

**STATE INTEROPERABLE & EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 27, 2017
DHSES - Building 7A - First Floor Training Room**

SPRAGUE: Welcome, everybody. I'd like to call everybody to order at the State Interoperable & Emergency Communications Board. You probably can tell I have an interesting voice today. I ended up with a little bit of a cold over the weekend, but I am surviving it, so my voice is back.

A couple things before we get started. Essential things. If there is an emergency for some reason, you'll hear an alarm. We'll go out into the hallway, find our way out to the front, back into the cars, keep the front alleyway clear and everybody will meet in the same place.

Please put your phones on stun. Everybody is definitely important, that's the whole purpose of this meeting, but we also realize that business goes on. So, if you need to take a call, please step out in the hallway. Restrooms are across the hall, and we'll work our way through that as well.

I want to reiterate a little bit about the purpose of this board and some of the things that are going on in the world today. The three hurricanes that have come along and created quite a bit of havoc between Texas and the Caribbean and Southern Florida. We've all been touched by that in one way or another. Every day we turn on the news, it proves what communications need to be and how important it can be and the need to have good communications. It reiterates why we're doing this and where we've been.

As the state and other agencies, we've deployed incident management teams and USAR teams and law enforcement teams. The Guard has been actively involved and we look to support those operations.

With that, I just want to highlight that for a couple minutes just because, it is kind of what it is.

So, a couple things. I wanted to welcome a couple of new members to our group. The first is Richard Anderson. Richard, welcome.

ANDERSON: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: If you could state a little bit about your background for us.

ANDERSON: Sure. Recently retired detective, New York City

Police Department, Emergency Service Unit. New York Task Force 1 with a deployment over to Haiti. So, I spent some lovely time overseas there. Wouldn't recommend it. Involvement with Hurricane Sandy, of course, 9/11, Katrina, a little bit part of the support team back here in New York. Also, involved in fire service down in Long Island, former fire chief for about a 120-member department, ran EMS and fire services. Still a current New York State EMT and practice that as frequently as I can with the company. Right now, I'm a security director for a school district down in Long Island, seven schools, about four thousand students, faculty, about a hundred square miles down in Suffolk County, Long Island. So, look forward to bringing what I can to the table here with everybody.

SPRAGUE: Welcome aboard.

ANDERSON: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Also, we have Marianne Buttenschon. If you can give us a little background.

BUTTENSCHON: Thank you. I'm excited to be here. I am an academic dean at Mohawk Valley Community College and as the Dean of the Institute of Emergency Preparedness and Public Service, which includes programs in law enforcement, fire, EMS, cyber-security, drones and variety medical programs. We have partnerships with the Utica Fire Department, with Utica County Sheriff, with Utica Police. Our programs are based on collaborative efforts and partnerships with experts that are in the community so that they can work with our faculty. I've been there a little over 20 years. And I look forward to working with everyone.

SPRAGUE: Welcome aboard. We look forward to having you. We also have Kimberly Beatty. Kimberly, I don't know if you called in. (No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay, apparently not. Kimberly was just recently appointed as well. And Kimberly actually comes to us from the Commissioner of Operations Buffalo Police Department. We look forward to having her come to our next meeting and be a part of this. These folks were just recently appointed to the board, so we welcome them and we look forward to them supporting us.

With that, we're going to go to the roll call. So, whichever one of you guys want to do roll call.

Board Members Present:

Michael Sprague
Stephen Campbell
Bob Terry
Brett Chellis
William Bleyle
Eric Day (by phone)
Joseph Gerace
Brian LaFlure
John Merklinger
Richard Tantalo (by phone)
Michael Volk
Marianne Buttenschon
Richard Anderson

Board Members Absent:

Michael Primeau
Col. James Freehart
Todd Murray
Kevin Revere
James Voutour
Kimberly Beatty

GUESTS:

Matthew Delaney
Jay Kopstein
Joann Waidelich
Angelica Kang
David Kislowski
Robert Gehrer, ITS-GIS

DELANEY: Eleven in person and two on the phone.

