



ANDREW M. CUOMO
Governor

JOHN P. MELVILLE
Commissioner, DHSES

ROBERT M. BARBATO
Director

State Interoperable & Emergency Communication Board Meeting Minutes
August 26, 2015
DHSES – Building 7A – First Floor Training Room

Barbato: Good morning everyone. We are going to begin the meeting. This is the 3rd meeting of the year of the State Interoperable Emergency Communication Board. I want to welcome you all to Albany and do appreciate you all taking time out to conduct business relative to emergency communications in the State of New York. Today’s agenda is somewhat light. We have some informational items as we always do and an action item relative to Channel Naming. Commissioner John Melville will be joining us later in the meeting and I will let you know when he will be joining us.

The first order of business before we get to roll call and minutes is I’d like to introduce Brett Chellis. Brett is the Deputy Director for the Office of Interoperable and Emergency Communications. Many of you know Brett from his prior positions. He is most recently the emergency manager for Broome County. He has a long and accomplished career in emergency and fire services in the Broome County region. He has an excellent reputation. We are very pleased to have him on board.

Chellis: Thank you Bob.

Barbato: I just want to remind everyone that this meeting is subject to open meetings law, it will be recorded and the information will be published on our web page for review within a minimal amount of time after the meeting. In addition to the members of the Board we have some guests here and attendees that will be here for this afternoons meeting of the Communications Interoperable Working Group as you know is an ad hoc group of subject matter experts. Those of you who are Board members and have the time are welcome to attend that meeting as well. With that we will begin with Roll call:

Board members present:

- Robert M. Barbato Chair and Director of the Office of Interoperable and Emergency Communications
Col. Steven Cumoletti For Joseph D’Amico, Superintendent, NYS Police
Mark Fettinger For Michael C. Green, Commissioner, NYS Division of Criminal Justice Services
Brett Chellis For John P. Melville, Commissioner, Division of Homeland Security & Emergency Services
Art Schloth For Margaret Miller, NYS Chief Information Officer, NYS Office of Information Technology
Brian LaFlure Emergency Manager, Warren County
Rod Sechrist For Matt Driscoll, Commissioner, NYS Department of Transportation

LTC Robert Mitchell
Gary T. Maha
William Bleyle
Michael Volk
John Merklinger
James Voutour

For Maj. Gen. Patrick A. Murphy, NYS Division of Military & Naval Affairs
Sheriff, Genesee County
Commissioner, Onondaga County 9-1-1
Chief of EMS & Communications, Westchester County
911 Coordinator, Monroe County
Sheriff, Niagara County

Board Members Calling in:

Robert Morris
Joseph Gerace

VP, Port Authority of NY-NJ Police Benevolent Association
Sheriff, Chautauqua County

Board Members Absent:

Joel Eisdorfer
Richard Rotanz
Michael Primeau
Kevin Revere
Eric Day

Partner, Real Estate Development Company
Executive Director, Applied Science Director
For Howard Zucker, MD, MPH Commissioner, NYS Department of Health
Emergency Manager, Oneida County
Emergency Manager, Clinton County

Speakers:

Robert Barbato
Larissa Guedko
Matthew Delaney
Toby Dusha
Joseph Gerace
Brett Chellis

DHSES, Director, OIEC and Chairman of the Board
Radio Engineer, NYS DHSES OIEC
Radio Engineer, NYS DHSES OIEC
Radio Engineer, NYS DHSES OIEC
Sheriff, Chautauqua County (call in)
DHSES, Deputy Director, OIEC

Guests:

Linda Messina, DHSES Legal
Chet Lasell, DHSES
David Kislowksi, ITS
Jason Baum, ITS/GIS
Matt Campbell, NYSTEC
Jay Kopstein, CIWG Co-Chair
PJ Higgitt, DHSES
Toby Dusha, DHSES
Matthew Delaney, DHSES
Thomas Gallagher, DHSES
Larissa Guedko, DHSES
Joann Waidelich, DHSES
Mike Rowley (call in)
Will Brunelle – Reporter for Politico
Steven Sharpe – Genesee County
David Scoons – CSX
Steve Grochowski – PMC Associates

Barbato: We have a quorum. Thank you. The next item is the approval of the minutes from the May 27th meeting. Do I have a motion to approve minutes from the last meeting?

Maha: Motion to adopt minutes.

