State Interoperable & Emergency Communication (SIEC) Board Meeting
Welcome and Opening Remarks

Michael A. Sprague, Director, Office of Interoperable & Emergency Communications, Chair, SIEC Board
Roll Call
Approval of Minutes
Approval of Agenda

Roll Call; Approval of the Meeting Agenda;
Approval of Minutes from July 31, 2019 Meeting
Approval of Agenda for November 20, 2019
NCSWIC State Interoperability Markers
New York Workshop

November 20, 2019

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT & ENTERPRISE ANALYTICS
CISA Overview

Cybersecurity And Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA)

Emergency Communications Division
Enhances public safety interoperable communications at all levels of government, providing training, coordination, tools and guidance to help develop emergency communications

Infrastructure Security Division
Provides strategic guidance to public and private partners, promotes a national unity of effort, and coordinates Federal efforts to promote the security and resilience of the Nation’s critical infrastructure

Cybersecurity Division
Offers cybersecurity programs and services to improve cybersecurity postures, including training, and technical assistance.

Integrated Operation Division
Provides tools and training to partners to help partners in government and industry manage the risks to their assets, systems, and networks.

Stakeholder Engagement Division
Leverages partnerships to build capacity for resilience across the Nation’s critical infrastructure and the cybersecurity community.

National Risk Management Center
A planning, analysis, and collaboration center that identifies and addresses the most significant risks to the Nation’s critical infrastructure

- Created by the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency Act of 2018
- Leads the Federal Government’s cyber security, critical infrastructure protection, and emergency communications efforts
- Unites efforts from across government and industry to understand and manage risks together
What CISA Does

Emergency Communications Core Competencies

National and Statewide Planning & Execution
Develop and implement nationwide emergency communications policy and plans, including the National Emergency Communications Plan (NECP) and 56 Statewide Communications Interoperability Plans (SCIPs)

Federal Grant Coordination
Manage funding, sustainment, and grant programs to support communications interoperability

National Governance
Support nationwide sharing of best practices and lessons learned through facilitation of the SAFECOM and Emergency Communications Preparedness Center (ECPC) governance bodies

Priority Telecommunications Services (PTS)
Provide PTS over commercial networks to enable national security and emergency preparedness personnel to communicate during congestion scenarios across the nation

Technical Assistance & Outreach
Build capacity with Federal, State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial stakeholders by providing technical assistance, training, resources, and guidance

Assessment and Reports
Assess the Nation’s progress regarding interoperable emergency communications to identify remaining gaps
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The True Cost and Scope of Emergency Communications

**What Most People See**

- 911
  - Voice Systems (Telephone)
  - Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Systems
  - Transition to Next Generation 911 (NG911)

**Radio Communications Systems**

- Mobile and Portable Land Mobile Radio (LMR)
- Interoperability Maintenance Costs
- Communication Towers
- Tower Equipment Sheds

**Broadband & Data Systems**

- Mobile Data Terminals (MDT)
- FirstNet
- Government Emergency Telecommunications Service (GETS)
- Wireless Priority Service (WPS)

**Alerts & Warnings**

- Outdoor Warning Systems
- Emergency Alert System (EAS)
- Wireless Emergency Alerts (WEA)
- IPAWS (including silver/amber alerts)
- TV/Radio/Website/Media Updates
- Social Media Outlets

**Emergency Communication Iceberg Graphic**

**What People Don’t See**

- SWIC / Communications Champion
- Statewide Communications Office
- Strategic Planning

**Governance**

- Telecommunicator/Dispatch Training and Retention
- Agency LMR, Telephone, Alerts/Warning procedures
- Agency System Maintenance staff (technicians, engineers)
- Incident Communications Training
- Communications Exercise (tabletop, functional)
- Technical Emergency Response Training (TERT)
- Incident Communications Unit staff training, including:
  - Communications Unit Leader (COML)
  - Communications Technician (COMT)
  - Incident Tactical Dispatcher (INTD) Training
  - Radio Operator (RADO) Training
  - Information Technology Service Unit Leader (ITSL)
  - Audio Gateway Information and Training
  - Cybersecurity Training and Awareness

**Cybersecurity**

- Expertise and Planning
- Tools and Solutions
- Risk and Vulnerability Management
- Prevention Equipment and Training

**Training & Exercises**

- Statewide Emergency Communication Exercise (WESSEX)
- Technical Training (TETRA)
- Online Training (LEED)
- Incident Response Training (COLT)
- Incident Command Training (ICT)
- Incident Command System (ICS)
- Incident Command System (ICS) Trainer

