

**STATE INTEROPERABLE & EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION  
BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
JULY 12, 2017  
DHSES - Building 7A - First Floor Training Room**

**SPRAGUE:** I'd like to welcome everybody to our meeting of the SIEC board. We are in July, which is a month later than we planned on, but there was so much going on in June, we decided July would be a better time to report on everything. We had more meetings and more travel than I can ever remember in one month, so it was a pretty interesting month. So with that, I'm going to move right along. We may see the Commissioner this morning. He was going to stop down at some point, so I'd be happy to introduce him when he comes in. Joann, do you want to do the roll call.

**WAIDELICH:** Yes.

**Board Members Present:**

Michael Sprague  
Charles White  
Michael Primeau  
Robert Martz  
Kevin Wisely  
Todd Murray (by phone)  
Eric Day  
Joseph Gerace (by phone)  
Brian LaFlure  
James Voutour

**Board Members Absent:**

Col. James Freehart  
William Bleyle  
William Hall  
John Merklinger  
Kevin Revere  
Richard V. Tantalo  
Michael Volk

**Guests:**

Brett Chellis  
Matthew Delaney  
Jay Kopstein  
Christopher Tuttle  
Joann Waidelich

Toby Dusha  
David Kislowski  
Angelica Kang

**WAIDELICH:** We have quorum.

**SPRAGUE:** Very good. Thank you. A couple things. I know we're all very busy people, but if you would put your phones on stun, I'd appreciate it. If you need to take a call, please feel free to step out in the hallway. If we have an emergency for some reason, we'll go out here, this doorway, into the hallway, follow the hallway and meet out front in the meeting area, back past the cars where we wait for the fire apparatus to show up. Restrooms are just out across the hall. A couple of things. I'll just read some of the ground rules for the meeting. Board members attending by video conference shall constitute presence at such meetings for all purposes, including quorum. Participants 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 a quorum and not permitted to vote. Guests or persons having relevant knowledge or information may attend and speak as part of the agenda upon acceptance of the meeting agenda by the Board. Board members unable to attend in person by video conference, his or her designee may attend the meeting and vote on behalf of the members unless they are an appointee not representing a state agency. Just a reminder for those that on the phone, if you do speak, please announce who you are for the recording secretary over here so that she can keep track of your comments. Okay. I'd like to entertain a motion to adopt the agenda.

**LAFLURE:** Motion.

**SPRAGUE:** Motion by Brian.

**VOUTOUR:** And I'll second.

**SPRAGUE:** Second by James Voutour. Any discussion? (No response.)

**SPRAGUE:** All those in favor? (Affirmative responses.)

**SPRAGUE:** Anybody opposed? (No response.)

**SPRAGUE:** Carried. Moving on with the agenda. The first thing on the agenda. Sheriff Gerace with the Standing Committee Reports, 911 Advisory Committee.

**GERACE:** This is Sheriff Joe Gerace. No, we have nothing new to report.

**SPRAGUE:** Okay. Anything you want to add?

**CHELLIS:** No. The committee has not met since the last meeting.

**SPRAGUE:** We'll work on trying to move that forward by the next meeting in September. Thank you, Sheriff. NG 9-1-1 Working Group.

**CHELLIS:** The Next Generation 9-1-1 Working Group under the 911 Committee has continued to meet. We've been doing regular conference calls biweekly or every few weeks depending on the schedules. It's continuing to make progress. There have been a lot of report-outs and discussions from the different agencies on their efforts. One notable point on that is New York City has reported recently they have issued an RFP; it's on the street, for Next Generation 9-1-1 ESINet and core management services.

Down the road, they'll be issuing an RFP for the CPE equipment and the PSAPs; however, this is the first major step by the City towards implementing Next Generation 9-1-1. We continue to work and we've actually stepped up recently working on all the sections of the draft plan to present to the Deputy Commissioner when it's completed and it will be a draft for her to review. At this time, the working group, we're just breaking it down section by section starting to work on that, building on the mission statement that I presented at the last meeting. OIEC and Department of Public Service also continue to work on the legal and programmatic review of the 9-1-1 programs in both agencies and preparing information for the Deputy Commissioner for the Chamber. We continue to work on that aspect as well. I attended the National Association of State 9-1-1 Administrators' meeting in San Antonio from June 2nd to 4th. It's notable that this being their annual meeting, director Sprague and myself have been appointed as the state representatives and we're accepted in that role as the Executive Board. This is the first time since 2009 that New York State has been represented at NASNA, which is a big deal. That's a notable thing and they were very excited to have New York State at the table again having a representative and hearing our status and our projects and so on and so forth. So it was well received. Several of the states have new representatives and there are another state or two out there that had not been represented that have representation for the first time as well. So I think all but two states had representation at the meeting. It was a good chance to meet and network with the 9-1-1 administrators from the over 45 states that were represented. The presentations concluded. The FCC --the deputy chair of the FCC was there. There was a lot of information on FCC studies in terms of indoor accuracy, Z axis requirements, they're coming forth from FCC orders, and how that is being played out in the industry and some testing being done in Atlanta, Georgia and San Francisco areas on this technology and how it can relate to Next Generation 9-1-1 or even 9-1-1 as we see it today. There was presentation by the Department of Defense. Since the incidents at Fort Hood and in Tennessee, the active shooting incidents on military bases, they've been working with PSAPs around the country that have military facilities trying to -- they found in their after action reviews of these incidents like, for example, the Chattanooga, Tennessee incident, it took an hour and 40 minutes before the upper levels of the military were notified of this incident. That seems like a tremendous long time, and the reason is trying to get details, this, that and the other thing and the situation at hand just tying up resources. So they realized that 9-1-1 centers really have the finger on the pulse in any community. If something goes down in a community, it's the 9-1-1 center that is probably going to know first. And so, therefore, the military recognizing that is reaching out to the 9-1-1 centers that they would like within three to five minutes following dispatch of resources -- they realize you take the call on an active shooter, you have to get the facts, get response enroute. But within three to five minutes after that, they're provided phone numbers, they would like notification made to the Department of Defense in Washington so that they can activate their response network. The group saw this as expanding; you know, it's a great concept but it also can be a concept to be expanded beyond the military community. If something goes down in any community in the country involving terrorism, active