Barbato: All of those in favor of accepting?

Fettinger: I have a minor change on the third to last page, it's about the third or fourth line down and should include Central Station Alarm Association.

Barbato: Noted, Joann will make that change. All those in favor of adopting amended minutes?

ALL: Aye.

Barbato: Clearly passes. Next item on the agenda is an update on the statewide interoperable communications grants program. Larissa Guedko.

Guedko: I do not have any slides for you today. But I do have an update. We have made big strides with the statewide interoperable communications grant program. There are many counties that have received our grants for infrastructure development, microwave development, and much more. This grant covers so many public safety areas. We are up to Round 4. The evaluation has been completed. We received 55 applications including NYC as one entity. This is the largest grant response we have seen so far. The Grant announcement is expected by the end of week. I would like to say thank you to our evaluators. It was a tremendous amount of work that needed to be done and they evaluated every single one, all 55 of them. We have very competent people evaluating those applications and it's beneficial for all counties. Once the announcement is made, letters and emails will go out to all grant point of contacts. Let's go back a bit, and I will touch base on spending. Spending on round 1, 2 and 3 of the statewide interoperable communications grant is moving well and on schedule, however there is one PSAP operations grant that I am concerned about. This particular grant was awarded to all counties. We have received no vouchers from 36 counties. This grant has only one year performance period and all vouchers must be submitted by end of this year. We have very little time left. Other grants; Round 3 has \$63 million in grant money that remains unclaimed. In Round 2, there is \$40 million that remains unclaimed so far. Please go back to the counties, work with consortiums, and make sure that vouchers are submitted for PSAP operations grant. This grant goes to sustain PSAP operations and the biggest difference from the SICG program is it can be utilized for salaries. There will be more information at the next Board meeting once we announce the grant awards. Are there any questions?

Maha: Yes, the PSAP grant, will that be a recurring grant every year?

Guedko/Barbato: That is the intent.

Guedko: We expect it will be going out with RFA qualifications; there will still be the application process, and it is a formula based grant, and all counties must apply and meet the eligibility criteria. If you do not apply, you do not receive funding. One thing I would like to mention is that there are many factors that go into the formula, but in the future, we may take into account county spending. If the county cannot spend the money, it will be reflected on this future grant award.

Barbato: Larissa, what is the timeframe for the release of the 2015 version of the PSAP operations grant?

Guedko: Hoping for September release date, but want counties to have a chance to finish Federal Homeland Security grant. We don't want to conflict with the timing of those. You know what to expect, it is going to be similar to the previous year, so no surprises there. We will be collecting certain data and hopefully the counties have been staying on top of collecting all their information and then there shouldn't be any problem conveying this information for a quick turnaround.

Barbato: Any other questions for Larissa? Thank you Larissa. Next item on the agenda is an update on Public Safety Broadband and the State's initiative in rolling out Mutualink applications to counties and State agencies. Matthew Delaney.

Delaney: Good Morning everyone. I'll talk about FirstNet. We have a couple of updates since our last meeting. FirstNet had requested comments on eligible users. This is potential interpretation on who would be a primary user of FirstNet and who would have access to the band 14 spectrum as a user of the public safety network. This interpretation was looking for how wide does it extend; our traditional first responder role; other governmental users; potential utility companies and so forth. The original legislation for FirstNet actually pointed to two different pieces of law as potential eligible users and in some cases there was conflict and in some cases there wasn't. So there was some comment requested on that. New York submitted comments in consultation with our Public Safety Broadband Working Group. FirstNet is working on all of these right now, and later this year they will make their determination on who they consider an eligible user. The FirstNet draft RFP was out for comment and the comments were due July 27th. The actual RFP is planned for release around the end of the year. They have been holding to the date for a while. Next they are predicting a May/June timeframe for submissions, so bidders will have 5 or 6 months to submit their RFP. However, FirstNet is not providing an evaluation/award time at this point. The data call from the states is due the end of September; originally this was due July 31 and covered topics such as coverage priorities, user base, metrics on calls and user density. Yesterday we had a Public Safety Broadband Working Group meeting here in Albany, and we spent 3 hours discussing this data call. Most of our discussion was based around coverage. There are FirstNet requests that each state provide what their stage coverage would be in each state. We put together a series of maps, working with State GIS, Jason Baum, and a draft series of potential requirements, things like roads, how it would be built out, and coverage percentage on the road, critical infrastructure, what areas we want portable coverage based on population or other key items like border crossings. We made a series of maps along with other data collected, based on hard numbers from our survey that we did back in the December to March timeframe. We will be finalizing that in the next week or two. Once ready we will send it around for any additional comments. Any comments or questions on FirstNet before I proceed?

