

STATE INTEROPERABLE & EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

APRIL 11, 2018

**HARRIMAN STATE CAMPUS, STATE POLICE ACADEMY LIBRARY,
BUILDING 24, ALBANY, NEW YORK**

SPRAGUE: I'd like to welcome everybody to the State Interoperable and Emergency Communication Board meeting. Before we get started, I'll move it over to Deputy Commissioner Wisely to welcome the group.

WISELY: Thanks, Mike. Good morning, everybody. Thanks for being here, making your way out to the second quarter meeting of the State Interop Board. Appreciate everybody's participation and attendance at the meeting, especially this week. It's National Telecommunicators Week. I'm sure you're all doing things back in your home communities recognizing all the great work telecommunicators do throughout New York State. We really do appreciate their efforts.

We're doing some visits to some local communications centers during the week this week. Brett and one of my commissioners from OEM are going to Washington County, making a visit later in the week. So, we really appreciate all that work that

those folks do. So, on our behalf, we say thank you to all those folks.

I think we had a lot of folks here attend our consortium conference a couple months ago. I thought that was a great success. I want to take the opportunity to thank Mike and Brett, the whole OIEC team, Joann, for putting that all together. What an excellent venue that was down there at West Point. It was a really good conference. I wish I had been able to stick around and stay longer than giving my open remarks.

But I just wanted to say hello and welcome to State Police Academy's library room and appreciate everybody being here. Mike, back to you

SPRAGUE: Thank you. We appreciate everybody bearing with us in the change of venue. It's a nice location to be and we're not too far from the other place. It's a little hard to walk between the two.

Okay. Joann, would you like to do the roll call?

Board Members Present:

Michael Sprague

Charles White

Colin Brady (by phone)

Michael Primeau (by phone)

Bob Terry

Kevin Wisely

William Bleyle (by phone)

Eric Day

Brian LaFlure

Richard Tantalo

Michael Volk

James Voutour

Marianne Buttenschon (by phone)

Richard Anderson

Board Members Absent:

Col. James Freehart

Todd Murray

Joseph Gerace

John Merklinger

Kevin Revere

Kimberly Beatty

Guests:

Matthew Delaney

Jay Kopstein

Joann Waidelich

Angelica Kang

David Kislowski

Larissa Guedko

Robert Gehrler, ITS-GIS

Brett Chellis

Nicole Erickson

Phillip McGeough

JOANN: Okay. Well, we do have quorum.

SPRAGUE: Thank you. All right. With that, let's also move into approval of the minutes. Hopefully, everybody got their minutes from the last board meeting, and if there's any questions or comments. If not, I'll entertain a motion to approve.

VOUTOUR: Motion to approve.

VOLK: Second.

SPRAGUE: Motion made and seconded a couple times. Any further discussion?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All those in favor.

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Carried. A couple things, just general etiquette and safety. We are in a different facility. If there is

an emergency, we're going to go out the door on the left, go out, take a left and an immediate right, through the door, through the door. That will put us outside. We'll all meet out on the sidewalk and a little accountability for our group out there.

As far as cellphones, please put them on stun if you haven't done so already. And if you need to take a call please feel free to step outside. It's not a problem. Rest rooms. If you go out the hallway and turn right and you'll see the water fountain it's the first clue there's a bathroom nearby and there's men's and women's rooms on either side.

We will be doing a lunch later, so that is part of it. Ground rules. Let me go through those for a minute. 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 Open Meetings Law.

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. All other guests must be recognized by the Chair before addressing the Board or participating in discussions.

If a Board member is unable to attend in person or by video conference, his or her designee may attend the meeting and

vote on behalf of the member, unless they're an appointee not representing a state agency.

A reminder to those individuals on the phone, please announce who you are before speaking.

With that, I'll entertain adoption of the agenda.

VOUTOUR: Move it.

SPRAGUE: Motion made.

LAFLURE: Second.

SPRAGUE: Second over here by Brian. All those in favor?

(Affirmative response.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. Carried. With that, we'll move on to the next piece, which is our legal report. Angelica.

KANG: Good morning. Today, I need to remind everybody of the ethics requirement for board members. The New York State ethics laws were enacted to prevent both actual and apparent conflicts of interest, including private interests, and the Division seeks to help ensure employees and board members uphold the highest standards of ethical and professional behavior.

The Joint Commission on Public Ethics, or JCOPE, is the agency that oversees ethics and compliance of the requirements. Per the statute that created the SIEC Board,

which is County Law 327, or better known as Article 6A, the Board has 25 members, 17 of which are appointed by the Governor, the remainder are prescribed by statute. Appointed members are designated as policymakers and, therefore, are required to file a Financial Disclosure Statement, which is Public Officers Law 73A. That filing deadline this year is May 15, 2018. You should have received a letter from JCOPE regarding your FDS. This is why we were verifying the address to which to send that letter to you a couple weeks ago.

Additionally, per Executive Order 3, FDS filers are required to participate with ethics training. So, while the Chamber handles appointments and JCOPE handles the FDS filings, DHSES has been tasked with overseeing and ensuring that SIEC Board members are in compliance with ethics training requirements.

Statutorily prescribed Board members, so those who were not appointed but are kind of automatically in the statute, you're likely handled by your own agency in terms of ethics compliance. So, here, we're only talking about the appointed members.

So, I just want to go over some of those requirements that go with the FDS filers. Executive Law Section 94 lays out those requirements. The first is the comprehensive ethics

training course with CETC. You are required to attend this training in person and it's typically about two hours. And today, we are offering one after this meeting in order to train anybody who has not done that one yet.

If you're unable to attend in person today, and you have not attended a CETC, these are the dates in which you can attend. JCOPE and DHSES both offer these trainings.

The registration is required for those trainings, not the one that's happening after today, but the JCOPE and DHSES ones. And it is first come first serve, so you have to be sure to register.

If you have completed a training at JCOPE or at DHSES and you have your Certificate of Completion, you should submit that to either myself or Joann and we'll make sure that JCOPE is aware that you fulfilled that.

The CETC is good for three years. After three years, you are required to do a refresher course, and that's the ethics seminar. That also is required to be done in person. That one usually is about an hour and a half, although I've done it in 45 minutes before. So that one is a much quicker one, kind of hitting like the heavy-hitter ethics issues.

So, if you have done the CETC and your three years have expired, you need to take the refresher course or you can also replace the refresher course with another CETC. The

dates for the ethics seminar are on the screen. Again, registration is required and it's first come first serve. And if you have completed that training and you have your certificate, you can send that to either Joann or myself and we will make sure that JCOPE database is up-to-date with your ethics compliance.

If you have any questions about either the requirements, the registration or if you have an ethics issue that you are concerned about and would like to speak to us, DHSES is available for you. Our ethics e-mail is on the screen. Our ethics officer is Jim Clark, but I'm also a designated trainer so I can also take those questions for you. And if I can't answer them, I can definitely point you in the right direction.

JCOPE is also available for appointed members. JCOPE is technically your first contact if you have a question, but you can always come to either myself or Jim Clark.

So again, if you have questions or you need to send us the certificate, my e-mail address is up there and you can always speak to me at any point after the board meeting.

SPRAGUE: As Angelica said, we just kind of got looped into this, so we're playing catchup and that's the reason why we decided to cancel the CIWG meeting following this, which we normally do, and just kind of do an abbreviated meeting and

then actually do the training. We're trying to keep you guys from having to make extra trips to Albany to do this. And now that we've got it in the system, we'll be able to track this better and, hopefully, no surprises down the road as we go forward.

So, I appreciate you guys working with us. We'll try to make this as painless as possible.

I will say if you're one of those employees that have already had the JCOPE, you're not required to stay for the extra two hours of training. However, if you're due, you can get your training done now and you can cover two birds with one stone. Any questions?

VOUTOUR: The financial disclosure, I haven't seen mine; is that coming e-mail or postal?

KANG: I believe it comes postal. But if you want to talk about making sure you can do it, I can show you where it is on the website and you can take the initiative and start it.

L AFLURE: When did that go out? I haven't received it either.

KANG: It should have gone out a couple of weeks ago but since we were playing catch-up in terms of getting addresses and getting it sent out, there might be a delay. But if you haven't received it, I'll take a note and we'll contact JCOPE and make sure that that is done, that's in the works.

DAY: Is the financial disclosure an annual requirement?

KANG: It is.

DAY: It is annual.

TERRY: How does that work for designees of the agency instead of the actual Board members? I usually get roped into coming.

