matches, including the attachment that goes with it. So any comments, questions in regards to this resolution?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. All those in favor?

ALL: Aye.

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Motion carried. Thank you.

DELANEY: That guideline, as soon as we get it in final PDF form, we will get put it on the DHS website.

SPRAGUE: The Citizen Alerting Committee. At the last meeting, we actually adopted a resolution to incorporate this within the working groups for the SIEC, and this is a brief report that we actually did have an initial organizational meeting on the 25th. We have a small core group that's been working on the issues for some time now. So basically we brought those altogether -- we have in the recommendations from the last meeting, there was suggested membership. So we kind of went through that list, came up with a number of potential candidates that we're going to canvass to put together for the next meeting, the nine governmental organizations and city representatives. We've actually talked about this at a SIEC meeting. I had some people volunteer to be part of it, so we're going to include that,

and we'll continue to talk at the SIEC meetings so that people are aware of it. So we've tentatively put together March 9th as the first full group meeting of this thing, and part of the other organizational piece was what are we going to talk about, you know, what things. Obviously this is a new committee format. We're going to work the committee and gain people's buy into the committee. IPAWS update is constantly changing as it moves through. The other thing really is going through and seeing activations of IPAWS. I think it's very inherent that there needs to be more training. The time that you get to use it is not the time to train on it, and we found some issues as you go through it that people are just not prepared for it as it comes through. We actually had one activation where they tried to use the presidential notification, which didn't work. So – and along with that, we're aware there's an IPAWS laboratory out there. This is something that we've been holding out for, or I should say DHS, and that allows you to do some exercising, but what those capacities are and how that works, we need to find that out. So that's -- those are just a few things that we're going to pull into this next meeting and start talking about, how to reach out to particular broadcasters and that type of thing. We're still researching all of that. There's a broadcaster's association. There's also a cable association. How does that interface with the satellite providers, either DirecTV or Dish or whoever's out there? So we're trying to find a lot of those pieces out, doing some research on it to bring back to this and identify some next steps. So that's kind of in a nutshell what we talked about, and by the next meeting hopefully we'll be able to give you a lot more detail as to what we're doing with this. So any questions, comments on it?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: That's pretty much it in a nutshell. So PSAP and SICG.

GUEDKO: Next we'll present spending, current spending, and also deadlines and performance periods for state-funded federal communication grant program and the PSAP grant program. The round two spending went up, and all the other PSAP '12, and PSAP '13 grant spending also went up. Those two PSAPs, '12 and '13, they are multi-year contracts. This slide presents the current status for spending as of the end of this month. One notable thing, 2016/17 PSAP operations grant. Right now, we have thirty contracts executed, twenty-two of them pending countersignatures, and seven right now in works for state approval. 2016 statewide interoperability communications grant formula grid. We have received the application from all counties in New York State, including New York City, and right now applications are in review process. This slide depicts the grant periods, one or two mentioned. The Round 2 State Interoperable Communications Grant performance period ends on February 4 -- 3rd -- February 3. Hence, the vouchers that counties have must be submitted right away. The contract with the county doesn't mention that you have thirty days after the grant period is closed to meet those vouchers. Just reminding you, if some counties have not submitted their vouchers yet, please do so as soon as possible. This highlights the programs, the non-federal grant programs with one-year duration for the grant period. There are no extensions. Now the new statewide interoperable communication grant program, which is using the formula distribution, does pay a lot of attention to interoperability channels, national interoperability channels. I wanted to go over exactly what are those nation non-federal interoperability channels are. There's some confusion across the state what they are and what they are not, because there are several different rules applied to national interoperability channels, even from the FCC's perspective. In addition to that, we have New York State channels that we use for our purposes to interoperate; however, they are not national interoperability channels. They are common channels. So the non-federal national interoperability channel governed by the FCC rules C.F.R. Part 90.427 give you some questions on how you use it and what's authorized and what's not authorized. And Part 90