The other piece I am going to talk about today is Mutualink, the county deployment of Mutualink. Each county that has elected to participate will receive 5 software licenses and 2 radio interfaces. In the process to participate each county has to execute a memorandum of agreement with the State, has to be approved by the State Comptroller Office and so forth. This office so far has received back 43 signed

MOAs to date. There are 58 potential counties including NYC counted as one county for the program. So 43 of 58 have been returned. Once returned it goes to the Office of the Attorney General and Office of the State Comptroller for approval. 24 have been approved in that process. As soon as they are approved, Mutualink reaches out to the county to begin installation planning. The software piece, the Edge can be implemented very quickly. That is mostly installation on a computer, while the radio interfaces require a little more planning. Getting up and running with the software is fairly easy process. We are working to develop some high level guidance and standard operating procedures. We don't want to get too detailed in this simply because we want to make sure that there is enough flexibility at a local and regional level that Mutualink can be used the way it is needed. There has been a request for us to put together some form of high level requirements or operating guidelines as to how it would be used, how the State envisions it being used, and certainly we can do that, we just want to be sure that we are not so restrictive or so inflexible that we restrict what may be some very good uses for it that we have not thought of at the local level. That is all I have on Mutualink, any questions?

Bleyle: How are the interfaces being handled with, you mentioned console interfaces? Is Mutualink doing that with individual radio vendors in the different counties?

Delaney: It depends. There is flexibility to do it with whichever way essentially works best for the county. If the county has internal support, if the county has a particular radio vendor, they can separately engage the radio vendor to work with what they need. Mutualink will go out and do the work themselves. They really want to be flexible and do whatever works best for the county. Any other questions?

Thank you.

Barbato: Thank you Matt. Next item is an update from the 911 committee. Sherriff Gerace has dialed in. Sheriff, do you have any update for us. Thank you.

Sheriff Gerace: I do not have anything new. We are still trying to put our hands on the document that we changed. Is John Merklinger there?

Barbato: Yes, he is here.

Merklinger: We located the pdf and we need to get it back into Word format. Brett and I will take that on as a task.

Barbato: So, as I understand it, the final edition of the comments and revisions to the wireless 911 standards is almost completed.

Merklinger: We do need to do a conference call to legal; they had a few things they wanted to go over so that we can make those changes, so that we can get a final version out to everyone before the next meeting.

Barbato: Along the topic of 911, through the CIWG, the subject matter expert panel, Mike Allen, Oswego County as you know is coordinating a project team to develop a proposal to explore the

NextGen 911 technologies. That committee is in the early stages of defining the scope of that type of engagement. We believe by the Board meeting in November they will be able to report through the 911 committee and back to SIEC Board. I believe Mike Allen will be speaking to this topic at the CIWG meeting later today.

Merklinger: Bob, I just have a process comment. So once we have these revisions done, I can't remember the process, it has to be posted 30 days before we vote as a Board or do we vote as a Board then post it?

Barbato: I think it is the opposite. I'll ask Linda Messina, our counsel.

Messina: You would vote on it first with final language then post it.

Barbato: Subsequent to this meeting, the committee can have a conference call and find out the status, and get the final version completed. Any other questions on 911 committee or 911 issues for the Board?

Sheriff Gerace: Bob, just one more question. We talked a little about Smart 911 and putting on a presentation. Is that still doable for a future Board meeting?

Barbato: I think it is possible, Sheriff. I would feel more comfortable if that was at the CIWG and offer that for your consideration.

Sheriff Gerace: OK. If you can get me that information, and I can maybe work to schedule something in the future. That would be a good start.

Barbato: OK. I will have Joann get you that information. Next item on the agenda is Channel Naming Guidelines with Toby Dusha. He has updates and further activity.