shooters, whatever, the 9-1-1 center is the pulse. If we can step up the notification there instead of the feds finding out through the media and what occurs with that, then we can help the entire security of the country. So there was a meeting there, both there and at the NENA conference, about this topic with the Department of Defense. That was very interesting. There was also a report on an interoperability project with four states with Next Generation 9-1-1 in the Midwest: North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota and Iowa. They're working together. They've got statewide ESINets in place and they're actually working on the interoperability factors between them. This is the first in the country. And it's a project that the National 9-1-1 program is sponsoring and helping fund to study this and figure out what are the factors involved and how do we get ESINets to be compatible and work together. They're built either from different vendors, you know, all following the NENA I3 standard but even with that, there are technical factors that have to be considered. Cyber security is a big topic everywhere now. It was a topic here as well. Cyber security and what it means to Next Generation 9-1-1. There was a presentation by FirstNet. One of the vice-presidents of AT&T was present, FirstNet's contractor. And they had a good meeting with the State 9-1-1 representatives. We did push them a lot about a letter that was submitted to FirstNet back in March that asked FirstNet to consider the interoperability factors with Next Generation 9-1-1. There's a lot of common factors that as FirstNet is rolled out nationwide, we should be taking into consideration, having to do -- you know, take it this way, that much of the media that's going to be put out over FirstNet to first responders is going to come in through a Next Generation 9-1-1 system, which will be pics, video, these type of things. So they come in through NextGen 9-1-1, they cross the PSAP, they go out through FirstNet. There's compatibility things, interoperability. It may be possible to use sharing resources, sharing equipment, technology, cyber security. You know, if one side is building border control and all this for Next Generation, there are issues on the FirstNet side with that. It should be compatible. There are a number of issues where they're asking FirstNet to sit at the table with NASNA and, it turns out, NENA also to address some of these issues as we deploy and design the FirstNet system to keep NextGen in mind throughout. Under the National 9-1-1 program's report, they reported that 10 states now have full ESINets statewide rolled out, and have all their PSAPs connected to it. There are 10 states that have some of their PSAPs connected to the ESINet. For example, that would be Iowa where they built one in all wireless PSAPs, they now got all wireless 9-1-1 onto ESINet; however, their legacy 9-1-1 routers and all that are not. They're still standing alone in the legacy. They have not yet connected them through the gateway. Then, moving on, I went to the NENA conference June 4<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup>. It was an annual conference, also in San Antonio. They scheduled them together back to back so I went to both. There was a number of representation. There was a good regional breakfast with all the northeastern states where we could talk about issues and so on just in the northeast. It was a good opportunity. Some of the things were repeated from what we had in NASNA but with a bigger audience. There were some good sessions on legislative changes to support Next Generation 9-1-1, governance and funding for Next Generation 9-1-1, the

implementation models. The Four State ESINet Interoperability Project. Talked a lot about Internet of Things, Next Generation 9-1-1. You know, is your clothes dryer going to dial 9-1-1 automatically to report it's on fire and how is that processed? These things are all like right on the edge of technology and are being developed or already developed. Again, cyber security and a number of sessions on NextGen case studies. Any questions? (No response.)

**CHELLIS:** Okay.

**SPRAGUE:** Thank you, Brett. I'd like to take a moment to recognize our Commissioner. Commissioner Roger Parrino, Sr., just stepped in for a few minutes. He's got to go to the Chamber in a little bit, but we're very excited to have him on board and to have him stop in and be part of our meeting.

**PARRINO:** Thank you.

**SPRAGUE:** One other thing I neglected to do is to decide to approve the minutes. I kind of breezed by that one. Do I have a motion to approve them?

**DAY:** Motion.

**LAFLURE:** Second.

**SPRAGUE:** Motion made by Eric and seconded by Brian. Any discussion? Any edits? (No response.)

**SPRAGUE:** All those in favor? (Affirmative responses.)

**SPRAGUE:** Anyone opposed? (No response.)

**SPRAGUE:** Carried. Thank you. Okay. Communications and Interoperability Working Group.

**KOPSTEIN:** Good morning. I'm going to cover two items. First, the State Communications meeting in San Antonio, the director was also there. APCO is looking to do a project on broadband impact for the PSAPs. We're expanding or looking to expand the curriculum for COM-U. SAFECOM is creating the 9-1-1 Working Group and a website working group for SAFECOM. AES 256 is now going to be the nationwide standard for encryption. Matt is going to talk about the state plan, so I'll skip that. There was a very, very interesting comment made by one of the executives from FirstNet when she was asked about LTE and FirstNet. The question was: "When will LTE replace LMR?" The answer: "I don't know about LTE replacing LMR, if ever." That was the official answer from FirstNet. So take that for what it's worth. Currently, AT&T does not have built-in redundancy in many locations. They are, however, saying on their LTE network, they will have push-to-talk by the end of the year but it's not device to device. It's through the system, similar to what we had with Nextel. Going back to COM-U, it's got to be expanded to include IT, social media, video and drone feeds. Any questions so far? (No response.)

**KOPSTEIN:** Okay. We'll move along then. I was at the PSCR in San Antonio in June. Very, very interesting meeting. As a little divergence, Tony Catalanotto and I, and Tony is a member of the CIWG, were both given awards for tower design; Tony for the elevation and I for camouflaging a tower so people don't know what it is. All right. Band-14 devices. AT&T says they will be coming out and they will be again push-to-talk available across the spectrum for everybody and that will be a feature that they will sell

to their commercial market as well. They're looking for in-vehicle repeaters so that somebody carrying an LTE device that's on Band-14, a FirstNet device, can actually get back to a tower. Matt is going to talk about priority and the like. I'm not going to step on his parade. However, preemption requires LTE first. Secondly, there are some issues on who gets priority. FirstNet was saying police, fire, EMS. In some states, fire and rescue are separate agencies, so they have to be included. We had other people complaining, well, I should be in the top tier because I'm the system manager. Yeah, but you're probably not going to be at the scene of an incident. So that's kind of up in the air on who's got top tier access. One of the items that came up was using fire department ladders to put devices on to get penetration at upper level floors. We're looking at location-based services using GPS. The device that the GPS fits and then as you go into a building and you no longer have GPS access but there's a little gyroscope in the device to kind of track where you are. That's one of the things they're looking at. Again, looking at the device having access to an SCBA tank to tell an incident commander or a safety officer when somebody's tank is running low. Using inertial tracking devices and magnetic anomaly sensors and devices to find out where you are inside a building, perhaps. Using police radio cars, ambulances, et cetera, light poles in order to get better connectivity to devices. Having a device with automatic access to local Wi-Fi networks, again, to get connectivity. All of the devices will have a secondary use as a repeater. So if you can't hear the tower, the guy 500 yards behind you may be able to, so your device will talk to his device and then get to a tower. One other item and this is something that I have a problem with and I think most of the people here would have a problem with; they were talking about tracking people using breadcrumbs. So if you're having an incident in the Catskill State Park or in the Adirondack State Park where towers aren't many, somebody would come in and as soon as their device would say they're starting to lose connectivity, he'd drop a device on the ground or hook it up to a tree and use that as a repeater and then continue. And people would use these breadcrumbs as they did their search and maybe on your way out, they would pick them up and maybe not. And when I questioned the expense, the answer I got was, well, they're only going to be \$150 to \$200 a piece and that an agency can absorb that cost. And my answer was maybe the federal government can absorb that cost, but local agencies can't absorb a cost of a thousand dollars or two thousand dollars every time they go out for a lost child or a lost hiker. Questions? (Affirmative response.)