KANG: Well, so you are statutorily required once. That's going to be a little bit different. It really -- I mean, do you typically file an FDS?

TERRY: No.

KANG: The FDS requirements are for those who are statutorily on the Board or appointed. So, if you're a designee, I don't believe you have to file an FDS. And if JCOPE hasn't reached out to you about that, then I think you should be okay.

TERRY: Okay. Thank you.

SPRAGUE: We'll try to follow up on this and kind of see if we can put some notices out there which you should be expecting down the road so that you're not missing something. Any other questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Angelica.

PSAP and SICG grant update.

GUEDKO: Good morning, everyone. SICG program overview.

There are no significant changes, except for the last two grants spending, 2016 PSAP and 2016 SICG formula grant. The spending is increasing slowly, and everybody's still working on it.

The 2016 spending PSAP ended at the end of the last year, but counties are still submitting vouchers for those. We will accept those vouchers, but we encourage those counties that did not submit vouchers yet, and there's about 3 million still unsubmitted, to please do so as soon as possible.

So, we do have two more grants, 2017 SICG formula and 2017 PSAP formula. Those are 45 and 10 million, just like last year. And right now, all contracts are still in the development process. There's still three counties that kind of struggling to submit budgets. We are working with those. They submitted budgets and sign, but we had to ask them to revise those because of ineligible expenses and other issues. But we always say, the sooner county submits their budgets, the faster we can start process for contract development, the faster you can start your spending.

We did work with our administration, our senior management, DHSES management and other control agencies to make sure that we have a good schedule for SICG and PSAP grants. In the past, there was sometimes a delay, sometimes it's early. Now, we're pretty much trying to put them on a strict schedule

where the SICG formula grants and the PSAP Operations grants will be each and every year, as long as there is appropriation for that, in May-June time frame.

And the SICG Targeted grant, is ongoing, rolling schedule. We work with each county as we go on and develop contracts. There is no schedule for that, but we already started the process for the SICG Targeted grant. We contacted several counties and we're in the process of project development. Any questions on spending?

(No response.)

GUEDKO: All right. We already completed the draft for 2018 SICG formula and PSAP Operations grants. As of right now, the RFAs are in a review and approval process. It has to go through legal review, it has to go for Commissioner's approval and Governor's sign-off.

The targeted grant, is already in process as I mentioned before.

As of right now, we are up in total awards at 395 million in grants. We do have a historical documentation of each grant, except Round 1 because that was not done by electronic submissions. But everything else is kept as a historical record on our website.

This would be a good reference point, because our grants did develop and did change, we adjusted the grant program and

the RFAs, in general, as we were receiving the feedback from the Board members, from county members and public safety officials.

As you know, the budget for this year passed and we have an appropriation of 75 million for interoperability grants for years 2018-'19. As before, Targeted grants will be 20 million, formula grants will be 45 million and the 10 million will go into PSAP Operations grant.

Now, this is the targeted interoperability grant goals.

This is what we are trying to achieve to make sure that we accomplish interoperability across the state. You probably saw this before and you probably will see it again. We're trying to make sure that there's wide awareness of what we are trying to achieve with the targeted grants program.

Because there's no RFA posted online, because we are working with each county individually to develop that, we still want to make sure that everyone involved is aware, since it will affect every single one of the counties as we develop interoperability.

So, we are trying to implement calling channels statewide, and that involves VHF, UHF, 7-800 frequencies, all of them. The typical good coverage we're looking for is 95 percent mobile coverage, which you understand is going to be very difficult to achieve with 800 and 700 frequencies. So, the

first priorities will go to VHF and UHF. Again, that will also pose problems because of Canadian border restrictions. However, we are overcoming all those issues slowly but surely, and we will be developing overall ubiquitous coverage for calling channels in New York.

There's also monitoring of all those calling channels. We want to make sure that counties have monitoring capabilities of all those calling channels that's installed on those towers. This will ensure safety of the public safety responders and also our citizens.

The backhaul enhancements. We do understand it might be necessary to do certain backhaul enhancements to bring all the traffic to the PSAP or, if there are new towers, to make sure those towers are part of the system. This is also part of the targeted grant program.

Tactical channels. These are also very good to have on a system level. We see more and more utilization in New York of tactical channels, it seems, since the outreach and this program started.

There's also a serve list, which is actually sponsored by Connecticut. When tactical channels are activated on the system level, the e-mail goes to all those active members on the Listserv that those tactical channels activated, for how long they're activated, which ones precisely and where.

This way, there's less potential for interference if there's nearby incidents and that will prompt another agency or another jurisdiction to use different tactical channels to avoid interference.

Governance. We are in the process of developing statewide FOG. However, targeted grants also offer the assistance for development, county or region-wide TICPs, FOGs, SOPs and MOUs. You can also work with us.

If you have any questions, please contact our office. We work with several counties. We do have some examples from other regions, other counties, which already developed FOGs and SOPs, and we can certainly provide some guidance on that. CASM. Right now, one of the requirements, very strict requirements, of the grant is utilization of the CASM. Right now, in New York, we are actively utilizing this system. We are encouraging state agencies, our agency, also to use CASM system. And we have one of the designees for the CASM implementation sitting right here, Phil. You probably know him if you are involved with CASM. But if you have any questions, he can certainly answer those questions. There are multiple reasons why we are using CASM. I'm not going to take your time to describe all those, but it's beneficial from governance perspective, it's beneficial from technical perspective, and more.

Measuring the progress. We are measuring the progress as we go along. That allows us to make sure that we can make certain adjustments to our grants program. And allows us to see where our gaps are. So, this is a nice slide, this is the best slide, everything is hundred percent.

Everyone is a consortium member, everybody's working nicely with the nearby jurisdictions. Counties opened up systems for the State agencies, and they are actively implementing national interop channels in the subscriber equipment.

Even though it's a hundred percent, there's still certain counties that we're continuing to work with. They have some interop channels, but we would like them to have more.

Now, this slide has kind of gone down. VHF-Lo calling interoperability channels. Right now, there's 32 counties out of 58, and this is just the county base, it does not include the coverage and it is 65 percent achieved. We are targeting this particular gap with the targeted grants.

The same goes for VHF-Hi band, UHF and 7-800. As you can see, UHF and 7-800, they're kind of on the lower end as well as VHF-Hi. The reason for that, we don't have many 7- or 800 systems in New York State. Most of them are downstate New York and this is where most of those interoperability channels are. But the rest of the counties are a mix of VHF and UHF. There are a couple counties north and west that

have 7-800, too.

This looks a little better. In accordance to the grant applications, 71 percent of counties are monitoring national interoperability calling channels. We are working from county to county to verify this particular point because it is a very important for us, for our office and also for public safety reasons. We might even go out to counties to see how they're monitoring those channels and what exactly they're monitoring.

CASM. I'm happy to say a hundred percent of counties have a log-in for CASM. That does not necessarily mean all of them are active at hundred percent. Some of them have not logged-in for several months now. But it might mean that there's no changes in the system. We are monitoring all the log-ins and all the activity in CASM and we'll be working through the process to make sure that all the counties have up-to-date -- this is important; it has to be up-to-date in order to properly use the CASM inventory system.

Agreements. A hundred percent of counties are working with one or other state agency in New York. If there is any type of system connectivity difficulty or certain gateways are necessary, we will be using a combination of targeted grant and formula grant to close those small gaps.

Collaboration between consortium and region. So, there's

a star there. We don't have very specific data. This is just the base from the word of mouth. But we probably will gather this information in our next iteration of the grant program.

We do know there are certain regions and certain counties that actually have SOPs, standard operating procedures, or some sort of tactical plan for interoperability and for interregional operations.

This is connectivity with the backhaul between consortiums and regions. This is not between counties; this is actually between consortiums and regions. Again, there is no standard data. The difficult part is also that the consortium is such a live organism, it's constantly changing.

In the last eight years, it changed pretty much every single year. It's stabilized right now at this point and it has been stable for about a year. But if any changes take place, those statistics will change as well. And that's the end of my presentation. Any questions?

WHITE: Just a couple. On the interop channels, both the deployment of base stations and monitoring, is there a target date of being able to get to that hundred percent where we're trying to get to? I know it shows something percentage-wise at this point. Is there something you're looking to try to

hit date-wise?

GUEDKO: If you're talking about the combination of both, for example, let's take north county, we can implement 7-800 interop channels there without any problem. So, there will be interoperability channels. VHF and UHF will be a difficult task to implement.

Now, let's step back and go into the rest of New York. That's where you can implement VHF and UHF; it's easy to cover Albany, New York, however, the 7- and 800 is going to be difficult from coverage perspective, because most of counties have VHF and UHF systems.