also gives you the communication related to -- it just states how you can use those channels in case of eminent safety of life or in case of danger of life and property. Now as a rule, six base stations for all those national interoperability channels must be licensed. Now the VCALL, VTAC, and UCALL, UTAC, 8CALL, 8TAC, 7CALL, 7TAC, also 7GTAC, 7LAW, 7FIRE and 7MED, they can operate on the subscriber equipment, such as mobiles and portables, without individual license. Public safety entities are licensed by rule, so it's covered by the FCC as a blanket authorization. What it means is you can program those channels on your subscriber equipment, even if you do not hold a license. There are two -- not two, more than that, but LLAW and LFIRE. They must be licensed to operate on the subscriber equipment. So by the FCC rule right now, it's unclear whether it's national interoperability channels or it's just mutual aid or common channels. However, right now, if you take a look at the NIFOG, you will see that they're defined there as national interoperability channels. This is a proposed direction for the FCC to go, but right now it has not been clearly clarified by the FCC rules and regulations. Now from New York State's perspective, our grant program perspective, public safety perspective, we would like to consider those channels as a national interoperability channel. We are aware of -- in the same manner. Now what are those common channels, and what is the difference between national interoperability channel and the common channels. So common channels are not governed by the same FCC rules. They are not covered by blanket authorizations and you cannot use it in your subscriber equipment, program it in your subscriber equipment without holding a license. So what are those common channels? They're VMED, VFIRE, VLAW and VSAR. They must be licensed. As I mentioned before, there's also New York State common channels, which is NYFIRE, NYLAW1, and NYMED, but they also must be licensed in order to operate, not just the base station but also your subscriber equipment, mobile. So any questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: We think that the little catchphrase that Larissa rattled off there is going to be a requirement for getting grants from now on, the VCALL, the VTAC, and the UTAC. I can't go through it all. You have to say it forward and backward. Thanks, Larissa.

GUEDKO: Thank you

SPRAGUE: Okay. New business. I am pleased to be able to announce that we're going to schedule the 2017 consortium or symposium on March 21st through the 23rd. We're going to do it in Syracuse in order to find a little more room. The last one has gotten large enough; it was difficult to put it all into two days. So we're looking at the 21st through the 23rd, with the last day being optional. These are some of the topics that we're looking at trying to do, and the goal of this is actually to come out with some products when we're done. So day one is going to be kind of a review of FirstNet state plan review. We'll get into FirstNet a little deeper as to how we're going to do that, just to give a little more information. We'll get some consortium reports. I've been talking with Director Merklinger about something that he may be talking about, and also mutual aid and some other topics that may be of interest to folks. The second day we're going to -- and you may have seen, we've already put out announcements for three different CASM workshops. They're one-hour online CASM - this is a one-on-one for CASM type thing. We're going to follow that up by a day-long CASM workshop. The OEC folks have agreed to come in and do CASM. And they're going to do CASM training, and also what we'd like to do is get the folks from the different ICCs and counties to be able to do hands-on entry while the guys are there, so when you run into a problem you can get an answer. The other good part about that is at the same time, if you run into a question about entering data, the guys with the knowledge will be in the room next door and be able to feed that information back. So we're looking at having some people that

can really understand how CASM works when we're done with this. On a separate track, along with that, we're going to run the information on the interop -- some of the information that Larissa just talked about, and what we're seeing and how that's interacting with grants, employment and the use of the federal interop channels, and in particular Matt's been working on doing that with encryption, NG9-1-1. We looked at the possibility of bringing in some IPAWS training so we can get some hands-on information into the folks that are actually developing the policies and then report-out at the tail end on CASM, where it's actually been entered and where it stands. So there is a lot of information that we can pull out of that one day. So that's the first two days. The next day, for only those that are interested, and that's probably going to be all the counties on the northern borders, we're looking at doing a Line A workshop that Larissa's going to be putting together to really talk about trying to do a -- this has been done apparently in some other states -- develop a statewide license for the Line A interoperability side of things, but if that's the case and we need -- and we'll send information out on this, but we need the counties to come and in particular bring information on their towers and that information so we can pull that information together and do that project. That's going to be a half-day session on the last day and really kind-of dig into that particular issue. I think the timing with the program that's going to be going on up in Erie County couldn't be better. We really haven't connected the two until we just sat here. So it's really going to highlight and drive those issues and give us a lot of information on why we need to get this to happen. So that's what we're looking at. I'm certainly open to any topics that somebody thinks we should address, or if a consortium is doing something that's got some real meat to it, I'd love to have that on, besides just having a report. I still want to hear reports from the consortium. So that's kind of what we're thinking. Comments, questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I guess it's okay. Actually, I think Brian may still be on the phone. One of the things that isn't on that list, and we talked about, is we usually have some sort of a working dinner of some sort, and I've asked Brian if he would talk about the jamming exercise -- exercises he's been working on, and he's actually going to be working on another one this year. So he can bring some that information to the whole group, which not a lot of people are familiar with that. So I'm speaking out of turn, Brian, but I think you agreed to that.

LaFLURE: I'll be there, Mike.

SPRAGUE: Very good.

LaFLURE: How much are we getting paid for that?

SPRAGUE: Let's see, hamburger or steak?

LaFLURE: Alright. I understand.

SPRAGUE: So that's kind of where we're at with that particular program. We're trying to -- it used to be a twice a year thing. We're looking at doing a once a year thing and putting a lot of work into it. The reason that we're kind of looking at Syracuse is because it's central, but we're open to other options in the future.