**KOPSTEIN:** Yes, ma'am.

**KANG:** Going back to when you were discussing the priority for public safety entities, you said that there was a discussion about whether somebody would be at the scene of the incident. Was that said by FirstNet or was that just part of the conversation?

**KOPSTEIN:** It was part of the conversation. If you have an incident, you have a cellular sector that covers that incident. You might have two cellular sectors. If it's a particularly heavy incident, you start to put a load on it. Somebody managing the system 200 miles away, their priority is irrelevant if they're not within that sector.

**KANG:** Right, I understand that. So I'm just trying to make sure that FirstNet wasn't trying to convey a certain standard that they would prioritize people based on likelihood

of presence. They didn't say anything like that?

**KOPSTEIN:** No. The FirstNet standard as described was the top tier of first responders.

**KANG:** Okay.

**KOPSTEIN:** Police, fire, including rescue, and EMS.

**KANG:** Thank you.

**VOUTOUR:** That most likely is in the AT&T RFP as well, I would assume.

**KOPSTEIN:** Well, AT&T is building the system. The management of the system is by FirstNet and local directive. And it's really a locality or a state that defines to some extent what a first responder or an emergency responder is. In New York State, the Vehicle & Traffic Law in some cases defines what a first responder is by virtue of the fact that you can use lights and sirens.

**SPRAGUE:** Matt will get more into this as we get into FirstNet.

**KOPSTEIN:** Anybody else? (No response.)

**KOPSTEIN:** Thank you.

**SPRAGUE:** Thanks, Jay. Matt, you're up.

**DELANEY:** Good morning, everyone. I will talk a little bit about where we're at currently with public safety broadband and FirstNet. A lot has been going on right now. But just a quick overview, just a reminder of how we got to this point so far. So 2012, Congress passed a law creating the national public safety broadband network. From 2012 to 2016, FirstNet consulted with the states and other public safety users to develop their RFP. Federal RFP was issued in early 2016. Reviewed through 2016. There was a brief federal court legal challenge. FirstNet awarded a nationwide partnership back at the end of March to AT&T; I think we all know now. So that really kicked off the real time-sensitive work. Basically, the RFP that FirstNet issued required their partner, which is AT&T, to issue a state plan to every state within six months of that award. So that's by September. Then, the Governor had 90 days to make the decision, so that set some pretty strict times on it, so eventually, it ends in December. So we attended a meeting in Dallas last month that brought together all the states to go through sort of the AT&T plan at a high level and some of the stuff going forward, talk about the state plan review. We received our draft state plan, which they're now calling initial state plan, on June 19th. That does not start the 90-day clock. That is simply for us to review and provide some comment on. So the plan describes how FirstNet/AT&T would build the network in New York, what the coverage would be, monthly subscriptions, eligible users, and so forth. So there are certain things that are in the plan that are nationwide. Things like the eligible users, policies and network design are the same in every state, we presume. I mean, we haven't seen the other state plans, but we presume they are based on our discussions. There are other things that are specific to New York, such as coverage. Every state, obviously, coverage is a need for every state. Some states have AT&T third-party partners. States like New York; it's entirely AT&T corporate networks. There are no roaming partners. So that varies some from state to state. But they will offer priority service as soon as a state opts in on their existing network. So when FirstNet was going through all their planning for years and

released the RFP and so forth, the assumption would be that the network would be built sort of from the ground up, there would be sites you go in, you start adding coverage, you get priority on those and you build the sites out. What AT&T did in their proposal, which FirstNet awarded, was they said, "We have the existing network. We'll offer priority preemption on our network from the beginning and then add Band-14, the public safety broadband band, on top of that for additional capacity. "What this means is that a state that accepts the AT&T proposal doesn't need to wait for Band-14 to build out and have priority on the existing network. So as Jay was mentioning, what are some of those questions about priority? And you know, the plan describes in very general terms what users are primary and there are a couple categories of users. It depends. The range of users that can be a FirstNet user are pretty wide. The difference is do they receive priority, just priority, or do they receive priority and also have the ability to preempt? What that means is in the ability to preempt is you actually can kick somebody else off the network, essentially take what remaining there is and take it and bump somebody off if you need to; whereas, everybody else who's an eligible FirstNet user, which is a pretty large range of basically defined as commercial user involved in the protection of public safety, can get priority. So you can get priority use of the network above the regular commercial user. But it only affects a particular sector of a particular cell site. So if you have two incidents on opposite sides of the city that are served by different cell sites, priority preemptions don't come into play. It's only when you are on a particular sector, and every cell site traditionally has three sectors, they point out 120 degrees apart in different directions from that tower, everybody in that incident is contained in one of those, that the whole sector is becoming overloaded by that public safety or that commercial use that you now have priority preemption. Priority means that the commercial user here is getting loaded; you have access to network over them. Preemption means you have access over those that also have the priority. So if it's really, really getting loaded, you can actually start bumping those people off the network. The other place it does come into play is if there are major outages where you start losing cell sites, start going down off the network and you have the same number of people on less sites, because all cellular networks are built so that they're -- some of the sites are just providing coverage and others are providing capacity, so they're adding additional bandwidth to the network. So if you start losing some of those, priority allows the public safety users to get the remaining use of that network that's left. So we're still going through all this. I can't talk unfortunately in extensive detail here, because the state plan portal is protected by a Terms of Use agreement. Essentially, AT&T and FirstNet require everyone who views the state plan to sign a Terms of Use and our DHSES Legal has also put an NDA and conflict of interest statement together. So that anyone who is reviewing the plan and viewing the portal have to agree to that Nondisclosure Agreement and also agree to FirstNet Terms of Use, which basically says you won't disclose it, you'll only use information in furtherance of the Governor's decision. So there's a lot of detail there we can't talk about, but we do have a group of about 45 individuals who have agreed to the Terms of Use or have signed an NDA and conflict of interest statement who are evaluating the