**Alerts & Warnings**

- Outdoor Warning Systems
- Emergency Alert System (EAS)
- Wireless Emergency Alerts (WEA)
- IPAWS (including silver/amber alerts)
- TV/Radio/Website/Media Updates
- Social Media Outlets
CISA analyzed numerous resources to identify markers that could indicate interoperability “health” at the state/territory level. Some included:
- SCIPs
- ICCAP observations
- After Action Reports
- Lessons learned from *Enhancing Public Safety Governance Workshops* (2018 CISA & NGA effort)

CISA worked collaboratively to discuss research trends and gather feedback. This collaboration helped identify what measures were the most important.

Based on all the gathered information, CISA developed the markers and defined three categories to distinguish the state/territory level interoperability health:
- Initial
- Defined
- Optimized

Official language for the state markers was developed based on input from:
- NCSWIC Executive Committee
- Full NCSWIC in PA & OK
- 14 States participating in two Pilot Meetings
Benefits for States and Territories

- Understand impacts of interoperability efforts
- Improve coordination and buy-in from lawmakers and executive branch staff
- Reduce workload by eliminating Statewide Communication Interoperability Plan (SCIP) Snapshots and reducing time to gather data
- Improve strategic planning and implementation aligned to ecosystem
- Justify grant funding and state budget requests
- Enhance the SCIP planning process
- Improve coordination with locals
- Enhance governance body participation and membership
Benefits for CISA

- Understand state/territory interoperability capabilities and gaps and assist in improving the SCIP process
- Improve alignment to the 2019 National Emergency Communications Plan (NECP)
- Improve Technical Assistance (TA) offerings to better meet state/territory needs
- Justify resource requirements to DHS leadership, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Congress, and the President
- Respond to Congressional, Government Accountability Office and OMB requests for ECD program impacts
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State Marker Status Map
New York vs. National Average

1.87
National Average Marker Score

1.79
Region II Average Marker Score

2.17
New York Average Marker Score
New York vs. National View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Defined</th>
<th>Optimized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State-level Governing Body Established</td>
<td>7 (13%)</td>
<td>23 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGB/SIEC Participation</td>
<td>9 (16%)</td>
<td>18 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWIC Established</td>
<td>19 (32%)</td>
<td>37 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWIC Duty Percentage</td>
<td>20 (36%)</td>
<td>18 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIP Refresh</td>
<td>20 (36%)</td>
<td>18 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIP Strategic Goal Percentage</td>
<td>20 (36%)</td>
<td>27 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Emergency Communication Grant Coordination</td>
<td>10 (18%)</td>
<td>19 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Unit Process</td>
<td>13 (23%)</td>
<td>18 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Communication</td>
<td>18 (32%)</td>
<td>28 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICP (or equivalent) Developed</td>
<td>30 (54%)</td>
<td>17 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Operations Guides (FOGs) Developed</td>
<td>31 (55%)</td>
<td>14 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alerts &amp; Warnings</td>
<td>38 (68%)</td>
<td>10 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Programming</td>
<td>9 (16%)</td>
<td>17 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybersecurity Assessment Awareness</td>
<td>41 (73%)</td>
<td>11 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG911 Implementation</td>
<td>37 (66%)</td>
<td>5 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Operability/Interoperability</td>
<td>21 (38%)</td>
<td>23 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Exercise Objectives</td>
<td>20 (36%)</td>
<td>29 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained Communications Unit Responders</td>
<td>28 (50%)</td>
<td>10 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Usage Best Practices/Lessons Learned</td>
<td>32 (57%)</td>
<td>16 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPS Subscription</td>
<td>51 (91%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>16 (29%)</td>
<td>20 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainment Assessment</td>
<td>15 (27%)</td>
<td>18 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Identification</td>
<td>29 (52%)</td>
<td>17 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Border/Interstate (State to State) Emergency Communications</td>
<td>23 (41%)</td>
<td>28 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Kansas requested CISA to host State Markers workshop with their SIAC.

Oklahoma has agreed to share their COMU best practices with Idaho.

After reviewing the marker data on WPS, Connecticut immediately contacted their PAR to help drive participation rates.

New York hosts CISA for State Markers review workshop with their SIEC.

CISA has begun to incorporate the State Markers into the SCIP process.

Virginia presented the State Markers to the SIEC to gain feedback and participation in the process.

Alabama shared their TICP template with the other Region IV states to improve TICP and FOG participation and planning.