LaFLURE: I'm sorry. Mike?

SPRAGUE: Yes.

LaFLURE: This is Brian. You're still looking at one rep from each county?

SPRAGUE: We're talking about the potential of two. The other thing we're looking at was -- when you get into the consortium, two or three people from each consortium -- it would be really good to have some people within the consortium that could then help the rest of the counties do their CASM. And by all means, if somebody's got somebody that has an interest in CASM in their county, and is really good at it, we certainly would love to have them as part

of it, as well.

LaFLURE: Okay. Thank you.

SPRAGUE: And we just got the green light. You're going to see this stuff coming out shortly. This is really kind-of the big unveiling. Anything else for the good of the order?

TUTTLE: Just two things, one regarding CASM. If you've been lax in nominating members of your county or your agencies to be members of CASM, I highly encourage you to do that. CASM is currently hosting a symposium – that was set to be sun setting in the next month or two and will be transitioning to the OSC information network. So if you are an active CASM member, you'll automatically get a generated invite to visit once it moves. If you're not, there's going to be a more in-depth process if you will to become a member. So if you have members out there that you haven't invited to be part of CASM yet, I would encourage you to do so. Secondly, kind of tying into what Larissa was talking about on the non-federal interoperability channels. The Department of Homeland Security, working with the Department of Interior, has basically generated a draft MOU for states to utilize the federal interoperability channels known as FEDLE and FEDIR. These are the law enforcement instant response channels that are used for federal agencies. The MOU, draft MOU, has been distributed to all states and territories for review in terms of their legal departments and various governing boards to determine if they want to adopt or not. This will provide the state to be the licensee if you will of the -- as far as the MOU holder, and they can grant that to respective counties and municipalities, etcetera. So this has a lot of help towards federal interoperability for joint operations with federal agencies. And we all know what the border channels use, so the LE and IR channels that are already licensed there to provide interoperability for counties, municipalities and federal government. So I just provided this information yesterday to Mike's office, and I'm sure by June we'll have more discussion on it, but it is in the process. It's another tool in the toolbox, if you will, coming down the road for interoperability. Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Chris. Any questions or comments for Chris?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Anything else for the good of the order?

MERKINGLER: Just two things. Just to give an update on the automated secure alarm code protocol. We made tremendous progress since our last meeting. We've done successful end-to-end testing where we passed test alarm codes through the entire network, through NCIC through the state switch all the way through our CASM in Monroe County. We went on to this past Friday the next step, which they call a stress test. We shipped through 13,000 alarms in a little over an hour. We did crash the state switch. So we -- but that is the point of the stress testing. So they're doing some changes to fix that. Whatever they do to fix that, I don't know, it's up to the IT people, but we're going to restress test this week. We're hoping to go live in February with Doyle will be the first, followed by ADT.

SPRAGUE: Excellent.

MERKINGLER: And just to recap from our panel discussion yesterday. We did have a chance yesterday to present at the Association of Counties two sessions related to NG9-1-1 and the work we're doing on this group with the state. Myself, Mike Allen and Brett Chellis were on the panel, and really this was about educating the local elected officials. They're all starting to hear about this a lot, but they still don't really know what it means. So we spent a lot of time just giving general background on educating them on the importance of all of us working together and working through on that state plan to get that plan in place and encouraging people not to go off on their own, to do it as part of the big picture. And I think it was very well received.

SPRAGUE: I agree with that. I was there to watch, and the people in the audience were picking up on – they were taking a lot of notes, I noticed that. In particular, I like what it is and what it isn't that you guys put out there. I think that helped a lot as far as some of the confusion of what NG9-1-1 really is. So I think that was very well received. Good job.

MERKINGLER: Thanks.

SPRAGUE: Any comments or anything for John?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Anything else for the good of the order?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I would like to thank everybody for coming. The sun is gone but it isn't snowing yet. And you can see from some of the stuff that's going on, it's been a busy few months here and I'm hoping that we get a little bit longer time in between this and the next meeting, but we still have as much to report out at the next meeting. So I really want to thank everybody that reported and all the information that was provided. So thank you very much. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

MERKINGLER: Motion.

SPRAGUE: Second?

BLEYLE: Second.

SPRAGUE: All those in favor?

ALL: Aye.

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: You're welcome to stay. Thank you.

* * * * *

(Whereupon, the Meeting was adjourned at 11:19 a.m.)

* * * * *

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, NORA B. LAMICA, Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of New York, do hereby CERTIFY that the foregoing record taken by me at the time and place noted in the heading hereof is a true and accurate transcript of same, to the best of my ability and belief.

Nora B. Lamica

NORA B. LAMICA

Dated: February 2, 2017