Therefore, you're going to need a lot more towers to be able to actually provide it with coverage system-wide, whole jurisdictional boundaries for 7- or 800 frequencies. In some cases, you might need up to 10 times more towers. So, the date for that is very -- I cannot provide the date. But I can say with a firm assurance that the interoperability coverage, whether it's VHF or 700 or UHF or 800, we can probably achieve in a couple of years.

WISELY: If I might. So, we have talked about this for some time, as you all know, and it would be difficult because some of the things we have -- I don't want to say it's kind of a moving target but it is a finite time and we want to get to that end line, because we've been working on this for a

long time.

That's the focus of the parties to be able to focus in on -- we need to enhance capability and then work through the issues that we have. We're not setting firm dates. We talked about those in the past, the difficulty --

WHITE: It is difficult.

WISELY: It's not something like a 25-year plan and we roll out FirstNet. It's a much closer target, as Mike and Brett know, as we talked a little about it.

GUEDKO: So right now, there's about four or five counties that have no interoperability channels. That doesn't mean they don't have coverage. So, if you're looking if each county has interoperability channels, then not yet, we are working with those counties that don't have interop channels. But coverage is going to be more difficult.

WHITE: How many counties don't have any at this point?

GUEDKO: Four or five.

WHITE: On the subscriber equipment, is there something down the road that's being planned for a grant for that equipment refresh, for end of life user equipment?

GUEDKO: Yes. The SICG formula grant it's going to cover those expenses.

WHITE: Thank you.

TERRY: Wouldn't it be best served in the future to possibly

look at getting a full blanket of VHF coverage, if we could, and talking with the Canadians and whatnot so we can have one common platform rather than -- you know, I can't buy UHF, VHF and lo band VHF radios and have them all. So, what I've decided to do is buy the most common VHF radio and put, you know, the V-CALL and V-TAC channels in them.

But still, if you don't have a statewide plan which would be like a statewide network almost that we could use, at least we would have some basic level of interoperability.

GUEDKO: That's absolutely our goal. And that's why, number one, we are concentrating on implementation with VHF channel, as mentioned before, in the region where it is most difficult to achieve.

However, we already working and talking to Canadian government, not we directly, because it has to be done in the proper manner, so the State Department, U.S. government, is talking to them, but we are constantly getting updates. We are working on establishing or finding a channel in VHF spectrum to make sure that we do have operations in Canadian border region. We might have to have dual channels, one in Canadian border, another one in the rest of New York.

TERRY: Right, but at least have a common platform across the state. I mean, a lot of state agencies, their equipment is mobile and they take it from one end of the state to the

other, which we do for plowing and --

GUEDKO: Yes. The good thing about having all interoperability channels in all bands as any agency will go through New York State, they know that they can contact on any interoperability channel no matter what.

The idea is to implement all VHF channels regardless where you are, so you can be asking for help and somebody will hear you.

Matt.

DELANEY: I was just going to add to that. The reason they build multiple bands is that you have to assure if you had just one band and every vehicle out there had that band of subscriber equipment, which the cost is greatly magnified on the subscriber end.

By building UHF, you can assure that counties, for example, in Central New York, UHF, their units can also have the interop channels --

TERRY: I was looking at possibly even the state doing it on their dime and, that way, at least state agencies have, you know -- I can't talk to anybody really, you know, without the VHF radios that's supplied, and very few people have them. It's like two per region.

That's my only means of interoperability with anybody with me having Lo band radios in my vehicles.

GUEDKO: I can provide more details for each band in our future meetings and report the progress as it develops. As I said, we're already working with certain counties. Multiple counties utilize SICG formula grants to implement VHF channels, UHF and 7-800. It's ongoing work and very active work that's being done by all counties in New York. We will see results quite soon.

SPRAGUE: The other thing, Bob, the CAN-US meetings we talked about, they have actually cracked that ceiling where there is dialogue, real dialogue, going on about a VHF channel on either side of the border. It's still being worked out, but Canada actually went through and identified the channels that could be used. Now, it's kind of in the FCC's ballpark to see if they are amenable to doing that, what has to be cleared.

TERRY: And who would you put the onus on to build that out? The counties or, you know, would the state provide grant money to do that?

SPRAGUE: Yeah, it would become part of our build-out for interop. The key to that is, you know, they can give us those, but if we're the only ones that have it, it feeds the national interop piece of it. So, the FCC is going to have to step back and adopt that as a national interop channel as well. If we bring in somebody from --

TERRY: Right, but at least you have a base for state agencies to interop on anyway, which there really isn't at this given time.

BLEYLE: Larissa, Bill Bleyle, question on the phone.

SPRAGUE: Go ahead, Bill.

BLEYLE: Yes. I'm just wondering on the targeted grants, and I know a lot of the effort has been spent on the national interoperability channels, will there come a point when there's an outreach to the consortiums and, you know, some kind of strategic planning in terms of where we need to go next with that?

I know that -- you know, and I speak for the consortium that we're a part of, that we would like to see the ability to connect cores and other things and expand the footprints, maybe beyond the immediate consortium.

Is that something that's being looked at and, if so, how far out do we think that, you know, we might go beyond the, you know, fiber interconnects and the microwave interconnects and the national interoperability channels?

GUEDKO: Bill, you're just right on the target, as always. Actually, yes, we are working on this particular topic already, and from different levels, I would say. Level one, as you mentioned, we work a lot on the targeted grants right now, implementing national interop channels, but we are not

forgetting the interoperability between counties and regional connectivity and the backhaul which is one of the targeted grant goals.

And if two counties or two regions would like to connect their systems, whether it's the core connection or a single core used by two counties, we are definitely looking at that connectivity from the interoperability perspective. And we are allowing for the core connectivity or maybe a gateway connectivity between the two or more regions or counties. Yesterday, I had a conversation with a county and we discussed, this particular project. We look what's surrounding you and what can be done to make sure there is no duplicate effort, there is a wise use of resources from the targeted grants to make sure that we achieve most with this funding.

BLEYLE: Yeah, I think projects like that would be very advantageous, particularly for the agencies like the state where patrol areas and service areas for like your organization, you know, transcend consortium boundaries. So, I think those things ought to be the definite next step and I'm glad you're looking at it. Thank you.

GUEDKO: Thank you. Mike.

VOLK: I just had a quick comment about the VHF-Lo. I know that they reported that 50 percent of the counties have it.

That is kind of going away. You can't even buy base station equipment. So, I don't know if that's realistic to even track that, or maybe kind of encourage agencies to --

GUEDKO: First of all, VHF-Lo, it goes far. And in some cases, 50 percent of counties having it sometimes is enough to cover the whole New York because of the significant propagation characteristics of VHF-Lo frequencies. The presentation slide reflects whether a county has physically interop channel on a system level, not from the coverage perspective.

Now we're also looking from the coverage perspective, and as I mentioned before, I will provide such data at our later meetings as we are developing interoperability across the State. Right now, the VHF-Lo is very widely used in New York. So, we don't want to get away from it for sure. In our future analysis we will combine two characteristics from physical implementation perspective and from the coverage perspective, to give you the best picture of where usable or where unusable signal is.

DAY: In the formula grant, whatever the mystical formula is, you asked the counties a lot of questions about the various bands and this and that. To that point, does Lo band or lack thereof impact somebody's score in the grant process?

GUEDKO: No.

DAY: I know it makes sense, but the Lo band to that point, it doesn't really make any sense --

GUEDKO: Not at this point, because really, that's what we're trying to build, interoperability. Not all counties are on a level plane just yet. But those that have interoperability base stations already implemented, we are giving them some punitive amount of funding to maintain those. That's the purpose of it.

SPRAGUE: Any other questions?

(No response.)

GUEDKO: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Did Sheriff Gerace join us?

VOUTOUR: I did check with him. He's not going to be able to make it.

SPRAGUE: He indicated he probably wouldn't be able to. With that, I'm going to pass this over to Brett. NG 911 Working Group.

CHELLIS: Good morning, everybody. The Working Group continues to meet regularly with conference calls. We report out every conference call from the agencies on the Working Group, the state agencies being OIEC, the Division of State Police, ITS and Department of Public Service. We get reports from each of the agencies. We have discussion. We have 16 counties participating. Most of them are pretty

regular on the calls, so we have a lot of good discussion and we continue to work towards the draft plan.

OIEC and DPS continue to meet and work together on a regular basis on legal and programmatic review and preparing the information that we feel needs to go down to the Chamber to move the ball forward for Next Generation 911.