Louisiana leveraged State Marker data to receive funding for a full-time SWIC.
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For More Information: CISA.GOV

Questions?

Email: mark.grubb@cisa.dhs.gov

Phone: 302-419-6775
PSAP, SICG and Targeted Grant Updates

Presented by Larissa Guedko, Radio Engineer, Office of Interoperable and Emergency Communications
# SICG Program Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Appropriation Year</th>
<th>Appropriation Amount $$</th>
<th>Reimbursed $$</th>
<th>Project Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1 SICG</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>20 million</td>
<td>20 million</td>
<td>12/21/2011 – 09/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2 (SICG)</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>102 million</td>
<td>101.7 million</td>
<td>02/04/2013 – 02/03/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2 (2012 PSAP)</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>9 million</td>
<td>9 million</td>
<td>05/01/2013 – 04/30/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2 (2013 PSAP)</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>9 Million</td>
<td>8.9 million</td>
<td>06/25/2014 – 06/24/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 3 SICG</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>75 million</td>
<td>75 million</td>
<td>12/03/2013 – 06/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 4 SICG</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>50 million</td>
<td>33.4 million</td>
<td>01/01/2016 – 12/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 SICG Formula</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>45 million</td>
<td>30.2 million</td>
<td>01/01/2017 – 12/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 SICG Formula</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>45 million</td>
<td>14.6 million</td>
<td>01/01/2018 – 12/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 SICG Formula</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>45 million</td>
<td>2.3 million</td>
<td>01/01/2019 – 12/31/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SICG Program Overview (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Appropriation Year</th>
<th>Appropriation Amount $$</th>
<th>Reimbursed $$</th>
<th>Project Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17 PSAP Operations</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>10 million</td>
<td>10 million</td>
<td>01/01/2017 – 12/31/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18 PSAP Operations</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>10 million</td>
<td>10 million</td>
<td>01/01/2018 – 12/31/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19 PSAP Operations</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>10 million</td>
<td>5.2 million</td>
<td>01/01/2019 – 12/31/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SICG Program Overview (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Appropriation Year</th>
<th>Appropriation Amount $$$</th>
<th>Reimbursed $$$</th>
<th>Project Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2018 SICG Targeted Grant: announced $32,640,405 in **Phase 1** of the award process.

**Anticipated RFAs Schedule:**
- **PSAP Operations Grant** - *every year in May-June*
- **SICG Formula Grant** – *every year in June-July*
- **SICG Targeted Grant** – *ongoing, rolling schedule*
SICG Program Overview

✓ 2019 SICG Formula – Award Results are being evaluated by Governor's office
✓ 2019 PSAP Operations Grant – Awards announced
✓ 2019 SICG Targeted – RFA First Quarter 2020

TOTAL $492.6 million in grants

Please visit www.dhses.ny.gov/oiec/grants for additional information
Use of Interoperability Channels

✓ Any use of Interoperability Channels should be notified via “Interopnotify” listserv (contact OIEC office for details how to sign up)

✓ National Interoperability channels were activated in NY over 100 times since January 2019.

✓ Uses include: testing, training, exercises, emergency situations (fire, manhunts, search and rescue, providing communications between different system using patching, etc)

✓ Interoperability Repeaters MUST be OFF when not in use!
Standing Committee Reports

Presented by Michael A. Sprague, Director, Office of Interoperable & Emergency Communications, Chair, SIEC Board
911 Advisory Committee

Presented by
A. Wesley Jones,
Committee Chair
NG 9-1-1 Working Group

Presented by Brett Chellis, Deputy Director, Office of Interoperable and Emergency Communications
NG911 Activities to date:

- Established NG911 Working Group
- Developed Federal partnership with DHS CISA ECD
- Attended National NG911 conferences
- Multiple In-person working group sessions
- Bi-weekly working group calls
- NG911 Draft Plan
  - Framework developed
  - Stakeholder input and review
  - Amendments, updates
  - Present for Exec Review
Stakeholders

- 911 Committee
- ITS GIS
- NG 911
- SIEC Board
- CISA
- NYS Police
- DPS
- ECD
- NY City
- Other
Plan Under Executive Review

Contents of NG911 Plan

- NG911 Roadmap
- Program/Operations
- Technical Systems
- Data Development Maintenance Support
- Analysis/Planning
The Process in NY

Will be impacted by many factors, including but not limited to:

- Agency feedback and direction
- Funding
- Established and forthcoming national NG911 standards
- Evolution of technology and available options
- Stakeholder outreach and feedback
The Path to NG911

Need PSAP managers, 911 Authority managers, and elected officials at every level to come to an understanding to create NG911 end states at the County, regional, State and the national level.