plan and will help us make our final recommendation to the Governor. What we're looking at right now is just the initial plan. We're providing comments back to FirstNet and then they will take those and provide the final state plan, which is the one that the Governor will make a decision on. So just a quick timeline here. We are currently in this July time frame of the initial state plan being reviewed by the state. By the beginning of August, we're going to provide back our comments on that state plan to FirstNet. FirstNet/AT&T are going to take that, evaluate all those comments and determine what needs to be changed based on our comments. And then probably in September time frame, potentially earlier depending how long they take to review the comments, they will release the final state plan. That is sort of the lockdown version that will be delivered officially to every state and the Governor will have 90 days to make a decision on whether to accept it or reject it. Then, the opt-in decision will be 90 days after that. So if it is, indeed, September, delivery will be in December. What that means is the state opts in, they accept the AT&T and FirstNet plan. AT&T and FirstNet build the network in that particular state at no cost to the state. There's no requirement to subscribe. So you can have them build the network and not use it if you choose to or you can have them build the network and use it. It's the individual agencies' choice. If the state decides "I don't like the plan, I'm going to do better", you can opt out, which means you rejected the official FirstNet plan and you decided you want to try to build your own. You then have to conduct procurement and provide the outcome of that procurement, basically, like a review and application, to the FCC, NCI and FirstNet and they all have to approve the plan. If they all approve that state's plan, then the state can build their own network. If they don't approve it, then it basically falls back to the FirstNet original state plan. There is a lot more detail in there, but that's essentially what happens. So just a summary of timeline. We're currently in the review of the initial plan. Final plan in September-October. Then, we provide a report based on that plan to the Governor, you know, the current plan. We do that in November if delivery happens in September. Then, the Governor would make that decision in December, that decision to opt in or opt out. Actually, there's a third option, which is same as opt in, which is you make no decision, you let the clock run out, the 90 days run out. You don't make any decision and the state is opted in. Again, there's no cost to the state if you opt in and you don't have to subscribe to that service. Any questions?

**VOUTOUR:** Matt, Virginia opted in already. It looks like Wyoming has opted in.

**DELANEY:** I didn't hear about Wyoming. Virginia announced two days ago that they liked the initial plan and they were opting in. They had a signing ceremony at FirstNet headquarters yesterday opting into the Virginia State plan. I had not heard about Wyoming.

**VOUTOUR:** Yes, Wyoming just did yesterday. Not that we can speed this up, but does it hurt if we come in, say, 25th as far as the system being built? Would Virginia's be built first? Will we end up waiting years because we opted in late?

**DELANEY:** So there are certainly things that happen at the national level that have to happen regardless of any order of state opting in, things like the FirstNet core, AT&T having to add that preemption service. So the priority will be available as soon as you

opt in. Preemption won't be available probably til around the beginning of the year, because they have to bring up their FirstNet core; basically, their LTE core for FirstNet, which is what allows them to offer the priority service. Other things are state by state. So the priority and then the preemption on the existing network can happen with the AT&T network. There's coverage from AT&T today. AT&T has indicated that they will continue their commercial investment in every state just the same as they do when any cellular network provider builds out their network, continues to expand the network or add coverage and capacity, they would regardless of whether a state opted in or opted out. There would be additional sites they will likely build in every state to sort of satisfy the needs of that state for FirstNet. So every state during that 2012-2016 period provided areas they wanted to have covered. New York provided that, the working group and others who worked on that in 2015 and revised it in 2016. We provided that. So they will take that and add sites to cover specific areas they wouldn't do commercially but would do because the state asked for it if the state opts in. Would that happen -- going to your question, though, would that happen sooner or later in a state depending on what order you opt in? You know, that's kind of -- you know, AT&T and FirstNet have said, especially AT&T, has said, "Hey, you opt in sooner, the sooner you opt in, the sooner we'll come in and build those sites and we'll upgrade our sites, we'll add Band-14." There's some of that. I think at least some states, I think New York is probably one of them, we're a large state with a lot of consumers, you know, a lot of necessary for bandwidth, you know, use in specific areas of the state, I think they would probably not necessarily treat it in a truly linear order and say, okay, first state to opt in gets everything first, then second or third. I think they would probably prioritize some as well. Once a state opts in, if they opt in, like Virginia or Wyoming, they can start adding Band-14 today. They can start building those sites today if they choose to. But just because you're 25th to opt in doesn't necessarily mean you have to wait for the first 24 before they get to 25. I think there's probably some delay. Certainly, they can't do anything, add in sites and add the bandwidth until the state opts in. That is a hard start date. But that doesn't necessarily mean if you're 25th to opt in that you're going to have to wait for the first 24 to be done first. Any other questions?

**WHITE:** Matt, there's no plan right now or any pricing yet for the end user equipment?

**DELANEY:** For the equipment or the service?

**WHITE:** Well, either one, I guess. Because to migrate AT&T from our current wireless platforms, you have to put modems in the car and then submit a plan from the state as to how to support this, because that's going to be --you know, we've got, you know, 3,500 vehicles.

**DELANEY:** So even if a state opts in, there's no requirement to switch. You can stay with your current provider if a state opts in. Obviously, you can't take advantage of the FirstNet quality of service and priority preemption if you don't use the FirstNet service if you opt in. But in terms of the plan for service pricing are in the state plan portal. Unfortunately, because of the Terms of Use, I can't tell you what --**WHITE:** It's understood.

**DELANEY:** -- the values are, but they are in there. FirstNet and AT&T have said that

those rates are and need to be competitive to traditional government contract pricing that exists today, you know, and AT&T is on existing contracts for services today. Their intent is to update the price list, add the FirstNet service, the FirstNet device and the FirstNet data plan services to that OGS contract as well as the national buying contract as well and GSA and so forth. Device pricing is not in there. I can tell you that there's really a variety, a real variety. So you can get the rugged public safety device, you know, the Sonim and so forth, the harden devices. They're going to be more expensive just by the nature of the fact that they're more rugged devices and there are less of them made, so there's less volume, so prices are higher. But you can use the traditional consumer type, your iPhone's and your Galaxy's and so forth, too, can be used on priority preemption. So those prices should be in line with what you pay today for those types of devices on a traditional state contract buying plan, because they are the same device. The difference is it just has a FirstNet SIM instead of an AT&T consumer network SIM card. The device itself is the same. AT&T said that they want to add Band-14. They want to get all of these device manufacturers like Apple, Samsung and so forth to put Band-14 in their devices. So your future iPhone 9 might have Band-14 in it. But that isn't necessary to use the services. A FirstNet user will still get priority preemption on the AT&T network in their other bands, so the bands that are out there today, Band-14, will still have priority preemption on it. So the pricing, I think, for a traditional, you know, device that you would be able to buy today would probably be pretty similar to what you pay today. Certain sort of unique type of devices may be more expensive simply by the nature that they're more unique and there's less volume. But if you pay a thousand dollars for a 4G LTE trunk modem today, I think you're probably going to spend about a thousand dollars for that device as a FirstNet. I can't say for certain, but that would be my expectation. Similar device, pricing would be similar.