SPRAGUE: Thank you. Very good.
I will entertain approval of the minutes. Hopefully, everybody got their minutes from the last meeting.

LAFLORE: So moved.

SPRAGUE: Motion made. Do I have a second?

GERACE: I'll second.

SPRAGUE: Motion made and seconded. Any discussion?

(No response.)

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

SPRAGUE: Any opposed?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Thank you. Adoption of the agenda. You have your agenda in front of you. Hopefully, that meets your approval.

MERKLINGER: I'll make the motion.

SPRAGUE: Motion made. Do I have a second?

BLEYLE: Second.

SPRAGUE: I have a second. Any discussion?
(No response.)

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

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I'd like to read the ground rules here as pertains to the board to refresh everybody's memory. Board members attending by videoconference shall constitute presence at such meetings for all purposes, including quorum. Participants must make notice of their location pursuant to the Open Meetings Law. If, by audio conference only, the member will not count as present for a quorum and not permitted to vote.

Guests or persons having relevant knowledge or information may attend and speak as part of the agenda upon acceptance of the meeting agenda by the board. If a board member is unable to attend in person or by videoconference, his or her designee may attend the meeting and vote on behalf of the members unless they are an appointee not representing a state agency.

A reminder for those individuals on the phone, please announce who you are before speaking. Thank you.
We'll go to standing committee reports.
911 Advisory Committee. Sheriff.

GERACE: I have nothing new to report. I am curious to know,

though; legal was going to take a stab at the regulations and we're kind of waiting on that.

SPRAGUE: Okay. You did that segue perfectly. Angelica.

KANG: So that has been on the agenda. Just to explain, legal has been going through some structural changes and so in that time, it's kind of gotten shifted around, but it is on the agenda. We have a meeting set up for Friday to meet with executive, our new general counsel, Elisha. She's been promoted from OFPC counsel to general counsel. We are meeting on Friday in hopes of beginning that process.

GERACE: Either myself or John could pitch in.

SPRAGUE: One of the issues that's been there, and Brett can back me up on this. Every time we've had to look at the regulations and standards, we keep coming back to 7-17 and 6A and the question of whether or not we have just the wireless and not the wire line. So, the meeting on Friday really is to take a look at clarifying that whole picture. So, we need to really look at 7-17 and get that so that it really clarifies for OIEC where this board is and how that fits. That's really the purpose for it.

~~**KANG:** It's 7-17 and 7A.~~

~~**SPRAGUE:** Yes.¹~~

GERACE: Another concern that we have is the regulatory oversight. And then prior to this point in time when the 911 board was in existence, we had (inaudible). So, that's something I hope is looked at, because we have no indication, no way to know if somebody's in compliance.

SPRAGUE: John, did you have something?

MERKLINGER: Just to add, you know, we spent a lot of time sort of at one point to Syracuse, spent an entire day there sort of hashing through that training subsection. And so, in addition to, you know, I think most of us on the board desire that those apply to all PSAPs and we'll have to obviously hear the legal part of that back from the staff,

¹ Speaker misspoke regarding the regulations. These statements will be stricken in order to ensure clarity and prevent misinformation. The amended minutes will be voted on at the next SIEC Board meeting on November 29, 2017.

but there's now a national recommended training standard. We may save all of ourselves a very large amount of work if we can eliminate a lot of the sections and simply say that New York State adopts the national minimum training standards as set forth by APCO was the lead on it, all ANSI certified and approved, approved by the National 911 office at this point, it might save ourselves a ton of work. Then, at that point, we would just have to work on those regulatory sections around, you know, your backup generators and some of those other things that are kind of separate from the training piece. So, that may save some work in the rewrite once we know where we can go on the legal front and maybe save all of us a lot of work.

CHELLIS: If I might add, John, in my involvement with the National 911 Administrators, I've noticed a number of states are starting to go that same direction and adopt the national standard.

MERKLINGER: When the standard changes on a national level, we don't have to change ours because they're doing the work for us.

CHELLIS: Right.

BLEYLE: They're always revising those standards to ensure they keep current.