Dusha: Good morning ladies and gentlemen. A couple of updates on a project we have been working on for quite some time. What we have now is the issuance of a new guideline regarding the frequency of 45.88 and then revisions to two existing guidelines regarding channel naming and usage. The first one, there is a copy in your packet, regarding 45.88 LFIRE4D, at the national level and it identifies this as being a common channel in New York State used primarily by the fire service and really needed to have clarification about the proper naming and usage, but also due to outside interference we needed to add the CTCSS or the private line channel guard or code to mask the outside interference. So this guideline was written with that in mind. I believe that's going to eliminate a lot of the issues that have occurred downstate where they have interference from other users in Connecticut or elsewhere and there may also be areas in the western part of the State that have experienced the same problems. That's the first document. There is a little caveat to that, Mike Volk may be able to expand on this a little. Yesterday during a phone call it was mentioned that one of the known sources of interference downstate may be using the same tone. We've had some discussion on this before and it was our feeling that we should stay with the national standard tone for outside users coming into this State. They should not have to add a second or third tone, adding confusion to the problem. This is the reason for standardization, to eliminate these problems and confusion that has existed for decades. The recommendation is that we

move forward with this guideline and work with that outside source to change the code in the future. Again, there is a copy of that guideline document in draft form. If you have any concerns, we can act today or bring it back at a future date. I believe the Director has prepared a Resolution if there are no objections.

Barbato: So the participation and drafting of these, who was involved with this?

Dusha: This has been discussed before with the CIWG group and the Channel Naming Group. Channel Naming did not have a meeting between the last Board meeting and this one, this is draft information and I have worked with Matt Delaney on some of the technical terminology and some of the folk's downstate had input, primarily the lower Hudson Valley, their concerns about adding the tone for interference.

Barbato: Thank you.

Maha: One question. So if we adopt this guideline and it is not used, then what is the sanction?

Dusha: Terminology as to the channel name? There really isn't any sanction. That is one of the problems. This is a channel that has been used for decades, it goes back into the early 60's, it was known unofficially as 45.88 and even though folks know this is a nationally named channel they still continue to use it, its engrained. Some folks have attempted to use it but we can only try to encourage them to utilize the national channel name.

Maha: Do we know if it is used in New York State?

Dusha: It is primarily used for intra county coordination channel for mutual aid between the fire services. It is also the secondary backup channel used by law enforcement. Almost every county has that still existing in their PSAPs even if they have migrated to low band or other spectrum. It is still a usable and common channel. Most of the fire coordinators in the State have that in their vehicles as a coordination channel for mutual aid in other counties. OFPC uses that to contact PSAPs.

Barbato: In addition to national interop channels, these existing or mutual aid channels are referenced in our SCIP.

Dusha: These will also be addressed at the state level TIC plan and state level FOG.

Bleye: Not that it's a big issue, but I noticed that the time out is two minutes as opposed to the other ones. Two minutes seems like a long time to lock up a channel.

Dusha: We have had some discussion on that, we had one that was set for three minutes but set that back at two. Did not want too short of a time out. The other two guidelines that were sent out, some folks used the 60 second time out. We were concerned with the EMS channel having too short a time out, and settled at 2 minutes as being mid-range.

LaFlure: How do you see this being done as far as compliance? We send this out and what kind of time frame would we request that counties get this in their system?

Dusha: That's a good question. We have not made a determination on that, I guess objectively by the end of the year. It's primarily a programming issue, in the old days it was a longer to do that. There are not thousands of radios that we know of. It's primarily county based radios, county coordinators and PSAPs, fire control centers, 911 centers, probably around the neighborhood of 150 radios initially. It is really going to require coordination through the consortium level. In the case of the lower Hudson Valley, the primary counties impacted by the interference can set their own schedule when they transition over. It's really going to be necessary that they all do it at the same time to maintain communications.

Barbato: If there is no further discussion, we can move forward to the resolutions. The first resolution before the Board is Resolution Adopting NYS Interoperability Channel Naming and Use Guidance for Frequency 45.88 MHz, Resolution No. 2015-0826-01, corresponding to guideline draft No. 15-01. Is there a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2015-0826-01?

Merklinger: Motion to adopt.

Barbato: All in favor of adopting this resolution? All ayes. No opposed. Resolution is adopted.

Next item is Resolution Adopting Revisions to the NYS Interoperability Channel Naming and Use Guide for the Frequency 155.370 MHz, Resolution No. 2015-0826-02, corresponding to guideline draft No. 13-02. Is there a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2015-0826-02?

Merklinger: Motion to adopt.