**WHITE:** But it's a migration.

**DELANEY:** Right.

**WHITE:** My point is that the state is moving toward a statewide migration to support FirstNet. That's going to be an expenditure or investment that's going to have to be made on some of that end user equipment.

**DELANEY:** So that will have to be something after the opt-in/opt-out decision, the state will have to decide: What's the migration plan? Are agencies going to migrate all at once? Are you going to migrate over time? Are there going to be special incentives for agencies to migrate from AT&T and FirstNet? I'm not saying they are or, you know, but are they going to offer some sort of trade-in deal or something or a special, you know, include a device to get you to switch? Who knows? They could. But that's something that going to be made on an agency by agency or an enterprise basis. It might be sort of an ITS decision, you know, we're going to -- as a state enterprise, we're going to move all public safety eligible customers to FirstNet and AT&T. That decision is going to have to be made in the future. Is it done at once or over time? Some of that -- we don't know the details on how some of that application is actually going to be made work. Are you going to be able to have some users on one and some on another for a

period of time? Some of those questions will have to come out over time in the future. But that is somewhat independent of opt-in/opt-out simply because if you opt in, you don't have to make that change. Just like if you opt out, depending on who your provider is opting out, you may have the same question.

**WISELY:** That's a good point. That's the point is opt in or opt out, FirstNet opting in, opting out is a separate thing from us than the state agencies making a decision on whether we're going to utilize and leverage the system. They are two separate things. Certainly, from the state's perspective, we're going to have to take a hard look at that and make a determination on whether we just do it by agency by agency or, hopefully, more of an enterprise approach to the public safety network we have in the state.

**WHITE:** I think when we get to that point, for the benefit of the agency or entity that's controlling that procurement, I think having that information, being able to get with DOB so we've got the mechanism to be able to support that, there's a little bit of fragmentation between agencies purchasing end user equipment, ITS supporting it or purchasing it, I think if we can work toward continuing to get some continuity there from both a financial support and then from the technical support and then a procurement process, I think that makes things a lot easier for all the agencies.

**DELANEY:** FirstNet.gov is the FirstNet government page. It has details of the network, it has their board announcement. When they launched the state plan portal which is restricted, they also launched FirstNet.com, which is sort of like a public facing website that will have the pricing on it. It does not today. They have not released that publicly. That will be where pricing will be available, service plans, device information. There is a coverage viewer, it's not as detailed as the one available in the state plan, but there is a coverage viewer. I think over time, they're going to expand that. A lot of questions about device availability and the plan will get on FirstNet.com, because the intent is where the public safety entity can go to and look at, you know, do their shopping so to speak like they might do on a commercial cellular carrier website today. And of course, with OGS, the price list and stuff, that will be a lot of where the details will be as well. I think Chris had something on this.

**TUTTLE:** So two things on this discussion. Good discussion. And recognizing the terms and conditions of pricing can't be released because of the Nondisclosure Agreement, I think we also need to be aware that once those are released publicly, the other commercial vendors are going to come out with their own pricing plans, and priority and preemption from them as well. So there will be a lot of homework that has to be done by each individual agency, each state, prior to actually going out and buying and subscribing. When you opt in is when you actually start spending the money. The bottom line is it's a win for public safety. When we have commercial vendors getting the best prices and providing the best service, we win. It's a matter of what we feel as an individual agency works best for us. To that point, FirstNet is piped. You're getting connectivity. What's going on that pipe is going to depend on each agency. Are you buying apps? Are you downloading free apps? We don't know what that looks like yet. Furthermore, interoperability is defined basically as the method of communicating to each of the devices. If we opt in as a state but not every agency opts in, then obviously,

agencies aren't interoperable. I'm sorry, change it to subscribed. Then, it's not interoperable. So unless every agency actually has a device on Band-14, FirstNet, it's not an interoperable network. Same thing with VTAC, UTAC, 8TAC, you know, if you don't program the radio channels, you're not interoperable. So kind of keep that in mind. It's a means to an end. You're getting an option; how is it going to be utilized.

**DELANEY:** I wanted to comment on one thing you said about if you don't utilize the network, you're not interoperable, I think you said, right? That's actually a good question. We had been wondering and sort of posed back is what applications and what services would be interoperable between users who are using FirstNet and not using FirstNet? Because certain things would have to be contained within the FirstNet core so to speak because of the way they operate, certain features. But other things can be data. And why can we not with the appropriate security and subscriptions have it transverse to be provided on another platform by another carrier? So just like you go to a website, you go to a website today and you may have Charter Internet service at home but they're not hosting a website you're going to, that's hosted on the Internet in the Cloud somewhere, so why can't data be interoperable from first responders as well? Just because your transport mechanism is FirstNet, the data being stored by someone else somewhere else, can you get to that? Is it a closed network? Is it open to you? Does it depend if you buy a particular application from FirstNet? It may be closed, but if you want to buy your third-party and use it on FirstNet, can you? Can you share the data and so forth? Those are a lot of questions that are really still up in the air that we've been asking.

**SPRAGUE:** I think this is really -- it's still a moving target, very much so. We've not really seen the final of what this thing is going to look like. But you know, there's a lot of things to take into consideration, because just the pure fact of being able to purchase it, it's not an OGS contract yet. Even though they're going to modify it, we don't know when that's going to actually happen. The coverage is not statewide yet. So as a state agency, for us to move, we really have to take a long hard look at that, because for state police, you could have multiple units having to use different vendors in order to be able to get the coverage. So there are a lot of things that's going to have to be in the consideration. The kind of rush to opt in or opt out, whichever way you want to look at it, really doesn't have anything to do with this piece of it. Even if other states are going to opt in today, there's no way you're going to touch it for six months to a year at a minimum before you can even start to use it. So it's kind of interesting. Jay.

**KOPSTEIN:** FirstNet is the medium to transfer the data. FirstNet is not going to store or own the data. That's come up numerous times. The issue is who owns the data and what control do they have of that data once the data hits the transfer medium?

Because different states have their own rules controlling what part of the data is public, what can be used generally and what can only be used for criminal investigation, and that's covered by individual state law. That issue has not been ironed out yet. It will be ironed out, hopefully, under ICAM, which is credentialing and management of data.