MERKLINGER: Exactly.

SPRAGUE: Anything else for -

GERACE: No, sir.

SPRAGUE: Okay. NG 911.

CHELLIS: Next Generation Working Group. For those of you that are new, this Working Group was formed by this board in February of 2016.

Current representation. We had polled the counties statewide for participation in this Working Group and interest. We have 13, county 911 coordinators now represented on the group as well as New York City DOITT and NYPD very involved.

State agencies are New York State OIEC, Department of Public Service, ITS and New York State Police. We've been conducting regular conference call meetings and working on a draft plan to present. Once the legal part that we had just talked about gets a little farther down the road, at least we have some language and the framework and a path to

move forward with next general, you know, the proposal to do so. So, that's what the Working Group has been working on.

In terms of the legal review, continue to research and prepare updates to the regulations to ensure that revisions made will consider not only the current state of 911 but also the constant evolution.

That's one thing in the language, when you rewrite something, if you put everything Next Generation, then what's after that? You know, you're going to be rewriting again. So, that's part of the review and so on.

And the regulations, we want to involve -- the state as a whole will be involved in the transition from E911 to Next Generation and whatever is beyond that. That's a lot of this legal review.

In terms of outreach, we've had -- we had a recent meeting with the New York City DOITT hosted at their new PSAP-2 in the Bronx, very impressive facility, their new dispatch center, capable of dispatching the entire city; however, they've got -- you know, they maintain two PSAPs in the City for redundancy and backup purposes. Very impressive.

But the purpose of the meeting was to meet with Nassau County, Westchester County and Suffolk County, along with our agency, to discuss just the thought or consider whether or not a regional ESINet would make sense downstate.

New York City is in the current RFP process for assistance for both the core management services and ESINet to support the City's project and they're looking at would it make sense to build an ESINet just within the City to encompass their neighbors as well for the purpose of connectivity. So, it was a very productive meeting, it was just kind of a brainstorming meeting, and we're planning on continuing to meet on that topic.

I attended as representative for the state the National Association of State 911 Administrators. I attended their annual meeting in San Antonio in June and also the NENA conference which was scheduled the following week there. There were a number of work sessions on Next Generation 911, it was very informative. It was good to meet with other state counterparts.

I should note they were very excited to see New York State represented in this group. New York State has not been represented in many years. They were very excited to see somebody from New York wearing a 911 hat at the table, so that was positive.

Been in continual communication with the Department of Public Service, their partners in this project as well as our partners in ITS. There's a lot going on we have to

discuss. As you may know, the Department of Public Service is responsible for the carrier side but in a limited basis. They're doing their own legal reviews and what is needed and regulation updates and so on moving forward and what position the state needs to be in on that.

So, it's taking a partnership -- you know, the working group is leading the charge, but it takes a partnership with all these agencies involved to make this work.

In terms of the GIS program, Bob Gehrler is here from GIS. We've had several meetings with them. It's been a collaborative working relationship, especially with Bob and Cheryl in the GIS SAM program. It's address mapping, a very, very critical part of Next Generation 911. Basically, the whole system drives on GIS in terms of locating the caller and plotting which PSAP the call is to be routed to is a GIS function.

The response areas instead of ESN table and M-SAG, it's looking at GIS to determine what are the response agencies, so on and so forth. So, that's just two examples, along with the dispatch full addresses and everything else. So, they've been undergoing -- Cheryl and staff there, you know, they were front runners in the country in terms of getting that part of it worked on several years ago and they're well down the road on that and they're doing good work.

Part of the -- they also have network folks and so on that we've been talking to a little bit in terms of their expertise and potential. We did have a call with their staff last week on the OneNet system to learn more about it. It is out there connected to most every county in the state and see whether or -- you know, how that would or could function in terms of this project.

Under new business, we're going to entertain a motion to form a GIS technical subcommittee to actually continue to work on the GIS. There used to be a committee under the State 911 Coordinators Association and, basically, it's to bring that back together but also to give it an official capacity, put it under the working group. We'll entertain a motion under new business towards that and discuss it some more. We have also continued to work with the Office of Emergency Communications at the federal level, the technical assistance contractors. They've been working with us on the language for a draft plan. So, that is another part of our work as I discussed earlier.