Barbato: All in favor? All ayes. No opposed. Motions clearly passed. Resolution adopted.

Lastly, the resolution before the Board are Resolution Adopting Revisions to the NYS Interoperability Channel Naming and Use Guide for the Common EMS VHF-Radio Frequencies, Resolution No. 2015-0826-03, amending corresponding guideline draft No. 13-03. Motion to approve?

Merklinger: Motion

Barbato: All those in favor? All ayes. No opposed. Motion clearly passes. Thank you very much. Sheriff?

Voutour: I apologize, as I know it has already passed, but should the name in first resolution be there?

Barbato: Amendment to final document to add LFIRE4D in the 3rd paragraph.

Merklinger: motion to approve as amended

Barbato: All in favor? All ayes. Passed as amended. I just have one comment relative to the channel naming guidelines. Over the last year and a half we have put a lot of effort into that, to finalize and normalize both the channel usage and the channel naming convention. It seems like a small effort, but it is a significant step forward in terms of expanding and having uniformity among the state. In addition to national interoperability channels, our office does emphasis a lot in our programs and during

deployments around the State. These common usage and mutual aid channels that have provided interoperability are important for the use for day to day operations as well. This is an important part of the resources. An effort that is worthwhile. I know Toby has worked very hard to try to bundle these as best as possible for operating agencies and support entities. Programming radios is often labor intensive and a costly endeavor. To the extent that he can do these updates in groups or simultaneously to minimize the burden of reprogramming equipment is best for that. I would also ask the Board members that you refer your colleagues and members in the field to our website as a reference for these and revisions to our statewide interop plan for details. I'd like to thank all of you that worked along Toby in that working group and coordinating this project.

Dusha: One additional thing regarding that. The distribution of this will be made to, probably, in excess of 200 mail recipients, coordinators, agencies, vendors, sales reps, etc. We try to hit as many as possible users. Please spread the word.

Barbato: Toby also has update today on ongoing consortium outreach. Very recently we have asked for additional information on progress and installation of interop channel infrastructure usage and Toby has an update for the Board today.

Dusha: Surveys are a great popular tool to use with folks up to the point they have to go through all the labor and send it in. Unfortunately that's a necessity and we've tried to keep it as simple as possible and think it's worked pretty well. Under the direction of the Director we undertook a project called the consortium interop survey to use in determining the state of interoperability in New York State. Larissa has provided information as to all the grants that have been issued and over \$200 million worth of grants towards communications. We bought a lot of stuff, but what did we get and where do we have gaps. So we went out and sought information with a 30 question survey. From there we used that as a baseline to meet with all of the consortiums except NYC. NYC pretty much has their act together. They have a lot of different operating systems that are unique to that area and works well for interoperability. We will be reaching out to them to get an overview, where they plug in, for commonality with the rest of the State. This time we are focusing on the other 9 disparate groups around the State. We got a lot of good information. The meetings were very productive, and we asked a lot of questions. Tom Gallagher, PJ Higgitt and I went out on these meetings and came back pretty much unscathed. The survey focused on the continuum topics, Governance, SOPs, technology, training and exercise, and usage. The other component we had was a Channel capability survey which has been issued. This went out after the initial meetings and to date we have about 30% returned. Here is a quick snapshot of the results to date. Governance has been developed in 7 out of the 10 consortiums. Three are in the process of developing governance documents and establishing MOUs with other counties. (How are they going to work together, what are their responsibilities, and who's going to perform what tasks). We are very pleased to see that counties have stepped up. Standard operating procedures; at this time there are 3 of the 10 that have written procedures in place, the others are all in development. They either have TICPs or FOGs, they have local plans that they are incorporating. It is not an easy task when you are dealing with two, three and more counties at one time. Brian LaFlure is trying to herd 14 different counties and needs to get everyone speaking the same language and cooperate with the same operating plans. The TICP results show that 4 have been developed and 2 are in development. We have