**SPRAGUE:** That's a good point, Jay. Anything else for Matt?

(No response.)

**SPRAGUE:** Anything else you want to add, Matt?

**DELANEY:** No. Thank you very much. Hopefully, we will have a lot more details on the exact timeline and – when is the next meeting?

**SPRAGUE:** September.

**DELANEY:** So we may have it released by then.**SPRAGUE:** Thanks, Matt. Stay tuned. State Agency Communications Working Group. I've just got a couple of things for that. We did meet in May. One of the things we talked about really was the symposium. We talked about the attendance and some of the discussions at the symposium and where the counties are going and how the states are trying to up where the counties are going. There was CASM training during the symposium, a lot of people got some training in it, some of the state agencies and we're trying to look at how we can update the state agencies input in CASM. We talked about the FCC comments that we put in regarding the proposed rules that the FCC had out for comment on air transport in Canada. We actually saw some of that during the Can-US meeting as well. We came out and had some very strong comments about that. What they're proposing to do is use 700 frequencies. We don't have a lot of 700 frequencies available. Then, they showed a coverage, an outline coverage map, primary and secondary coverage, that the secondary coverage extended almost to New York City. So it would literally impact all of the state. We sent some comments in on that. I haven't heard any more back from that. We also are working on the MOU for the federal interoperability channels and trying to push that forward. We talked about that and we have the MOU approved from legal on our side. So we're in the process of pushing that back to the feds to get that in place. That was about it. Anybody else have anything else that was at the meeting that you remember that I didn't? (No response.)

**SPRAGUE:** Okay. Channel Naming and Use Working Group.

**DELANEY:** I don't think we have anything updated unless anyone has any questions.

**SPRAGUE:** Any questions for Matt or Toby? (No response.)

**DELANEY:** I'll just give my usual: Please remember leave your inter-op repeaters turned down or off mode if you're not using them. There are still many around the state that are on.

**SPRAGUE:** We are checking.

**DELANEY:** We will knock on your door.

**SPRAGUE:** Okay. Citizen Alerting Committee. Just a brief update on that. That was really brief. We had a meeting in March. We talked about several things. We had IPAWS updates, training in the IPAWS laboratory, discussion. FEMA actually came in and talked to us at length about that process. They promise to have the laboratory available to us to test with. The interesting part about that is we actually did a test yesterday. After we postponed last week, we actually did an IPAWS test. And in the testing environment, you can go in and actually fill out form, make little boxes, shapes, polygon boxes and then actually select the different levels of testing that you want to do and hit the send button without it going out, which was always a huge scare. Because prior to that, the only way you could do it is put it all together, press it but try not to hit that button, because if you did, it went out. We did have a couple issues with the

software about two weeks ago in use where it was apparently not installed properly; it wouldn't let them do polygons. So we had to go to the help desk on that and we finally got to the point where we could do this laboratory. The nice part of it is it actually -- in the laboratory, you can actually log into their website at the laboratory and see what it's producing and how it goes through the system. We're also doing it through New York Responds, that's how we're set up, and New York Responds polls that data and actually sends that back to us as well in an e-mail. So it was pretty interesting to look at that and actually see how that works. There's a number of different drop-down boxes and stuff. It's fairly simple, but one little mistake and, you know, you have a problem. It also is limited to 90 characters. So if you're 140, but by the time you get done with your headers and your finishers and everything, you've got 90 characters to try to put a message together. So that's one of the things that need to be remembered. I think we tried to use it, the state police, at the WEA they wanted to be sent out in Greene County or down in that Catskill area and we ran into some issues with that. Trying to get that message into 90 characters was a real challenge. So what I'd like to see us do is do a lot more testing with it on a regular basis. I'd like to see regular shifts go through that on the test side of it so that the day you need to get into it, it's not foreign to you. We also went through and looked at what it looks like on the live side, which is identical, literally. The one minor detail is that the send button is right next to the cancel button, but you can just X out of it over here and they chose to X out over here so you didn't accidentally hit that send button. But other than that, to me, that's a big step to be able to actually work through that. That's the first time that I know of that we've been able to do any sort of almost live testing. So we can try that with some of the county stuff once we get a better feel for it, I think, as to how it's going to go. So the watch center staff will be getting more training on it and I'd like to see it used more often just to see how it goes.

**DAY:** Do you have a sense of how many counties have IPAWS access at the county level?

**SPRAGUE:** I knew that number. I can't tell you what it is off the top of my head. There are quite a few that do at this point. I think our goal eventually is to get everybody to be able to use that system. It's really pretty simple, the user format, especially now that you can do testing. We need to make sure that the test lab is able to accept volumes we might produce but, at the same time, you know, it would be great if you guys had access to it to be able to go into the test side of the world and generate those things on a regular basis. You could actually, theoretically, and this would take some coordination with the CMI folks, you could move your retired monthly testing or something. That's probably the next step. But yeah, this is a huge step forward. They've been promising this for years, so actually being able to get into it is a big step forward. Our next meeting is next week, so we'll be talking more about this. Just have to keep moving forward with that. Any questions?

**JAY:** When a county does an IPAWS message within that county, it's downward; is that correct?

**SPRAGUE:** Yes. That's the area they control, yes.

**JAY:** Does watch command automatically get a copy of every IPAWS message that goes out so that watch command knows what's going out?

**SPRAGUE:** I can't answer that. I would have to check with John and see what the feedback is. And I'm thinking the watch center from our perspective.

**JAY:** That's what I'm talking about. In case, for example, you get a phone call, "What's going on?" They sent a message out. You don't want to be in the position of not knowing the message went out?

**SPRAGUE:** Right, right. I think that happens, but I can't swear by that without double checking.

**DAY:** In the New York Alert, if you select some of the other routes for pushing stuff out, I think the watch center gets copies of those. I don't know about --

**SPRAGUE:** Right, yeah. On the IPAWS side, I can't -- a lot of it depends, you know, some people are using New York Alert; some people are actually using IPAWS, if they got it through New York Responds or they may have it through another vendor that they're doing it. Red Alert or somebody like that may actually be supporting it as well. I don't know if it's consistent across the board that way.

**JAY:** Thank you.

**SPRAGUE:** Any other questions?

(No response.)