These are good resources if you want to learn more about NG911 and the latest programmatic standards and so on and recommended operational and regulatory standards. There's a lot of good resources.

Any questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. Any questions for Brett?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All right. Let's move on to Communications Interoperability Working Group. Jay.

KOPSTEIN: Good morning. I'll talk a little bit about what we've done with SAFECOM and we'll be talking about it at the meeting to follow this one. Right now, we're still trying to come up with definitions for like public safety grade and what mission critical means; NCSWIC, and the NCSWICs, have a different view of those definitions than SAFECOM. To some extent, it's the operational people versus the administrative people on what we're actually looking for in a definition. What does public safety grade mean? Hopefully, in the next month or two, we'll come to an agreement on that definition.

Communications Unit Working Group, COM-U; where is that going to be? Right now, COM-Us are basically LMRs and the message center. Now, we have broadband, we have data, we have IT service, we have satellite service and the like. Do we expand the COM-U or do we look to leave COM-U as it is and create other units and create a telecom branch under Logistics? That's what's under review right now.

There have been some changes in FEMA and FEMA seems to be more willing to make changes in this regard. There have been some changes at EMI to make that happen. Interestingly, within the Coast Guard ICS system, they have now added an IT service manager within the ICS structure.

The FEMA response people, which is different from EMI, have added within their bailiwick, though it's not documented anywhere, a health desk manager, a network manager and a telecom manager.

Now, anybody reading about Maria, what's happened in Puerto Rico, or Irma with Florida, know that network manager is now an important function. That's something we're looking at; USAR's have also added an additional position for communications.

There's going to be a nationwide survey done by SAFECOM on communications issues. The original survey is 11 years old now and looking to do a new one. Those people who may be contacted have already been notified by me by e-mail that they may be getting a contact from SAFECOM. The responses to the survey will drive future funding and will be primary data for a new baseline showing a gap analysis. Part of that will be the need for accurate AARs, again, to show gap analysis and the like.

One issue came up with Houston and their use of data at the Super bowl and the like. They were sending out pictures of demonstrations and demonstrators over social media to their law enforcement agencies and the like, which is fine for the most part. However, it does not comply with the rules set down by the Second Circuit in New York.

We have to be careful that we comply with the Second Circuit rules as to taking photographs at political type demonstrations. That's something we have to look at in the future.

Not to step on Matt's parade when he starts talking about FirstNet, they're looking to separate common apps which will be available across the whole system versus apps that might be needed locally or regionally.

The training that EMI provides for communications is now going to fall under OEC. That's where it was originally. FEMA took it over. Now, it's going back to OEC. FEMA will continue to do the documentation of people for their transcripts and the like, but the training will actually be on TAs and the like in OEC.

Irma. There were significant 911 issues in Houston. The system was overloaded and they couldn't offload some of that workload. John Merklinger and I were talking about this earlier and he had a similar type problem, not to the same extent, up where he is. That's something that hopefully can be addressed with the regionalized systems that the deputy director was speaking about.

OIEC now are the quality assurance specialists on staff. So, I think that's going to show up in the future where questions will be asked for justification and the like based on a quality assurance analysis.

And last but not least, the federal government is still operating on a continuing resolution. The CR, new grant guidance and new grants will be held in abeyance until a budget is actually approved.

Questions?

(No response.)

KOPSTEIN: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Okay, thank you. Any questions or comments for Jay?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Jay.
Okay. Public Safety Broadband.

DELANEY: Good morning, everyone. I'll do a brief overview

on where we're at with Public Safety Broadband and FirstNet. I'm not going to go too much into the background details of what is FirstNet, we've talked about it a number of times, although I do recognize we have a couple new board members. I want to offer that if anyone needs further background information on FirstNet and what is Public Safety Broadband, definitely reach out and I'm definitely willing to make that briefing.