a technical assistance program that is administered by the feds and we have managed for the Hudson Valley and Finger Lakes areas to participate this year and are adding additional counties to the TICP process. As to technology, there is a wide variety of LMR solutions in use. The technology is old and everyone is at a different level. Some are moving to different bands and different technologies. Developing clean and consistent TIC plans is a work in progress. Others folks are in the process of upgrading three centuries of communications capabilities, moving from single analog channels to trunked environments which is quite a leap and tedious to implement. There is only one consortium in New York State with a primary single land mobile radio network, the Central New York Consortium, consisting of 5 counties. They have a major backbone, they share switch, have a lot of the interoperability that is built into their system and has been set as the benchmark in New York. We were fortunate to have money going forward, giving to people who had a need and it has worked out well. Plans to develop a consortium wide backbone including connectivity and the sharing of fixed LMR resources is ongoing or is in every consortium. Brian has a 16 path microwave loop and forms of connectivity and a lot of pieces need to be plugged in, a lot of agreements need to be worked out and technology needs to be revised, so it's doable but a tough process to get through. Data sharing is very limited, with some sharing of data at the county levels and as counties upgrade their cad systems they are talking with neighbors and simplifying with a single switch. In respect to training 3 consortiums have major plans in development, the Adirondack consortium, the Finger Lakes, and Central New York, the remainder do not have a formal training or exercise program developed. Many of their plans revolve around available funding from the state based grants. Other grants that have been issued have been covering the cost and grants in the future will be used to develop the training and exercise. Usage is across the board spectrum. It is used for day to day operations, planned events, emergency response, and mutual aid across the State and basic interop services used on a daily basis. As networks and systems become more enhanced the usage will go up. Any questions?

LaFlure: Toby, I'll make a comment for the group. Not sure if it is appropriate or not, but I'm going to do it anyway. As a result of what we went through with our consortium, and the spending down of governance dollars that everybody got in Rounds 2 and 3 we came to a point where it was becoming very difficult for us to end up with a common denominator with contractors and consultants without ever being used, so if you have multiple counties going out for individual bids and we're not getting similar contractors now to mix those plans, we're not doing it as a consortium, we're doing it as a bunch of individual plans. So what we did is Warren County went out and did a master service agreement, which is capable of being used State wide which we went out to bid and for a contractor that can do a governance job, with SOPs and training and exercise. So if anyone is interested in using that, you are welcome to that. That's what we are doing in our consortium, using that one contractor, that we went out and bid out, so that that person can, once they develop our training and exercises for all the counties and then ultimately consortium wide. I hope that can be of help to all of you.

Barbato: One other comment on training. As we revise the State interop plan, the SCIP, last year one of the goals we set for ourselves in the State of New York was to focus on training and to have specific exercises that demonstrate and convey interoperability across disciplines and across jurisdictions. That is our goal within the next two years. Secondly, I think it's a good idea to incorporate interoperable

components in other training and exercises. I know that does happen. In the NECP goal survey, number 1, we used the Rochester marathon as one example and other activities in the U.S. but I would ask the Board as you are going back in interacting with colleagues and peers and other agencies and organizations that may be planning exercises, in future, make a recommendation or suggestion that interoperable communications be inherent in that part of tabletop or exercise. Communication is often assumed to be there as an afterthought, but both at a state level and local level communication is an integral part, and preparation and planning, and familiarity with the resources we have available to us in the interoperability use, so that people are aware of them and know how to use them.

Any other comments on the consortium outreach? I would also like to mention, and most of you are aware, we are having a symposium on the 9th and 10th September, at the State Preparedness Training Center, which we will go into more details on information gathered this Spring and talk about some best practices, areas where we can do a little better on, maybe set the agenda for the coming year and how we can make some improvements and use resources better.

Dusha: I'm going to go back and just touch on the last bullet, channel capabilities survey. Thirty percent has been returned. This is a list of those common denominator channels that exist, the national and State interoperability channels. It is very difficult at this point to quantify the overall use, which band by which group. But primarily, law enforcement right now seems to have the most common use of its interop channel and that's the NYLAW1 we discussed earlier. It's been common throughout the State for almost 40 years. It exists at both the operational level and at the PSAP levels. That is one conclusion we have seen, one trend that we have seen so far. The counties that have developed single operating networks or have developed single land mobile radio system have implemented the use of national interop channels almost 100% across all uses, law enforcement, EMS and fire. That is a rarity, it is not every county. The five core counties in Central New York have that capability and are most advanced. Finger Lakes counties that migrated to trunked radio networks also have that capability.