During these calls, we also review the legislative activity that's going on at the federal level. One of them is the Next Generation 911 Act of 2017. As you know, it's been introduced, I reported in earlier sessions, introduced in both the House and Senate. So far, it has not -- we were hoping it would be part of this year's budget bill, but that hasn't happened as of yet.

And also, FCC activity, including location accuracy requirements, they've had a number of meetings and hearings on that. We've been following them closely. MLTS, multiline telephone system, direct dialing requirements and location requirements for those systems, there's been open dialogue and solicitation of comments for that by the FCC. Kari's Law actually passed and the President signed that bill. The Senate at the last minute put an amendment in which kicks the implementation date out two years, but at least it passed. So, two years from now, all MLTS systems must have direct dial to the 911 PSAP without any additional

numbers codes or anything else needed.

The Nationwide Number Portability is a new issue, opening up all lines, all numbers, work them anywhere in the country. It kind of changes a little bit in traditional 911 routing and so on, and things you depend on. Just looking at that and what the effect is on that.

Net Neutrality. Just seeing the impact of that, the FCC orders on that and how that may impact regulation down the road with Next Generation 911 in terms of voice and wireless services.

So that's a lot of discussion and still feelings on that that DPS is very concerned about, that this action by FCC puts a little farther away the reach of having the oversight that may be required down the road for Next Gen in terms of some of these services.

The FCC 911 report, also working on that, posting and so on, the data and so on required on that.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration put out a notice of proposed rulemaking, getting comments on the next round of the 911 grant program and just interested in -- one of the things was the tribal nations, allowing them to apply directly and not have to go through the state 911 coordinator. So, a lot of comments were solicited on that and other topics in terms of the grant program going down

the road.

NENA/APCO put out a number of updates from their committees on standards development which are out there for review as well.

There's a lot of activity in terms of the Working Group, a lot of work to do. We have asked the Office of Emergency Communications at the federal level to reinstate our technical assistance program. In the first round, it expired. They have now, with the new budget in place, they have approved that. It's just a matter of scheduling it. We hope to have our contractor consultant back online with that.

With that, we're going to move on. This year, our goals and objectives are to develop programmatic responsibility for NG 911. Continue development of statewide 911 plan. And define the roles of the state agencies within the plan. We also want to have a timeline and roadmap for the New York State Next Generation 911 statewide.

Any questions for me before I move on?

(No response.)

CHELLIS: Okay. I'd like to ask the Chair to recognize Bob Gehrler from ITS-GIS program to give an update for the GIS subcommittee.

SPRAGUE: So recognized.

GEHRER: Thanks, Brett. I reported at the last meeting that we had set up a GIS subcommittee at the request of the Next Gen 911 Work Group. And we're close to our first deliverable.

Our first goal was to poll each county, survey them and find out where they were with regards to GIS data readiness to implement Next Gen 911. The GIS data isn't a luxury. Most counties use GIS data in their computerized dispatch systems now, but you can operate 911 now without GIS data. You can't operate a Next Gen system without it.

For instance, PSAP boundaries, you need GIS PSAP boundaries in order to direct the call to the right call center. So, we're surveying each county and asking them about six data sets: Address points, street center lines, PSAP boundaries and police, fire and EMS response areas, all GIS data that will be used in the Next Gen systems. And we've got the survey done. We have eight counties in New York State represented on the committee. They've taken the survey and we're compiling those. They've worked with their counties to fill out the survey.

Typically, more than one person in the county needs to participate in that, because for instance, there's an addressing team at the county which will be different than the team that might map first responder response areas. So,

it's kind of a collaborative effort.

The eight counties that are represented by members of the subcommittee have taken it. We're compiling those results now.

At the next Work Group meeting on May 1st, we'll present those preliminary results to the Work Group and then on the 16th of May, the more complete results will be presented at the Next Gen 911 conference.

If there is a Work Group meeting on the 15th, which there's travel involved, maybe we'll be able to present those findings to the Work Group.

The goal is to let counties -- some counties are in good shape. The state has programs for address points and streets to develop this data in an appropriate manner. If the county's not in good shape, we want to give them time to build these data sets, because you can't just hire a consultant and two, three months later have this data. There's a lot of local knowledge involved to build it and it typically takes a long time to get the data in the type of shape necessary for a 911 system.

But the survey's in good shape. We should have some results soon. Thank you.

CHELLIS: Thank you, Bob. Any questions for Bob or myself?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: CIWG.

KOPSTEIN: I'll talk a little bit about SAFECOM. The SAFECOM Executive Committee has made a recommendation to OEC to seek grant funding for full-time SWICs and make it a requirement for all of the states and territories. Where that will go in the budget, we'll see.

OEC is developing an app where you can control cell priority from your phone. Twenty-eight applications have been submitted for at large positions with SAFECOM. There are currently eight openings that we're looking at. The Communication Section Task Force is still meeting. We've spoken about that in the past.

We want to raise communications to a section chief level and include IT within it, basically having two branches, one being IT, one being LMR, type-coms and the like. IT is getting very, very big with mapping and the like. Some federal agencies have already done that.

Within FEMA itself, there was a philosophical difference, the old traditionalists versus new doctrine. It seems that the new doctrine people are slowly taking over there.

We're working on a new emergency communications plan; the NECP Working Group will either start meeting either in May or June. T-band legislation has been introduced. It's HR5085. One submitter, nine co-sponsors. It's only in the

House. There's no sponsor in the Senate yet.

And last but not least, the GAO did a report on OEC. Several people in Congress felt that there was overlap between what OEC does and OIC and DOJ, Department of Justice and the like. The GAO found that there was no significant overlap, which was a good thing. The two issues that came up that affect us as well as other localities: The GAO felt there weren't enough county representation within SAFECOM and, secondly, there wasn't enough tribal representation.

In this last go-round with applications, we did get tribal applications, about five or six for at large positions and three for association positions that are being looked at. We didn't get any additional county applications, but they may come down in the future. We're still doing that interview process.

Questions? Comments?

(No response.)

KOPSTEIN: God bless.

SPRAGUE: Thank you, Jay. Public Safety Broadband. Matt Delaney.

DELANEY: Good morning, everyone. I'll give an update on Public Safety Broadband and FirstNet. So, what opt-in means for New York. I think everybody knows by now New York State opted in. I think I had this slide in the last meeting, but

it's important so I want to just sort of reiterate this. There is no mandate to use FirstNet. We've been very clear about that. I've seen some national discussions, there's still some confusion in some states about what that means, opt-in, the Governor opted in, do they have to use FirstNet? So, there's no mandate to use FirstNet in New York. New York opted in strictly for the network buildout. It has nothing to do with actual use. You're free to mandate within your county or agencies, whatever mandates you want to put on your devices and users, you control, but there's no state level mandate.

AT&T does have adoption goals and penalties and they need public safety subscribers. So that's maybe your avenue to help influence things like the radio access network and the tower site buildout for additional coverage.

If you said, "Look, I'm interested in transitioning but I really don't have coverage over here on this side of town, if you build the site and add some coverage, then, you know, count me in as a subscriber." So that's something that gives you some leverage, because they know you're not required to switch.

Then, FirstNet is expected to drive innovation. So, the public safety apps and devices, we're already starting to see some public safety devices and there is a FirstNet app

store with an app being certified to meet the additional FirstNet standards.

Some may be compatible with other providers. FirstNet app developers can submit their applications to the regular Apple store and the Google Android play store for general use as well. So, I think from what I've seen in the list of the applications and in the FirstNet app store today, they're generally seeking regularly commercially available applications anyway.

So certainly, if you were using a different broadband network, you could just download them and use them. It may require a subscription just like they would in the FirstNet app store.

So, the benefits of FirstNet. It creates a large market and encourages product development. User equipment and accessories. Application system interfaces. Not to say that everybody will subscribe to FirstNet, but now it is one sort of unified voice at least for one type of public safety broadband network and it brings AT&T's rather large buying power to the table as well and they've already seen a couple devices with Band-14. Samsung, the new Galaxy S9 have Band-14 in it. I think we'll probably start to see a lot more phones over time.

Samsung is a commercially available phone that has Band-14

in it. Applications, I mentioned the FirstNet app store. System interfaces. You know, how will this integrate with existing data systems. Will CAD vendors, for example, be able to build one interface for FirstNet and sell to their customers instead of each being a custom designed interface? We'll have to see.