So, FirstNet back in the spring awarded their national nationwide contract to AT&T in a March 2017 which started a process for a whole timeline of milestones that will occur. So, we had a national kickoff meeting in June with FirstNet and AT&T. In mid-June, they released the initial state plan. This was the first look for the state as to what the FirstNet proposal was, AT&T proposal was, for the nation and for New York State.

So, we reviewed that plan. The timeline basically is a little blurry up there, but from late June and through July to August 4th, we reviewed that. We had a number of subject matter experts provide comment. I have slides on that that show more detail. Then, we submitted comments on August 4th to FirstNet.

They reviewed them, provided comments back to New York and every other state and provided updates to the state plan. So, this says September, late September, final state plan released. So, I need to explain what's happened in the last couple weeks.

So, the initial expectation all along was that approximately six months after the contract was awarded, so that was in March, so it would be in September, FirstNet and AT&T would release a final state plan and notice to the Governor. By law, in the FirstNet enabling statute, by law, the Governor then has 90 days to review that final state plan and make a decision on whether to opt in or opt out. I'll talk about that.

But some things have been happening. FirstNet and NTIA -- nothing I say here is confidential. It's been in the industry news. If you read Urgent Communications, you'll see some of this.

So, what's basically happened is that FirstNet has provided the states, including New York, with a final state plan in terms of our state plan portal, which is where the actual information is. It's an interactive secure website with some of the details on the plan.

So, that information has been updated to reflect the state's comments and other clarifications that need to be made. That was done on September 19, so last Tuesday. FirstNet does not expect that will be revised any further. They also,

on Friday, provided us with responses to our comments that were submitted based on that initial state plan. So, some things were addressed in the plan portal, those were more national, global type clarifications, and then they specifically provided responses on things that we wanted for New York. However, the 90-day clock has not started yet. FirstNet has not made notice to the Governor of the completion of the plan and -- so this is the key piece -- the law says they have to provide the NTIA grant funding amount at notice.

So, if the state were to choose to opt out, they could apply for NTIA federal grant funding to help build that opt-out network. NTIA has not provided that information to FirstNet to make that notice yet. So, the 90-day clock for the Governor's decision has not started, although we have received what should be the final state plan in terms of the details as well as responses to our comments.

So, the timeline I'm going to talk about from this point forward is sort of sliding at this point. It's 90 days after we actually get that notice, the Governor gets that notice. So, while it hasn't occurred yet, many of the details have already been received by the state. So, we don't know exactly when this 90-day period will start. It's a day by day right now. We're waiting to see when it starts.

Sometime then -- this has mid-December on here, but now at this point, it's going to be at least -- it's 90 days from now, so late December, it could roll into January depending on when that notice actually occurs. I mean, there's holidays in there and so forth as well, so that could impact the deadline. We just sort of have to wait and see.

Then, that starts, of course, the action. Once the state makes the opt in or opt out decision, then the network needs to be constructed, people can subscribe or if the state chooses to opt out, the state begins the process to build an opt-out. Basically, the takeaway is the 90 days hasn't started yet and we don't exactly know when yet it will start. So, in an opt-in scenario, FirstNet and their partners implement the state plan. AT&T and FirstNet construct and maintain the public safety broadband network at no cost to the state. But subscription responsibilities are still the responsibility of the user.

If the state does nothing in 90 days, there's no decision made and it just lets the clock run out, the same result is opt-in on day 91; that, by default, is opt in.

Opt-out; the state decides we're going to build our own network, you still have to connect to that national core but you'd operate your own radio portion, the portion of the cell sites and the backhaul, support it yourself.

So, a little forty thousand foot view of the state plan: As I mentioned, FirstNet selected AT&T as their national partner for the national public safety broadband network. It's a 25-year contract commitment. AT&T, in all cases, opt in or opt out, will build and manage the national public safety broadband core, then will deliver those individual state plans for each state. So, we received the state plan. We just haven't received the notification.

So, throughout the development of FirstNet and the FirstNet RFP, there was a lot of -- it was all focused on building a new network specific on Band 14, which is 700 megahertz spectrum set aside for public safety, and it would be essentially a new network.