Managing the development and implementation in a planned evolution as opposed to a crisis managed reactionary implementation as TDM is replaced by IP technology.

With this in mind, we are preparing to deploy the NG911 Readiness Scorecard.
NG911 Readiness Scorecard

Source:
FCC Task Force on Optimal PSAP Architecture

Purpose:
The NG911 Readiness Scorecard provides the State 911 Program an understanding of the NG911 implementation maturity states and the essential elements necessary to be present within each County.

Result:
With this understanding we are able to better plan, budget and execute NG911 transition.
NG911 Readiness Scorecard

NG9-1-1 Implementation Continuum
The Scorecard utilizes a multi-step implementation model which consists of the following implementation maturity states:

Legacy
Foundational
Transitional
Intermediate
Jurisdictional End State
National End State
NG911 Readiness Scorecard

NG9-1-1 Essential Elements

- The Scorecard then identifies essential elements which are necessary to be present within each NG911 Implementation Maturity State.

- Essential elements are categorized into the following areas of interest:
  - Governance
  - Routing & Location
  - GIS Data
  - NG Core Service Elements
  - Network
  - PSAP Call Handling Systems & Applications
  - Security
  - Operations
  - Optional Interfaces
NG911 Readiness Scorecard

Completion process in New York

- The National 911 Program office will have a template available soon for PSAP’s and State 911 Programs to utilize.

- PSAP Authorities will be asked to complete the template and forward it to the OIEC 911 Program for compilation to complete a statewide assessment for New York to help the Working Group with planning purposes.
GIS Subcommittee Report

Gerald A. Engstrom Jr., AICP
New York State Police County CAD and GIS Program Manager
Office of Information Technology Services – GIS Program Office
Communications and Interoperability Working Group

Presented by
Jay Kopstein, Co-Chair
Mark Balistreri, Radio Engineer, OIEC
### NY State Communications Unit (COMU) Credentialed Personnel (Statewide)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICS Position</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020 (Projected)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COML</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COML (Instructors)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMT (Instructors)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUXCOMM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NY State Communications Unit (COMU) 2020 Training (Requested)

1/27/20 – 1/31/20 (COMT Course)
2/11/20 – 2/13/20 (INCM Course)
3/10/20 – 3/12/20 (Exercise Design Course) *
4/14/20 – 4/16/20 (COML Course)
4/27/20 – 5/1/20 (COMT Train-the-Trainer Course)
5/18/20 – 5/22/20 (ITSL Course)
6/9/20 – 6/11/20 (RADO Course)
7/21/20 – 7/23/20 (AUXCOMM Course)
9/15/20 – 9/18/20 (INTD Course)
10/20/20 – 10/21/20 (AUXCOMM Train-the-Trainer Course)
11/16/20 – 11/20/20 (COMT Course)

* DHSES-OIEC is requesting that at least two (2) individuals from each of the nine (9) Consortiums take this course.
Questions?

If you do have questions or need assistance later on:

Mark Balistreri
518-322-4939
Mark.Balistreri@dhses.ny.gov

Phil McGeough
518-322-4923
Phillip.McGeough@dhses.ny.gov

Joann Waidelich
518-322-4913
Joann.Waidelich@dhses.ny.gov
Public Safety Broadband User Group

Presented by Matthew Delaney, Radio Engineer, Office of Interoperable and Emergency Communications
Public Safety Broadband

- Continue to monitor developments and hold discussions with the carriers.
  - If you have a need for deployable or other coverage/capacity requirements at events coming up, please work with us (it’s NOT too early to plan for next summer)

- You may have seen in the news…T-Mobile has announced if the Sprint – T-Mobile merger occurs, they will offer free services to public safety. We don’t have all details yet, but will track for more information.
Public Safety Broadband

- There is more interest in LMR-LTE push to talk integration. We will begin discussions on this in the PSBBUG. End result: Does the State issue a guideline or best practice document?

- If you are using, or have evaluated, LMR over cellular, or PTT on cellular, please let us know.
State Agency Communications Working Group

Presented by
Michael A. Sprague, Director, Office of Interoperable & Emergency Communications, Chair, SIEC Board
State Agency Working Group

November 15, 2019

• Rapid Deployment Plan – Finalize document
    • Suggested Edits
    • Review by NYSP
    • Redistribution to State Agency Contacts
  – Agency Training & Familiarization
  – Exercise of RDP

• Consolidation of Radio Requests

• Agency Reports
Channel Naming and Use Working Group

Presented by Matthew Delaney, Radio Engineer, Office of Interoperable and Emergency Communications
Uncoordinated Interoperability Repeaters

• National Interoperability Channel (NIO) repeaters left on the air when not in use continue to be a problem.