The market share, obviously, if you build it in the FirstNet world, you know, you may be able to get a lot more customers and treat each one as an individual case. FirstNet has a test lab and certification of apps. So, they're vetted for public safety fitness and supplier support and is a single nationwide system.

So, as I mentioned, AT&T and FirstNet, obviously, we opted in. So, they will provide priority and preemption services for public safety in New York. That's sort of the FirstNet solution. However, Verizon has advertised they will provide priority and preemption services to public safety and they state it will be at no cost to existing public safety users.

We've asked them to provide some more written detail about exactly what they're offering and who will be eligible, but our general understanding is eligibility is more limited to core public safety first responders.

The FirstNet eligible user ecosystem is everything from

public safety first responders to city government services, utilities, critical infrastructures. It depends whether they're primary or extended time use on FirstNet. Verizon said their core focus is just the first responder public safety community.

Details on the integration/interoperability are still uncertain. We've expressed to Verizon that we'd like to see some specific sales sheets or eligibility lists and guidelines for sign-up procedures to pass along as well. So that's something to keep an eye on, especially if you are a Verizon customer. Talk to your Verizon representative, but also, it helps provide competition. So now there is competition between two providers and you have the ability to go to one and say, "The other one's offering me this. What are you going to offer me?" You know, sort of get down to price or maybe get some added coverage or other free device replacements to switch carriers. So that's something to keep in mind.

So, over the past three months, we had been having regular meetings with FirstNet and AT&T to discuss implementation of FirstNet in New York.

AT&T has committed to a significant number of new sites as part of the FirstNet buildout. Any new site they build, just like their existing sites, will serve public safety and

consumer users. So, when they build one of these new sites, it will not just enhance FirstNet coverage, it will enhance general public users of AT&T for their coverage, the ability when they dial 911, fill in some of those white space holes for AT&T users.

Focus on building coverage where there's no AT&T coverage today with an emphasis on area. We don't want to just continue to enhance areas already served. We want to add areas that are unserved by AT&T to improve the same thing as FirstNet coverage, AT&T coverage/FirstNet coverage, same thing.

AT&T will add generators to many sites. There are many that already have generators, but for those that don't, they're going to add a significant number of new generators. And all sites where possible, sometimes building new sites is not possible to put a generator in, but anywhere where they can, they build a new site where they can put a generator, they will put a new generator in.

AT&T has submitted pricing to OGS to add the FirstNet data plans to OGS's existing contract. However, OGS still has the addition pending. We had a conference call last week with OGS to discuss this further. They are looking at various avenues to be able to make those data plans available on state contracts.

If you have other non-purchasing avenues that you can take advantage of for cellular data services that don't require centralized contracts, you're free to have those discussions with AT&T, but the centralized OGS state contracts is still pending.

Something that does need more work by FirstNet and AT&T, though, is governance and policies. Services are being sold. There are a couple of agencies in New York, local government agencies, who have signed up for FirstNet data plans. But some of the policies are still uncertain. If you're going to have priority, you're going to have preemption, you're going to have local control, what are the policies? What are the guidelines on use? How do they integrate into emergency management and public safety response, into the state various large scale emergency management planning?

SLIGP 2.0. The state and local implementation grant program from NTIA. We've had a funding source from NTIA for over three years now for public safety broadband planning and it was a planning grant for -- we've had working group meetings on it. We've had a number of -- the website that we had, psbb.ny.gov, was funded under it, that grant came to a close in February of 2018, but because states did not spend all of the money that was originally in the original legislation

that was allocated to that, they were able to release a new grant to add an additional two years. As a new grant, you can retain the original funding source. There's no new funds appropriated by Congress. They were able to reuse unspent funds. So, we have a new two-year grant.

Allowable activities are a little bit different now that we have a FirstNet contractor, that there is a national public safety broadband network of a specific selection, every state has opted in. So, some of these things are identifying coverage needs and gaps in the state as being AT&T and we've had some discussions with them about how to do that. We've worked a little bit with state GIS on that as well and the best ways to do that. Plans for the transition of public safety application software and databases. Development of policies to increase data sharing between existing public safety systems.

This basically means we need systems that are out there today that may not be broadband-friendly or may be broadband-friendly but only for one agency.

Are there ways to make that data more available to other agencies who would use FirstNet? How would you share that data? Does it just require a policy or some sort of agreement between the agencies to be able to share it? Is it more of a technological, you need to upgrade systems?

You know, so this is not the actual funding to do those upgrades, but it's to help identify and maybe develop some of those policies. You know, if you're talking about 25 million dollars to develop an entire new records management system for the state, this is not what SLIGP is about, but SLIGP might identify that that's something that would help broadband adoption and allow a lot more agencies to share data in the public safety broadband network. So that's something that needs to be identified as sort of a plan for what would be needed.

Stakeholder outreach events and data collection in specific areas. Both of these have to be specifically requested by FirstNet. In fact, there was a webinar yesterday with NTIA and FirstNet discussed some of those processes around stakeholder outreach events and how we would request approval to use SLIGP funding to hold those events. They could be conferences, symposia, demonstration events.

One thing that we do need a little further clarification on, we did bring it up on our call yesterday, we want a little further clarification. We do have our public safety broadband user group in New York. I have another slide on that. We need to understand how that fits into what they described as stakeholder outreach event. We just need to clarify whether that's going to be under that or it's just

a routine governance meeting.

We do have one scheduled for later this month. Hopefully, it doesn't affect that. So, period of performance for that grant is March of 2018 through February of 2020, so two years. So, as I mentioned, public safety broadband user group, at the last meeting of this Board in January, the Board adopted a change in the public safety broadband working group that had existed for about three years to the public safety broadband user group, the purpose being New York stakeholder single point or focal point for all things public safety broadband.

We did adopt a revised mission statement at the last meeting. So, our next meeting for that working group, which is now the user group, is scheduled for later this month. If you're not a member of that user group and are interested, just let me know and we can get you added. We're not limiting the membership. We just want -- you know, we're limiting to people who are involved in public safety in New York, but it's not a commercial forum, but you know, anyone in the room here is free to be a member. So, what's next? We'll continue to advocate for public safety in New York. We'll continue to talk to AT&T and FirstNet about coverage needs. As I mentioned, they are committed to building a number of new tower sites and we need to talk about coverage. If you

have coverage needs for broadband, express that to them, express that to us.

Governance, as I mentioned, we continue working with FirstNet and AT&T on improving some of those policies and things that will exist or need to exist or in development. Just the other day, we heard something very encouraging, that FirstNet and AT&T are working on emergency management. An AT&T representative convinced AT&T that they need to do more on the emergency management integration, integration with ESF2 on communications.

They learned that as a result of the hurricane responses last fall that they didn't really as a company exactly appreciate some of the integrations that are necessary at the state and county levels for emergency management. So, every state, they're hiring writers, essentially, to write a plan for every state.

They're going to come out to each state, meet with the state, learn about emergency management in that state, integration of their activities into emergency management and then write a plan for that state on how they will integrate with emergency management in that state. They're starting with the tornado-prone states. They're going to try to get that done before the real tornado season ramps up. And then they're going to move to the hurricane-prone states. So,

it may be a little bit later, but they are going to reach into New York as well as every other state.

And app, probably continue to see the development of apps and the FirstNet app development program. The National Institute of Standards and Technology and the Public Safety Communications Research have a grant program for innovative apps of development, so I think we'll see a lot of new things coming out in the next few years that may or may not be limited just to FirstNet or be eligible to be used in any broadband network, wired or wireless. That's all I had.

Questions?

KOPSTEIN: Yes.

BLEYLE: Matt, Bill Bleyle on the phone.

SPRAGUE: Let's take Jay first, then we'll go to Bill.

KOPSTEIN: Quick question. A lot of data that's existing today is formatted so it looks nice on a computer screen. When you bring it to a tablet or a Smartphone, it's virtually unreadable. Whose responsibility is it to do the reformatting so that whatever device you're looking at it on, it will be readable?

DELANEY: I mean, fundamentally, that would be the responsibility of the app or software developer or owner or data owner. I mean, it's not -- FirstNet does not transcode, for example, data to be formatted into a particular format,

because it's just a network for applications.

So, either it could be that if that data exists from a records management system or a CAD system, that company could produce an app that worked on a Smartphone that read the data. If you have an in-house application you developed, a custom application, it might be some in-house developers or you may have to contract out or it may be something that you could migrate into an app that becomes available in the FirstNet store to move that data into, but there's no automatic reformatting of that data. That really comes down to the specific system.