AT&T, in their proposal to FirstNet, which was awarded, they are going to use their existing national LTE network. Instead of building out Band 14 and public transition as the network rolls out, if a state chooses to opt in and accept the AT&T FirstNet solution, it will be on AT&T's existing LTE network.

So, if there's LTE AT&T coverage in an area today, public safety will start using that and will start receiving priority and preemption.

Build-out Band 14 only where needed for capacity. So, AT&T has chosen this Band 14, a dedicated public safety spectrum, will be built out only in certain areas.

In areas where it's not built out, public safety will still have priority preemption, but priority preemption will just stay only on the existing LTE network.

So just because Band 14 wouldn't be built out in an AT&T proposed build-out, you'd still have your coverage and public safety priority preemption.

And they're going to build out the public safety core. So even though it's the network, you may use the AT&T network, you'll have access to that public safety core through that network.

We did finally get some clarification on the state plan users. This is a question that had been on the table for some time, actually, since probably 2012 when FirstNet first fashioned the law.

AT&T and FirstNet have proposed essentially two tiers of users, primary users and extended primary users. So, primary users: Police, fire and EMS, emergency management, and 911/PSAPs.

Then, extended primary users are other public safety users, and we've asked for clarification on what the categories will be.

The difference here is an eligible user who's primary, so those are the five categories, will receive not just priority

but also preemption, so they can preempt other users in the network. Their data traffic -- and this only really applies in areas at times when a cell site is extremely congested. If a cell site is not congested, then these don't come into play.

But if your cell site is extremely congested, those primary users will be able to actually preempt other users in the network, both extended primary and commercial users. Those services will also be included within the base rates for a FirstNet data plan. Extended primary users can optionally receive priority service on the network, but they cannot obtain preemption with the priority. So, they can have priority over commercial users, but they cannot have the ability to actually preempt users nor can they preempt the primary users.

So, our next steps: Final state plan review. We have those comments back from FirstNet, both the updated plan and the responses to our comments. We actually have a meeting scheduled tomorrow with our subject matter experts to talk about those changes and those updates. We're currently working through a contact timeline here to get any revised changes, comments on changed data, anything we need to address or put into our evaluation.

We're trying to do this in a quick and timely manner, but we're also aware of the fact that the 90-day clock hasn't actually started yet either, because that official notice has not come to the Governor.

So, based on that evaluation report, New York State, the Governor, must decide whether to opt in and accept the proposed RAN or opt out and pursue its own RAN. But that really is a decision made by the Governor. The FirstNet subject matter experts and the OIEC will provide a recommendation evaluation report, but in the end, the Governor will make the actual decision.

Adoption and use of the FirstNet network is an agency choice. So, there's no mandate to use FirstNet. If you're an agency, state, local, you determine what best meets your needs. Does the FirstNet network and AT&T meet your needs, coverage, data plan, rate, or does what you have today meet your needs? You know, this is probably going to become a more competitive marketplace. It did not appear to be, but recently, one of the other major carriers announced that they are going to enter this market as well and offer their version of priority and preemption and their own public safety core.

What that means for interoperability between the state networks, I think, is something that is probably going to evolve.

What's the difference here regarding these type services

versus LMR? So, you buy an LMR network, you buy a radio. You expect to get ten, twenty years out of the network, probably five to ten years out of your subscriber units, depending on what type of service you're buying for. You probably don't do that with your wireless devices. You're probably turning over your modems, your handheld devices on a couple year basis. I mean, it probably varies. It might be on a two-year basis, might be eighteen months, might be three years or four years. Data plans, you know, a lot don't have contracts, you're paying another provider for it, you're not doing it yourself.

So, you know, what you choose today and what's out there right now may be a totally different choice two years from now. So even if you decide what you want to do today, you're not necessarily making the decision for twenty-five years. You may decide I'm going to wait and see what happens, I'm just going to continue with my current plan and a year or two from now, re-evaluate it. Some devices are capable of operating on more than one network. It may be as simple as a SIM card swap depending on the band the device is capable of.