**SPRAGUE:** One thing I did forget; New York City is going to come up for the next meeting and actually do a presentation on their system. So we have a good idea of what their system is and also how we can make sure they're all tied together. Okay. PSAP grants and SICG grants. Larissa wasn't able to be here today, but I'm going to do it for you. So literally, we've got \$340 million in awards so far since 2010. The thing that stands out really is the reimbursement in green. For most of the grants, we're getting up there as far as what has actually been paid out. We eventually want to see these all come out to even, but the PSAP grants, we're very close on several of those. A little bit of change out there but not much. This is our spending overview on Rounds 3, 4, the '16 PSAP, '17 PSAP and the '16 formula grant. The formula grant, this is where we are right now, we've got 29 contracts actually executed, 14 are pending state approval, 15 pending county signatures, and 2 pending some contract development. It's been a little slow getting some of the actual budgets developed for the states for some of the counties, but that's where we are in a nutshell with that. We're doing pretty well on most of the PSAP grants. We still have some that are out there hanging that we need to tie up. We stress every time we go to meetings, we need to spend that money. So these are the different grant periods. Round 1 is obviously closed. PSAP operation is closed for '16, '17 and one of the things that Larissa puts in there is there's no extensions. So we have that time frame, and that's it. Any questions on where we are with some of these? (No response.)

**SPRAGUE:** The next round of grants. Right now, the SICG formula, what we're doing is we're making some changes to simplify the application form. There was some question about some of the terms that we had in there, the types of -- we were looking for inter-op channels and federal inter-op channels. We got some interesting responses

back of channels that weren't federal inter-op, they were other inter-op. So we're trying to clarify some of that. There's no changes proposed to the formula, so it's going to remain pretty much where it was last year. The targeted grant, we've got all the information right now. We're sitting and trying to determine -- we've got a listing of the counties and we're going to start reaching out to the counties to make those determinations and awards, put it that way. So the '17-'18 PSAP grant, again, work through some of the precise definitions. We had a working group that came back. We asked questions. They gave us some feedback on where the terms should go to and so we've tried to clarify some of that. And so right now, those things are being reviewed. We've got them all put together. We're just in the process of going through the reviews and then we'll get them out the door very shortly. And again, we're trying to get them out there so that we can make sure that it impacts the county budgets in a timely fashion. So we know you're just about at that point where you got to have those numbers. Any questions on any of that?

(No response.)

**SPRAGUE:** Okay, very good. Next, the Canada-US meeting, we went out and attended in Buffalo. That was about three weeks ago. Everything kind of blurs together. I'm going to do part of this and then Chris Tuttle is going to finish up the end part and tell us what really happened. It was an interesting meeting. There was a lot of attendance there from our area and from other states. There was really good interaction back and forth. Dusty Rhoads is the new co-chair of this group and it was his chance to get an idea of what discussion was going on and how this group worked and what kinds of issues were hanging out there. So basically, it was cross border interoperability. There was different -- New York State, obviously, province of Ontario did some discussion, and then there was cross border, mutual aid was on the agenda as well. US-Canada migration towards NG911 was one of the topics that were talked about. That was actually pretty interesting. They have a timeline that they've actually put in place for this to happen and that was kind of interesting. FirstNet was there talking about FirstNet and then they had Canada's public safety broadband network. They are converging towards what we're doing in the US. Initially, they only had 10 megahertz of spectrum set aside and they just recently have changed that to 20 megahertz, so now it coincides more with what's going on in the states. Border region frequency coordination, there was a whole discussion on that issue. FCC was there talk about it as well. The Can-US Law Enforcement Communication Interoperability, there was presentation on that. Tribal Nation Communications Interoperability case study. The folks up along the border with the *Akwesasne* came and did a presentation about how they work across the border continuously and what their communications are and how they're improving their communications, which actually is pretty interesting. They're about to start coming off the reservation to assist local law enforcement. One of the things they were talking about is that they -- and this, I think, was at some of the push of Dusty having realized that there's a lot of outstanding issues that need to be handled in this arena is he'd like to see it go to four meetings a year as opposed to two meetings a year. So they were doing two in person and they're talking about doing two

teleconference meetings which, to me, that sounds like a great idea. Deputy Commissioner Wisely and I presented this quick presentation to the group and, you know, we just highlighted our situation. We're not going to read this all for you, but basically, it shows 30 of our 57 counties, so a good portion, are impacted with it. We have a lot of work to be done and why we're trying to go that way, some of our partnerships. We showed the line A in graphic format so you can kind of see what it really does to us. We talked about our grant program and the fact that one of the things from our formula-based grant, we can pull a lot of information from there and see that we're doing a pretty good job, we put a lot of money into communications interoperability, but where we're really falling down is we cannot affect that line A zone. It's really hurting us and it shows very easily. One of the things that was nice to say is we've got 25 million dollars to spend tomorrow. The problem is if I spend it in certain areas, I can't spend it. Counties cannot implement it, because this program, this project, the whole line A thing will not allow it and we need help to fix that or -- you know, we're not asking for their money. We're just asking for their help. We put a couple of things in there to show where we do have VCALL10 and UCALL40 and it really kind of shows right off the bat. We actually had a slide that showed our proposed stuff. We didn't put that in, because we didn't want that published, but where our proposed upgrades are going to be and it still showed it. So we really are trying to promote standardization and alignment of US national interoperability channels, a working group, something that is down here more on draft level that's looking at these issues that they can make recommendations to the folks in Ottawa and Washington, is really kind of what we're proposing. So with that, I'm going to turn it over to my esteemed friend.

**TUTTLE:** So I'm going to try to not belabor this too much from points that Mike brought up, but there will be a summary coming out of the meeting shortly that will be distributed to everybody. For those of you don't know, Canada and the United States, across the border, worked with co-chairs and our office, Department of Homeland Security, Office of Emergency Communications. It is a continuing effort actually that came under a trade agreement and the interoperability and emergency management compact part of the discussion. As Mike said, some of the high level issues that came up was Canada increased their sense of urgency to move forward with the public safety broadband build-out and to make sure it's aligned with FirstNet. They provided update on their NG 9-1-1 capabilities. There is an agreement that further collaboration is needed as it pertains to the border. Anyone who knows the border is you have 9-1-1 handoffs that might originate in the United States, then it goes through Canadian PSAP, then it gets messed up by the time you get it brought back. Problems in Ontario, the EMS provided a case study explaining communication transportation across border, hospitals, local, Canadian, then stateside. And while that's something that those who operate along the border are very familiar with, it really highlighted the need for discussion on the importance of public safety broadband along the border for EMS and also LMR. I think the overarching thing that came out of this meeting for me, and those of you who know me know I've been kind of banging this drum for months, is this is the first time they've