But that's the kinds of things that we can identify and work through SLIGP 2.0 to look and say, "Here's some data that can be made available, but here's what needs to be done." SLIGP is not going to actually do that, but it's going to help identify that, determine sort of the scope, maybe just say, "Hey, look, there's one here, one here. Oh, there's actually 30 of these systems in New York. Here's a way that we can do all of them together."

How that will actually be done is something that would have to be identified separately, but you know, it would be determined that something needs to be done and here's a recommended way to do it. The actual doing of it would not be a SLIGP function, but that would be as determined,

something that maybe an app developer wants to take on, something that AT&T wants to take on. It's just going to be up to CAD vendor to develop an application for Smartphone devices.

KOPSTEIN: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Bill.

BLEYLE: Matt, I don't know if they gave you an indication, but I remember early on when FirstNet -- the state first opted in, I know that the AT&T people that we talked to said that the contract was in OGS's hands and they were expecting maybe a month and, now, I think we're rolling on three-plus months. I'm just wondering in your conversation with OGS, if they gave you any indication when we might see a state contract so those agencies that are currently planning equipment purchases or, you know, planning on looking at their broadband options and will soon be setting budgets up for the 2019 fiscal year, just wondering if there's any indication when that state contract may come out.

DELANEY: You know, we had a discussion with OGS about that. We did express the concern that there was, you know, a lot of agencies, a lot of counties, that were interested in purchasing services. You know, AT&T has submitted to OGS and is in OGS's review. They are looking at it as, you know, what's the best way to handle it as a contractor. Is it in

addition to the existing AT&T contract? Is it a new type of system that would have to be a new procurement, therefore, they'd have to bid out, you know, public safety broadband services separate from a standard wireless service; or could it be a sole source directly to AT&T?

Because obviously, FirstNet at the national level was awarded only to AT&T. We have expressed -- you know, OGS strongly expressed that there are agencies and counties and local governments that are waiting to purchase services off of a contract as soon as it's available.

So, you know, unfortunately, OGS is not something we can control what the timeline is and they are following all their processes and state procurement law as well in being able to place the services and data plans on contract.

So, in terms of timing, you know, unfortunately, we are a couple months into this already, about two and a half months into since AT&T submitted it. In reality, I think it's going to be at least a couple, few or more months before there is some avenue.

You know, there are options, short term and long term, you know, short term, for example, perhaps, a temporary contract, you know, capped contract or something to allow short-term services to proceed while OGS does a long term, they are looking at that.

You know, I certainly will provide any updates if we have them and will continue to express to OGS the extreme need and interest that people have in this, but I don't have a specific time, unfortunately.

VOUTOUR: That's really not necessarily a bad thing, because at least in my county, I'm still looking at coverage. So, if OGS had a price today, I still couldn't tell you because I don't know, my coverage is not adequate yet.

So, it's really kind of a bargaining tool to get the coverage adequate in my county, which leads to a second question. In your discussions with AT&T, have you talked about collocation on towers, collocating LMR systems with AT&T systems? That's something that I'm trying to approach. I need more towers and I'd rather have someone else build them and pay for them.

DELANEY: So just to expand on the first point a little bit, too, about the coverage and the time. I mean, once OGS signs a contract, you have no mandate or requirement to transition. So, you could still continue to decide your options and say, "Until this is available, I'm not going to purchase it." Regarding the tower collocation, they are looking right now at LMR towers that might be available and counties that would be interested in having post AT&T equipment on it, you know, potentially for rent -- I mean, obviously, they would prefer

no rent, but they're willing to pay rent on that.

In terms of building new towers, that is something, too, especially if, say, the county can provide land or identify a location and say, "We're going to partner with you", this goes back to the discussion of "We'll transition if you, A, say we need coverage over in this town, we have some, you know, county highway land or something available, build a tower, put our LMR on it, you can use the land for a dollar a year lease", or however you want to work it out, or say, "You build it, we're going to sign up 500 units" or something.

VOUTOUR: It's my understanding they've done that in other areas, so that's something we're looking at here.

DELANEY: I assume AT&T probably talked to you already.

VOUTOUR: Oh, yeah. I invite them in every day.

DELANEY: That's something you should continue to express. "Look, we're interested but you gotta do something before we --" you know.

VOUTOUR: We've actually run an air card, a couple patrol cars, with a mapping system to check coverage and we assign that car to different areas of the county every day. We've been doing that for about four months and we have a pretty comprehensive coverage map now. So, I keep telling them, "I need a tower there, there, there."

DELANEY: Good. That's exactly what you should be telling

them. Don't just buy services without knowing -- that's what we tell people; before you jump, know what you're jumping into. It sounds like you've definitely very well educated yourself on it.

BLEYLE: Bill Bleyle with another question.

DELANEY: Yes.

BLEYLE: Matt, speaking of coverage that he just mentioned, it did prompt a thought. I know that there's some money being made available to states. I guess it's like a Round 2 of FirstNet money for purposes. I'm wondering if there's going to be -- and I know some states are going to be planning on using that money for some coverage testing and stuff -- if there will be any coverage testing that, you know, could be done to assist counties and other municipalities in making intelligent decisions on what provider to go with.

DELANEY: So that is the SLIGP 2.0 grant that I was talking about. So, one of the allowable expenses is related to identifying coverage gaps. And in the grant guidance, there's a series of different allowable expenses related to that and processes, things like working with AT&T and FirstNet to identify coverage gaps, identifying further needs, buying commercial coverage data on companies like Root Metrics that collect coverage data and make them available as a product down to actually doing drive testing.

And drive testing is sort of the last option in that simply because it tends to be costly, although you know, the Sheriff brings up a good point about being able to collect that, sort of using an application in your sort of routine day-to-day travels and assignments.

We certainly are open to -- we thought a little bit about how to collect this information. We talked to AT&T a little bit. AT&T expressed to us they feel they have a relatively good feeling for where their network is and isn't, where their coverage holes are.

But if you have specific ideas or specific areas that you would like to see tested, that's something we can talk about offline and maybe that's something we can do a specific project under SLIGP 2.0. But there is sort of a process we have to follow and doing drive testing, we have to get pre-approval and you have to show why the other things aren't valid. In some cases, that's fine and that's certainly doable. It's just we have to go through the steps. If you're interested in doing that, definitely, let me know.

BLEYLE: Yeah, I think we are and I know at least at this stage of the game, AT&T is a little -- they want to sell the network and they're out there selling the network and they're anxious to do that, but their answers on things like coverage are probably as nebulous as you could always get from any

kind of vendor.

So, I think somewhere along the line -- and we've asked to borrow equipment and other things to do testing with and we've gotten promises, but so far, we've gotten no delivery. And I know my agency is on the cusp of making some big dollar decisions on what we're going to do countywide for mobile data.

So, I don't know if AT&T, you know, they just don't -- at least the people that you deal with at our level don't really seem to have the information that we need to make intelligent decisions.

And I know it's early and I know there's still going to be some time before the network's going to be built out to where it needs to be.

DELANEY: So are you talking to the FirstNet group at AT&T or the regular AT&T government sales, do you know? Because AT&T specifically has a FirstNet sales team in New York separate from the traditional government sales team.

BLEYLE: Yes, no, I believe it's the FirstNet team. That's what they identify themselves as. Like I said, I think they're trying to do so much so quickly that we're just not -- you know, you're just not -- I don't think AT&T has even provided them with everything that they need to do the job.

And again, I understand it's going to take a while before they get up to speed, but it would be nice to have access to that information. Because basically, what you get now is coverage maps that are equivalent to the existing network. Again, you can compare AT&T to Verizon and the experience really isn't normally what their coverage map shows. It's close, but there's still gaps that, you know, look like they have coverage but they don't.

DELANEY: Yeah, that's definitely very true. I mean, the actual testing is the best way to test coverage. I mean, maps are, you know, in anything, whether they be LMR or LT and cellular, the maps are a computer representation and as good as the information you put in and you have to apply variables.

If you look at, say, an outdoor, you know, a plain outdoor coverage and you have to ask the questions, in the cellular world especially: Is that standing outside with a handheld device? Is that a mobile-mounted antenna? Is it a handheld device inside a vehicle? Depending on how you have it mounted on your vehicle, you may have an antenna on the vehicle, you may have an air card and USB modem with no separate antenna. So, you've got additional loss in the vehicle. If you walk inside a structure, in-building, what kind of in-building? Is it residential, is it commercial,

industrial?

So, coverage maps can look good until you look at the details, so you really have to ask those kinds of questions. You know, coverage maps for how we're going to actually use the device.

Anything else?

(No response.)