So maybe right now, you're on one particular carrier and you decide a year from now, I want to switch, all it requires is getting a new SIM card and popping it in the device; you don't have to necessarily replace the devices to do that. The takeaway on this is you don't have to rush into a decision and you can reevaluate that on a fairly frequent basis.

So, as I mentioned, we are evaluating those changes. Our whole evaluation plan, both the initial plan and our review of the final, was to represent New York State public safety stakeholders. We have a group about 40 people or so and they are a cross-section of public safety and government in New York. There are several in the room today who are on that evaluation committee.

And then comment on those pros and cons and identify where improvement is needed and provide agency decision makers comparative information.

So, in the end, we provide an evaluation to the Governor. The Governor makes the decision whether to opt in or opt out, you know, based in part on that and other factors. But then we also want to document the unfulfilled requests.

So, what, during the review process, do we say this is something that needs to be fixed? So, we make recommendations, go back and have discussions with FirstNet and AT&T about things we want to see, but they don't get made right now, maybe they'll get made in the future and then they'll provide over those 25 years a better network, then in the end, provide that opt-in/opt-out evaluation to the Governor.

So just on that, you know, we're going back to the evaluation timeline. We've basically gone through all the initial comments. We received those back, the answers to those back, we received the final plan. So now, we're just sort of waiting for that 90-day clock to start. But even before that started, we're still going through those final changes anyway since they are final. And then we're going to make those recommendations and evaluations. And then in the end, the Governor's office will make that final decision.

Again, you know, obviously, this was written as December. This is really now a sliding day-by-day time that could easily -- if this is delivered and encompassed in the announcement of the notification in the next couple days, that could easily come in January.

So just as I mentioned in our evaluation, there were a number of subject matter experts. We had 15 topics of interest that we split those into. We ended up adding a 16th for governance and policy. And we had about six or so SMEs in each one. We had things like enhanced network features, network management, vendor assessment, legal factors, customer experience, and we looked at the plan for each of those different factors to determine which comments we needed to do.

So, as I mentioned, we had the SMEs. Unfortunately, FirstNet imposed strict terms of service on the state plan portal. So, we had to require all of our evaluators to sign nondisclosure and they had to agree to the FirstNet terms of use on viewing that information. So, they can't share what they know. We're hoping at some point, some information will become more publicly available, then FirstNet will be able to release it. But at this point, unfortunately, there's a lot of information that we can't share just because of the way the process ended up becoming. And a lot of the states had some issues with that. There's a lot of -- they actually, I think, made two or three complete rewrites of the terms so it was agreeable to most states. So, in our evaluation, we ended up with 400 individual comments from all of our evaluators. We found a lot of common themes in them. Some of the comments were almost identical. There were others that were very similar. We were able to aggregate those into 89 comments. Many of those comments had like a subpart A and B and we had some in the file attachments as well, but really, 89 really expressed what we had comments and concerns or additional clarification required on that plan.

So, then our next steps: Continued dialogue with FirstNet, review the state plan and SPOC, State Point of Contact, providing that recommendation and evaluation to the

Governor's office, and the Governor makes a decision. I said late December, because really, the slide is going to come day by day. If it doesn't happen, certainly, this could become January. Of course, it could happen earlier. 90 days is the maximum. You could make the decision on day 1. So, the Governor's office can make the decision on day 10, day 20, day 30, day 16. It doesn't have to be all the way to the end of the 90 days, but it must be made within the 90 days, otherwise, it's an opt-in.

So just some useful websites I want to put up here. Our public safety broadband website: Psbb.ny.gov. FirstNet's website: FirstNet.gov. This is the official government website that has the board meetings and information on the law.

FirstNet.com is FirstNet's public facing website. This is equivalent to if you're looking for a commercial service from AT&T or Verizon, Sprint, T-Mobile, and you go up look up data plans and types of phones and coverage, this is the FirstNet equivalent of that. It's a little sparse in information right now. I hope as states opt in and we come, you know, a little further along, it'll get updated by FirstNet/AT&T with some more specific information.