done this meeting at a border municipality or border area since 2010. So while there were past efforts along the border and there was a lot of great content that came out of them, this is the first time this was formally adopted along a border community. Because of that, where we had the FCC, public, Canada, and others giving their briefings, where in the past there were no questions, there were a lot of questions this time from stakeholders in the room, and a lot of great questions. A lot of times, people really were put on the spot that, "Okay, you're going to do this? You're going to follow up on this?" One of those, Brian Morenco from the FCC, Brian, I owe a lot of beverages out there on the firing squad lines, but Brian was put on the spot and some of the things the FCC agreed to working with the former Industry Canada, now called the Innovation Science and Economic Development Group, or ISED, they're going to start to share the local ISED frequency manager information with the United States counterpart. We're not going through the main office. We're actually going to deal with the regional office now for frequency licensing issues. Also, the FCC pretty much agreed that they're going to start to link commonalities and VHF interoperability frequencies along the border where they're not being used and where they are being used whatever it takes to get them off on the side. There's no commitment, no agreement, anyone get moved off the frequency but we're going to look at what's available. In Montana and North Dakota area, they use VLAW31 now for common interoperability frequency for across the border communication. So while it might not be a VTAC for cross border communications for New York and Canada, there's something else available to us that's available that can be used. There is also for those of you don't know a cross border working group through NPSTC. They do a ton of work. I know some of us have been a part of that. There have been White Papers written that show the operational impact and the financial impact to agencies, data. That seems to be the avenue where a lot of discussions happening from the stakeholder level. If anyone wants information on that, see me and I'll be happy to give it to you. So high level summary issues, I can't show just yet. Action items. As Jay was talking about earlier, and Mike, regarding the COM-L and COM-U stuff, they want development of a cross border international communications unit leader. So kind of taking the COMU or COML one step further on the United States side. What does it take to coordinate a cross border incident? What do they need to know on both sides of the border? Identify areas of prime further collaboration to foster evolution and integration of NG 9-1-1 public learning and public safety broadband. This also includes the overarching theme that we often hear in cyber security. So when you deal with cyber security on a state level, that's one thing. When you deal on a national level, that's another thing. Now, a more international cyber security and public safety is a whole other issue. But there is a need and also an identification that's a priority. Governance. We've always come back to governance. There's not a mechanism to governance that pertains to international communication across the border. That has to be worked on. We had discussions years ago when we first did the skit in New York to bring some sort of cross border piece into it, to identify it and create a discussion point to move forward. That also can bring many partners to the table for subcommittees to discuss that moving forward in the state. CAUSE, which

is Canada-United States experiment, DHSES and OEC, run from the United States side, they do cross border initiatives to do experiments on communications. New York has never been a part of it; Maine has been a part of it in the northeast. They want to do CAUSE-5 and I'm going to raise my hand and say New York wants to be a part of it and see if we can get it here. They look at bringing new technology; they look at bringing new initiatives. One that was explained in the Detroit area, there's maritime interoperability that was provided through a gateway. Now, its border control, local police, state police and RCMP all take turns on the gateway and five seconds from being requested, they all communicate with one another. That was done through funding through the CAUSE initiative. The biggest thing that came out of it if you want my honest opinion is while the FCC and other federal agencies provide guidance and talking points out constantly as it pertains to cross border communications, there's never a follow-up as to what it really means or how to explain. So when Brian Morenco was giving explanations on roaming cross border and how you can utilize cross border on the international border, there was another level explanation he gave that people in the audience never really fully understood and comprehended. And in the administrative session at the end of day two that Mike and I were in, it was agreed that there needs to be further training on these things, not to the point we're going to come out and hold your hand, but if it comes out with ruling, there's going to be a webinar in a week at this time and they're going to go through what that really means and allow for questions and answers. There needs to be more of that on this international border because as we all know, it gets very confusing. So you're going to see more of that coming forward. As Mike explained, Dusty wants to do this more like four times a year. We're also going to bring in some sort of webinar to this as well, too. Mike DeJong, who is the co-chair from Canada said unequivocally from the start of the second session, second day that this has to be a cross border community from now on. It no longer needs to go back to DC or anywhere else. The feedback that was given primarily by the New York stakeholders there was absolutely wonderful. So I applaud everyone who was able to come out and their agency. The final point to bring up, and Mike alluded to it, it does not really pertain to this but it comes up is the continued engagement with the Tribal Nations of New York. So I've been doing a lot of work with the St. Regis Mohawk tribe up in the northern part of New York State. They're now going to be part of the Adirondack Communications Consortium based on the work we've done there. Erie County reached out to me and Seneca Nation reached out to me. They want to start to do some work as well. So I think we need to be aware that there's a desire for them to be a part of the communications community in the state. I want to continue to give the Tribal Nations consortium to have that first touch where the most impact will be felt and maybe at some point, we can bring them into other aspects of the state. So that's all I have. If there are any questions, I'd be more than happy to answer them. Thank you, all.

**SPRAGUE:** Thank you, Chris. One of the things I didn't mention in the presentation that I kind of blew through there real quick, we gave everybody a copy of the White Paper, and you have it in your folder, that really backs up what we said in that Power

Point so that everybody walked away with a copy. I was glad I stayed for the second day. That afternoon administrative session, my understanding is it used to be closed, they left it open and they actually took comments from the folks that attended. We tried not to be too vocal, but it was a good session, it really was. I left with a lot better feeling from that afternoon session than I did from the actual meeting itself. So it was very good. I have one other thing. We received a letter from Chief William Hall. He's put in 32 years and he's retiring. So we actually made a certificate up for him. We were going to present it to him if he was here, but we will make sure we get it to him and we wanted to recognize his impact and his work on the board.

**VOUTOUR:** I can send some comments and pictures.

**SPRAGUE:** Thank you. We'd greatly appreciate that. Anything else for the good of the order?

(No response.)

**SPRAGUE:** Very good. I want to thank everybody for coming in. I realize it is July and this is a tough month. But as you can see, there's an awful lot that went down in the last couple months. I think we got a lot more to report on, otherwise, we would have told you things we thought were going to happen. So our next meeting is September 13th, I believe. Okay. And I really thank everybody for their input today. Other than that, motion to adjourn?

**VOUTOUR:** Motion.

**LAFLURE:** Second.

**SPRAGUE:** Motion made and seconded by LaFlure.

All in favor?

(Affirmative responses.)

**SPRAGUE:** Thank you very much. I'll assume nobody opposes that

\* \* \* \* \*

(Whereupon, the Meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.)

\* \* \* \* \*

## CERTIFICATION

I, THERESA L. KLOS, 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.

Theresa L. Ardia

THERESA L. ARDIA, CSR, RPR, RMR

Dated: July 15, 2017.