• E.g. UTAC41 left online but dormant. When an agency needs to activate UTAC41 for an incident, they receive interference from the other repeater.

• NIO repeaters are a great asset…but only when properly coordinated.

• NYS Guidelines address this…repeaters off when not in use; activation notifications sent to listserv.

• If you install an NIO repeater, you must have some way to control the repeater mode…over the air DTMF, console button, site telemetry, etc.
Uncoordinated Interoperability Repeaters

• Some recent examples of issues

• Bethel Woods festival: Command repeater on UTAC43 was receiving interference from another repeater left on. With the FCC’s help…on a weekend…it was tracked to an out of state location. They did not know they had a repeater online…likely not used in years. Repeater was shut off.

• Orange County Airshow: Backup channel on UTAC42. Console control stations were able to key a distant repeater. Luckily this backup channel was not needed. Later tracked down during UNGA mission.
Uncoordinated Interoperability Repeaters

• UCALL40 heterodyning from multiple repeaters interfering with training event at the SPTC. Determined to be a central NY county with 3 sites, all turned on and not simulcast. Fortunately there was a Morse Code ID (CWID) on the repeater and the licensee was quickly found and contacted. Their vendor did not understand the issue as the repeater was not locked into transmit. Had to explain about NIO, heterodyning, etc. Repeaters were disabled. (Counties/agencies, remember, you are the license and are ultimately responsible)

• VTAC34 in the Adirondacks. Was discovered during routine testing. A dispatch center answered the test and was identified. Follow-up through the county resulted in the repeater being turned off when not in use. Discovered repeater is regularly used for interop, but left online 24/7 without any coordination.
Uncoordinated Interoperability Repeaters

- OIEC, working with DHS and the FCC, has begun tracking down these uncoordinated repeaters. The first joint planned mission was during September’s UN General Assembly (UNGA).

- DHSES, FCC, DHS, FDNY, NYPD worked as a team to track multiple repeaters in the NYC area.

- Over the course of a week, multiple repeaters were found online, many interfering with each other (making the channel totally useless when needed).
Uncoordinated Interoperability Repeaters

Some causes were:

- Repeater controller programmed to default repeater-on when power comes back;
- DAS testing that was forgotten about;
- Grandfathered non-interop licensee (but with a repeater that was transmitting bursts of static for no valid reason);
- A county where their console indicated the repeater was off, but a site visit proved it to be enabled.
- An installation where the person in charge retired and nobody was aware of its existence;
- A fire department that decided to take a 2W grandfathered mobile license and make it a high power fixed repeater (you don’t want to explain that to the FCC).

END RESULT: ALL QUIET ON THE NIO IN THE NYC AREA
Uncoordinated Interoperability Repeaters

• Additional work still to be done. There are others in the State. We will be visiting all areas…so please check your repeaters now before we are in your area.

• Don’t ASSUME they are off…verify they are off. We have seen a number of instances with well-intentioned statements that “all our repeaters are off” when they really are not…technical issues exist.

• If notification hasn’t been made to the listserv, the repeat-mode must be disabled.

• And remember, ALL fixed sites must have an FCC license. FIXED TRANSMITTERS ARE NOT EXEMPT FROM FCC LICENSE. (Only mobile and portable radio use of the NIO frequencies is covered by “license by rule”)

November 20, 2019

NEW YORK STATE
Homeland Security and Emergency Services
Citizen Alerting Committee

Presented by Michael A. Sprague, Director, Office of Interoperable & Emergency Communications, Chair, SIEC Board
Citizens Alerting Committee

- No Meeting – This Quarter
- NYSOEM
  - Conducted monthly test of WEA on Monday November 18, 2019
  - Attempted at test with IPAWS in October but was postponed by FEMA
- Reminder that effective November 2019 all COGs are required to conduct monthly tests
New Business

Presented by
Michael A. Sprague,
Director, Office of Interoperable & Emergency Communications,
Chair, SIEC Board
New Business

• Schedule Meetings for 2020
Summary, Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Presented by Michael A. Sprague, Director, Office of Interoperable & Emergency Communications, Chair, SIEC Board