A quick update on training. The COMT course is scheduled at the Wildfire Academy & Incident Management Academy in Long Island in October. COML course is being planned by Orange County later in the year. They are in the process of obtaining outside instructors for that. There is a possibility of doing a COMT also. This office will be hosting on November 12, a COMU/ICS Integration course. Notices will be going out on this one day training course on how the communication unit integrates into the ICS process. More importantly, how they integrate, operate, plan and perform in conjunction with the needs of an IAP, the incident action plan, and how they interact with the operations section. An invitation will be going out and we can accept 50 to 60 students, to be held in this room. We'll send notices out to the consortiums to see if they would like to select individuals. It is not designed to be a train the trainer, but can be taken back to the county and local levels. More details will be forthcoming. This is a solid date of November 12, 2015. The next training that we have is NG911 Strategic planning and development Workshop is a Federal TA offering with the thought to conduct this in conjunction with the next Board meeting and the CIWG meeting. This is a good workshop as we keep talking about the development of NG911 in New York State and to use this as a planning tool to see what New York State needs to bring NG911 to life. TIC Plan Development is another TA for TICP development. This is also being put together by the Feds and targeting the Hudson Valley and Finger Lakes regions. The

Finger Lakes have a TICP in place for Monroe, some of the neighboring counties do not have one and this will supplement their base plan with a TICP for each of the individual counties. And the last item is, we do have additional training items in COML/COMT training guidance and looks like it will be after the first of the year.

Cumoletti: On the COMU/ICS integration training, who is the intended audience? This would benefit a variety of levels, who do you see going to that?

Dusha: Primarily it is the COMT's and the COML's, the technician level, The COMLs primarily as they are the ones that are faced with the ICS structure. There's also been some discussion about inviting senior management in agencies that may not have a full understanding of what the Communication Unit is responsible for or what they are capable of doing. Educating folks at the management level or operational level to understand more of what communications is all about and the service that can be provided can only be a benefit. Primarily, COMUs but we will consider some senior level folks.

Cumoletti: Well, that's why I am asking. Seems like a good opportunity for senior management or the organizational level to bring in participants to at least part of the session.

Barbato: How much lead time does the facilitator need prior to the Board and CIWG meetings?

Dusha: Probably a month is sufficient for prep time on their part. The next Board meeting is November 18, a Wednesday. My initial thought was to have the workshop the Tuesday before so that any action that needed to be taken could be acted on the following day.

Barbato: The Chair would like to recognize Jay Kopstein, who is a senior advisor to Homeland Security and is a Co-Chair to the CIWG. Jay would like to speak relative to the training schedule.

Kopstein: From the SAFECOM standpoint I have to say that SAFECOM and OIEC are talking to FEMA about expanding the COML and COMU to include representation within the command post. This is a nationwide issue and being discussed actively.

LaFlure: Long overdue.

Barbato: Any further comments on training? Thank you, Toby. We are moving into new business on the agenda. One particular item that needs no introduction is minimum training guidelines for the 911 telecommunicator which are circulated on a national level. Brett Chellis and John Merklinger will speak to that.

Chellis: Mr. Merklinger brought forth a minimum training guideline and after looking at it I'll let John explain a bit further, but one of the important topics is to line up our guidelines with national guidelines. If I understand this John, it's a group of 17 organizations, and this group of national 911 committee met to come up with the minimum training guideline and develop a core curriculum looking at different national training programs or organizations that have coming up with a common denominator what they want to see, where all telecommunicators nationwide are trained to a certain level. This is more or

less a guideline recommendation. I don't see a plan for governance or anything other than just recommending to state to include this in a minimum training standard. Is that correct?

Merklinger: Yes, that is correct. Basically, APCO and NENA lead the charge on this. The idea being that anywhere you go in the country, every single employee in the PSAP would have this minimum training. The National 911 office took it on as sort of the moderator and leader to move it forward. The plan would be that once this is circulated and they get comments back, APCO and NENA would formally adopt and make sure this is added to their actual classroom curriculum. We just need to be sure we are covering all aspects of training.

Chellis: Do you know what the process is?

Merklinger: The plan is to recommend this as a standard and each organization, NENA; they will make sure that it is part of the curriculum. There is no carrot and stick at this point, no enforcement, but they are (NENA) hard pressed to pass this and expect it to be followed.

Barbato: So John, could we incorporate this or use this as a reference to NYS 911 standards?

Merklinger: Yes, I think we easily could, I think in the grand scheme of things we are in good shape. I think we need to review in our subcommittee to see if this is the case.