DELANEY: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: I'm going to walk through the State Agency Working Group for a minute here. So, we did have a State Agency Working Group on the 21st of February. Essentially, we did a FirstNet update which you just received. We highlighted the upcoming symposium that we had. We talked about CASM and there were some changes to CASM that we highlighted, including an asset and personnel database that's been a lot easier to get into. An application process, who can be assigned and maintaining accounts.

So, there's some big changes, and there's a few other changes we talked about within CASM. We had a training coming up the following week that we advised everybody about.

And then we got into some discussions, agency discussions.

In particular, State Police talked about some of the multiband radio testing that you guys were doing and how that's fitting into and the reception you're getting with

the counties. We talked a little bit about that at the symposium as well. And then you also talked about the 2020 radio system end of life that you are facing and some of those options. I don't know if you want to expand on any of that, Chuck.

WHITE: At this point, I think that any of us that are in the State Agency Group that have a statewide jurisdiction and have end user equipment that has that multiband capability, we all purchased that equipment all about the same time around a narrow band, you know, transition and all of that is becoming end of life and having to make some decisions at this point in time what the next step is. And there are competitors on the market. We've been testing the equipment, making sure that we're getting the performance out of the various vendor equipment that's being offered to us there.

There is some nuance in some of the county systems that make some of the features critical for supporting reliable connectivity in some fringe areas of certain radio system designs. So, making sure the features in the radio can compare to the competitors is something we're looking at. Obviously, price is an issue, as always, with it, and then figuring out where the appropriations come from to be able to make that all-important purchase. We're looking at even

some other options beyond purchasing that have been available to state agencies in the past, leasing, which I think may be an option for us to consider and have a discussion with some of our control agencies.

At the end of the day, these radios are becoming more like computers and just like your Smartphone, the shelf life on these continue to shorten as time goes on and maybe there may be a better platform to be able to support this from a financial investment to ensure that you can stay current with the changing technology.

The only thing we can count on right now is change and what we don't know is what the next software upgrade is going to bring and what the next rollout of the system may provide, because advances are going quickly in this environment and we're just trying to keep up.

From our land mobile infrastructure, just our base stations are becoming end of life and making some decisions on that. We still have our conventional analog system. We've got probably close to nine thousand users on it, five thousand are members and then we have another four or five thousand that are agencies and even local PDs that depend on a radio system for day-to-day communications operation.

So, making sure that we keep our infrastructure in good shape and reliable. We're still working on our migration from our

analog radio circuit to an Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS) environment. We have a lot of things going on right now. Making sure that we don't lose any of the reliability that we currently have and, hopefully, provide some level of assured stability, resilience and redundancy as we move forward into our next phase of evolution.

Analog still stays the same. The key to us is being able to participate and communicate on all the various systems that we've got across the state.

And like Bob mentioned, traversing the states from Buffalo to Long Island, finding a piece of equipment at this point in time, I think, collectively -- let me know if I'm wrong -- really, the only answer we have right now for interop connectivity is really multiband end user equipment.

I think at the symposium, there were discussions about gateways and patches and multiband end user equipment, the most popular solution at this point in time, but technology may get us there. So, we're not there right at this moment in time. That's the balancing act that we have currently.

SPRAGUE: It is a balancing act. I think us as a group will be very interested to see how you make out with multiband radio testing with the various counties and the actual application of them in the vehicle will be a chore all by itself.

WHITE: Absolutely. And that's the challenge that we have. Cars keep getting smaller. The functionality we need in our radios keeps expanding. You've always got that noise level in the vehicle. You've got competing technologies operating at the same time. So that's always a challenge. But you know, my hope is that if we can offer the counties and the consortiums a P25 compliant device, we will have the opportunity to test that device on these county systems. And if there is a concern with some of the counties that have got new systems online and they want to make sure that the system's running appropriately and maybe that the addition of an end user piece of equipment may complicate the assessment of the system, I would only offer that this would be a perfect time for you to identify any operational or configuration glitches or hiccups in your systems design that would prohibit a P25 complaint radio from another manufacturer to be operating on the system. So, it may be an opportunity at the same time as it is a pause for concern.

SPRAGUE: That was the gist of the meeting. Any questions, comments?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All right. Thank you. Matt, you're up.

DELANEY: So federal IO channels. Let's talk about the federal interoperability channels a little bit. The

federal interoperability channels, the VHF, UHF, the LE and the IR channels. You may have seen some references to these in the past, LE-3, IR-4, etc. These are not the same as the national interoperability channels, although some confuse the naming or refer to the national interoperability channels as the federal interoperability channels, and say, "Oh, I'm going to use the federal interoperability channels."

Make sure you actually are appropriately calling the federal channels the federal channels and the national channels the national channels.

The federal channels fall under the authority of the National Telecommunications Information Administration and agreements are required for non-federal agencies.

The primary goal or purpose of these channels was for federal agencies to improve interoperability. But after they deployed them, they started looking at, well, maybe we should make them available for joint interests.

So, if there's an incident involving both federal and non-federal agencies, for example, a manhunt or an active shooter that might have federal law enforcement, F.B.I. or the Marshall Service along with state and local law enforcement, you have common interoperability as well. They're not for internal state and local use only. There

has to be an incident that involves the federal government or a federal agency.

An MOU template has been developed for the use of the US government and state. Prior to the template, every state and every agency that wanted to use it had to go to a federal agency that maybe they worked with, come to an agreement, develop an MOU.

A couple years ago, the State of Wyoming worked with the Department of the Interior, a federal agency, to develop a template that could be used for all of the states to sign and then utilize the federal interoperability channels for those kinds of federal/non-federal joint operations in their state.

So, the Department of the Interior as serving as the federal agency, the response, once the MOU is in place, you're not restricted to only talking to the Department of the Interior. They're just sort of the sponsoring federal agency.

But then each state, acting through their state interoperability coordinator, Mike, who wishes to participate will sign the MOU. So, we started this process about a year ago. Unfortunately, we had a change in legal. So, it had to get reviewed and redeveloped again. But the review has been completed.

And, actually, I have good news since I completed this slide

last week that we have received our internal agency approval for signature on the document. So, it will get signed by Mike and then it'll go to the Department of the Interior, the federal government, for the signatures. They've been involved in the development as well, so hopefully, that will go rather quickly since they already sort of put their terms and stuff into it and whatnot.

So, then DHSES will develop policies and processes related to the channel usage. This is actually going to be a responsibility of the SWIC, because the person who signs the MOU has that responsibility under the terms of the MOU.

We will obtain a license, an FCC license, for these channels. Agencies that wish to use them will need to follow the process and procedures developed to coordinate with OIEC. But essentially, what happens is you have -- the ultimate end goal is you have an incident with federal law enforcement, you know, a manhunt or something where you've got federal agencies there, you can utilize these channels and you won't have to enter into an individual agreement for that incident. You'll have worked our processes in the state agreement that we developed with the feds to have immediate use of those channels.

And one thing that's beneficial about those channels is that they can be encrypted. So, encryption is allowed on them.

The national interoperability channels, the ones we talk about every day, the V-TAC and U-TAC and stuff, must be analog. It has to be made very clear that only the 700 MHz interop channels can be P25. Everything else is analog. So, for the V-TACs, the U-TACs and the 8-TACs, if they're analog, that basically means that they're in the clear. There is no standardized encryption in analog. There is in P25. AES encryption works across multiple vendors in P25 without a problem, but there is no really such thing in analog.

So, you can't take advantage of encryption then in the VHF, the UHF and the interop channels. You can in the 700. Of course, 700's not always available. You may not have 700 in your area, or 700 subscriber equipment.

So, by having access to the federal interop channels, if you're working with the feds on a particular incident, law enforcement or something, you can encrypt.

So, you can have your task force, the sheriff task force, the F.B.I. or the Marshall Service share in encryption on one of these federal channels and be very secure and have secure encryption.

So, I talked before about encryption guidelines for New York. A number of the consortiums were working on developing it. Two consortiums had developed two slightly different plans,

tables and so forth in an attempt to develop one for the state that would be set aside, a non-overlapping set of encryption references. In encryption in the radios, you have to -- if you're going to share your encryption keys or you're going to share -- even not working but just share other peoples' keys in your radio, you can't have a reference in the radio to hold the storage location of the key ID overlap, because if you do, you can't share your key or you're going to overwrite the other person's key when you load the radio. So, if you have a task force that wants to get together for something or you have two neighboring sheriff's departments that want to share encryption keys, you have to have different ID numbers on those encryption keys. I'm not talking about the key itself. I'm talking about the reference to the key.

If everyone uses one, for example, which is kind of like a default, oh, I'll just use key number one, you can't share it, because you'll overwrite the other person's key. So actually, Customs and Border Protection, the National Law Enforcement Communication Center, NLECC, has developed basically a master database for the U.S. and you can request to have a key assignment from them and then it will not overlap with anyone else in the country. Not the actual key. So, the actual encryption value that you're using to make

your transition secure is still entirely under your control. It's simply the reference number. So, say, key number 437 belongs to the Empire County Sheriff's Department. That way, no one else in the country is using key 437.

The actual contents of that key and how you encrypt your communication, how you change it all, is still entirely up to you, but at least you know if you want to share your key with your neighboring Sheriff's Department or the State Police, for example, or the DEC, you know there's no chance that two counties over is using the same number for their key if they're all following this guideline.

So, we need to develop -- now that we have clarification from NLECC on the way they want to follow process basically, you'll send them an e-mail and they'll respond back with the next available key assignment and key ID or three key IDs if you rotate through on a regular basis, if you change your keys. Some people just use one key and it's the same key they always use. Other people want to rotate their keys on a regular basis. So, we're going to develop guidelines around that.

The problem is we know that there are people who are getting ready to reprogram, there are people using systems right now and are looking for this guidance. So, we want to get something out there sooner rather than later and the next

board meeting is not until the fall. So, we definitely want to get something out very soon. Basically, this guideline is going to say here's how you contact NLECC, here's the process to follow. It's totally up to you what key you actually use, who, if anybody, you share your key with. You may choose not to share it with anybody. You still want to follow the process, because if you later decide to or somebody neighboring to you wants to share their key with you, you don't want to overlap.

So, I'd like to suggest that we go ahead and develop a guideline, a draft guideline, at least get it out in draft and we can bring it back to this Board in the September meeting for sort of formal finalization, but we need to sort of develop something sooner rather than later describing that process, providing the content for NLECC and getting it out, because we know there are counties that are currently in the process of street mapping and need to follow this process. Otherwise, it might be too late by September and they'll have just picked a key number that it turns out overlaps with two or three counties away or a neighboring state, because they didn't realize it.

So, I'm just looking for some sort of yes or no if that's a good idea to get this out in draft.

SPRAGUE: Is there anybody that has any disagreement with

us putting this together?

(No response.)

DAY: No disagreement, but I just have one question. How are you going to incorporate localities that already have keys?

DELANEY: So our guideline will say that, you know, you don't have to change. You know, again, it's voluntary. The best thing is to follow this guideline, of course. But if you already have a key, you know, you can e-mail NLECC and see if your key ID has not already been assigned to somebody else, you can say, "This is my key, we reserve this particular number."

But it may be already assigned to -- you know, it may be assigned to the Texas Police Department. Okay, you'd have to take that risk that, okay, you're probably not going to interoperate with them, but if you're a county that borders the State of Massachusetts and you go, "Well, gee, the State of Massachusetts has already been assigned the same key number," you might want to think about what process do I want to take to incorporate at some point in the future changing my key ID so I don't overlap with my neighboring --

DAY: So part of this process is -- a mandatory part of this process should be a reach-out to anybody that we know that already has -- say this is something you really should do.

DELANEY: I'm only aware -- and there could be more, but the input I've gotten from the members of the group here who were on the calls we've had about the encryption, there were probably less than a dozen keys, AES keys, we're only talking about AES. If you're using some type of legacy encryption or proprietary encryption, this doesn't apply. We're talking about AES encryption potentially.

So, if you're building P25 or have a P25, if you're using Provoice or something, that doesn't apply here. This is just for a P25 system.

So, I'm only aware of probably less than a dozen agencies using keys and most of them are only using one or two. So, the number is relatively small, the ones I know about. But there could be more. I think we probably have to put like an all call or something with the guidance anyway. We want to put out a notification that it's published. But there's also national keys that are reserved -- the first 20 or 24 are reserve numbers for national encryption and, actually, all federal agencies have or will have these keys and they are available to public safety at the state and local level. So, if you have encryption in your radios and wish to load these interoperable encryption keys, for example, the F.B.I. in Albany has them in all their radios. So, if you have your radio, and you took advantage of an interop channel or a

shared channel, you wouldn't have to share your keys with the FBI and the FBI wouldn't share their keys with you, but you could assign the use of that national public safety key. There's a process to follow, too, that will be in the guideline. That process is set by NLECC about which key loader you have, KVL, you either dial in or send it to them, they have to sort of make it Wi-Fi disabled, it's sort of one of the newer ones.

Then, basically, they maintain the key and you can upgrade your radios with that key on a yearly basis if you choose to do that. That way, it doesn't matter whether it's a federal agency, whether it's another state agency that's using those keys. It's a public safety shared key. And that doesn't prevent you from using your own keys for your own channels. It just allows you to have something in common from the start. You can always tactically load peoples' radios at the time for a task force operation or something as well.

DAY: Do you need a motion to move forward with that or are you just looking for concurrence?

SPRAGUE: Just looking for concurrence at this point in time.

DELANEY: We'll bring the final guideline, obviously, to the September meeting, but we didn't want to wait to put it into

draft in September.

SPRAGUE: And the guideline should include all the questions we have. What happens if you already have a key? What if there's a conflict? That type of stuff should be included in the guidelines.

DELANEY: That's all I have. Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Okay. Citizens Alerting Committee has not met. The OEM Planning Group has been rewriting the plan and one of the things that's just popped up is that the deputy director that was kind of carrying a lot of that stuff retired. Good for him. Not good for us.

And the other thing that's kind of in the mix that we have to factor in is the transition that's going on. So, we have to get this committee together to have a discussion of where we are with all of that. And I'll have lots more information when we get to the next board meeting. So that's where we stand on Citizens Alerting Committee.

New business. It's not really new business. This is just kind of a really quick look at where we were with the consortium. We had 113 people, 55 people took the tour of West Point and 55 came back. We did have our C3 meeting, the second one, and it was again well attended and everybody that was there really appreciated the meeting.

We're going to try and host another one out in the Canandaigua

area out in Ontario County coming up in June. That group really seems to have a lot of energy there and we're going to keep going. It was an interesting event, because it was shortened by Winter Storm Toby Dusha. He reached out and hit us one last time.

Here's some of the things we talked about. There was a lot of stuff we went through at that particular program. You know, highlighting some of the stuff, the hurricane responses, I think everybody got a lot of information out of that.

We had one where we had impact to infrastructure but communication stayed up to some extent. We had other areas where there was literally nothing left and had to start from square one. So that, I think, was a really good thing. We talked about CAN-US, we had them report back to us on CAN-US. So, we're kind of keeping the pressure up on that group. They are still meeting quarterly. The next one is supposed to be in Canada somewhere. I'm trying to find out where the meeting's going to be.

Some of the other things we talked about today. On the COM-U side of things, we do have a new state FOG that we're going to be looking at in the near future. I mean, we're just starting to look at that and we'll get people in to take a look at that. Folks have been working on it from OEC.

We actually do -- we have issued, I think it's what, 32 COM-L credentials. This is one of them. That's what it looks like. So, we're doing that program where we pull them in together and getting them more organized in the near future. The other thing, we did the quad state interoperability planning and one of the things that came out of it, we talked about CASM and some of the new stuff with CASM. We are now interoperable CASM between New Jersey, New York and Connecticut, and we will be shortly with Pennsylvania. So, if you're doing any sort of COM-L planning or working with communications near the borders, you can see what's on the other side of the border in CASM. Haven't got it yet. That was something we found out we could open up as SWIC, we opened it up and it was opened before we left the conference. So that's kind of a cool thing that we pulled out of that.

And that's really kind of the gist of where we went. It was a busy two days. We shortened it all up so we didn't have to do the last day.

Any questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: We're looking towards next year already. So, I don't know where that's going to be, but we'll get it out as soon as we figure it out. That was all I had for new

business.

Any other new business anybody wants to bring up?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I appreciate everybody bearing with us and making a shorter meeting out of this, although it pretty much came out on time. We'll take about a 10-minute break while Angelica gets set up. We will have a working lunch that will show up at some point. Thank you very much.

Do I have a motion to adjourn?

LAFLURE: Motion.

VOU TOUR: Second.

SPRAGUE: Motion made and seconded. All in favor?

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Our next meeting is September 13.

* * * * *

(Concluded at 11:47 a.m.)

* * * * *

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

I, **THERESA L. ARDIA**, 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

Dated: April 15, 2018.