Barbato: What is the time frame for adoption?

Merklinger: It's supposed to be already completed, so not sure when it will actually be adopted. They wanted comments back by August. I think they wanted to see if there was any feedback at the APCO conference.

Barbato: If the 911 Committee wants to use this as a reference, do we have the Word document?

Chellis: Going forward once this is adopted, down the road once we have our standards they need to meet the national standard as well.

Merklinger: Yes, the one thing that we have not gotten to in the State is that this would be for any PSAP employee anywhere, whether it's a primary or secondary PSAP. Right now the in state stuff really deals with wireless. Either way, when we are talking wireless we are going to meet that national standards and keep us in compliance.

Maha: About time.

Bleye: The good news here is that we do not have to reinvent the wheel.

Maha: We just have to incorporate this in our current standards.

Merklinger: We will incorporate into our State standard but the way the legislation reads it only applies to wireless PSAPs. So we would incorporate this national standard into our State standard and comply with that. From a State perspective we can only apply that to wireless. From the national perspective, everyone's going to have to beat it. State law can't force it on the secondary PSAP in essence the

national standard is going to make that secondary PSAP follow minimum guidelines. The legislation that would need to be changed is NY County Law 328. Not an easy thing.

Fettinger: Will telecommunicators train after effective date?

Merklinger: Effective after adopted.

Barbato: John is there a webpage link for this that members could go to?

Merklinger: I don't have it with me, but I can get that for you.

Barbato: Any other questions on the minimum training guidelines?

Voutour: I still think we have an obligation, why are we ignoring second hand PSAPs, to hold them to the same standard? I think we are doing an injustice to the citizens of New York State here, by not holding them to the same standard. I think we need to approach that law and work at it.

Barbato: I think the committee in the subsequent conversation raised that issue and will at least highlight areas for amendment and consideration for legislation and make it comprehensive?

Ladies and Gentlemen I'd like to introduce Mr. John Melville, I think most of you know the Commissioner already and he is able to join us today, Commissioner.

Commissioner Melville: My apologies for my tardiness, I had a couple of things going on. I just really wanted to come down and say thank you and let you know how much I appreciate your efforts.

Barbato: Thank you Commissioner. One item I'd like to move on just for discussion also under new business is meeting dates. Per statute the Board is required to meet a minimum of 4 times per year. The statute does not say that we have to meet exactly every three months. We've been meeting that requirement without too much difficulty even in the middle of hurricane Sandy. However, just for the sake of discussion and consideration, I know the months of July and August is very tough for us to get together. For 2016 perhaps we can consider meeting dates in the beginning of the year, late January or early February and no later than June for the second meeting, and perhaps mid-September and late November. Something I was just considering last week as a convenience for the Board members and just wondering if anyone has any thoughts on that.

Various members: Good idea.

Barbato: So at the November meeting we will establish meeting dates for 2016 we'll work around that since July and August is such a busy time for all of us. Any other new business to be brought before the Board? Brian.

LaFlure: In working on some of the committees and work that needs to be brought forward, we have found that having the CIWG meeting after the Board meeting delays us months at a time. If the working group met first, and they have something that they want to present to the Board we could do that. What happens now is that now we'll have a working group meeting, but we can't tell the rest of the

Board about that until November. We are ending up six months down the road before accomplishing something. So that was just a suggestion to reverse the order of the meetings. I know that is a major change, but for some people that are traveling, it may make it easier for them to get to both meetings. I just throw that out there for discussion.

Barbato: I think that is a good suggestion and going forward to the CIWG we can discuss this good option. I would also like to mention that this Board can meet additionally more than 4 times, if there is a need to do so and the CIWG, which is much more adhoc and informal group, can meet more frequently as well.

Maha: November 18th, so everyone knows, is the Intel Summit in Warren County. For scheduling, this could be a conflict.

Barbato: Is this a potential conflict for other members as well?

Cumoletti: I think the sheriffs and myself.

Barbato: So that would be 18th and 19th and you would need travel time. We will look at moving the meeting to the beginning of that week. No other business? I just want to mention one other thing, Chris Tuttle, who is with the United States Department of Homeland Security, is unable to attend today as he is on vacation this week. We will all be seeing him at the regional consortium meeting in September.

Barbato: Motion to adjourn?

Maha: Motion

Fettinger: Second

Barbato: Meeting is adjourned.