There is a contact on there. You can contact Dave Cook and John Bagdonas. Dave Cook is with FirstNet. John Bagdonas is with AT&T. They can provide additional specific information if your agencies have questions about specific rate plans and so forth.

Other than that, I would just say evaluate your needs and ask questions if you're thinking about transitioning, stay tuned to options. If you're thinking about subscribing to a service, ask questions.

So, speaking of questions, that's all I had. Does anyone have any questions for me?

MERKLINGER: Matt, not so much a question. It's really more just information for the committee. So, on September 13th, at the Association of Counties Public Safety Committee, they voted to urge the Governor to opt in on the network. And that really kind of filtered down the National Association of Counties is urging their members to urge their governors to opt in.

DELANEY: And approximately 21 or 22 states and territories have early opted in. That means they have notified FirstNet of their intent to opt in once they can actually officially opt in once they receive the notice. But based on what they see in the state plan, they decided they wanted to opt in ahead of waiting for that 90 days. A lot of other states

obviously are still evaluating their options and stuff. Once that official notice comes, I'm sure a lot of states will start making informed decisions.

KOPSTEIN: Matt, on the non-Band 14 utilization, is it just preemption or is there ruthless preemption as well?

DELANEY: There is ruthless preemption if you are a primary user anywhere on the AT&T LTE network. So yeah, if Band 14 is built in an area where you're operating, you have a Band 14 capable device, that would be your primary band. But you're not excluded from any of the features on other bands on the LTE network.

If you don't have it because it's not available or your device -- I mean, there's very few devices that have Band 14. There are some specialized devices. I think over time, we'll see it get into many consumer devices. Everyone who has a Smart Phone, your phone probably has anywhere between 5 and 8 bands in it or more of different LTE bands.

So, it's probably fairly likely that we'll see within the next couple generations of devices Band 14 in there. It will benefit public safety, but it will also -- you know, AT&T has the financial incentive to do that, because they want to be able to use the Band 14 spectrum that they build and you need that to be in devices to be able to utilize the spectrum.

GEHRER: If there's an opt-in decision, are there actions that states can take, Matt? Do you have now a new point of contact at FirstNet or do you have to wait for AT&T to build something?

DELANEY: Do you recognize him?

SPRAGUE: Yes.

DELANEY: Because he's not a board member.

So, states who opt in early, early opt-in, we believe, can subscribe to data plans, data packages, as soon as they make that early opt-in decision.

If a state waits until the official clock starts and opt in, they could then take advantage of those once they make that opt-in decision. There has to be, of course, packages that have a method to buy them. So, we had discussions with FirstNet/AT&T about making sure, like the state OGS contracts, they get updated so the state can opt in with those service plans.

They are working, I know, at the national level on putting them on some of the larger sort of GSA and Western State

Contracting Alliance as well. Is that your question?

GEHRER: Isn't there infrastructure that also has to be built?

DELANEY: Infrastructure. So, because AT&T proposes to use their existing LTE network, no infrastructure actually has to be built to be able to take advantage of the priority and preemption as soon as the states choose to opt in on the existing network. They will start to build out Band 14 in states once they opt in at that additional capacity and the specific Band 14, but there's no requirement to build anything to take advantage of the public safety features. In the bigger picture, some of the aspects of the FirstNet core is still being built by AT&T/FirstNet to allow some of the later public safety features, like mission critical voids that will come later on. But that's a nationwide thing, so that's not a state thing.

Yes, there will be work done -- once a state opts in, there will be work on getting Band 14.

AT&T has announced they plan to do -- use that approach, go out and work on a tower to add other bands and do other network enhancements and so forth. But there is like a period of time after a state opts in while there's some infrastructure built before public safety can take advantage of it.

Public safety is literally the appropriate mechanism to purchase equipment and services, and could really take advantage of it the day after a state chooses to opt in.

GEHRER: Thank you.

DELANEY: Any other questions?

BLEYLE: Just to add to that, even though you may opt into the existing network right away, they still have five years to build up to the coverage and other requirements of the state plan. Right?

DELANEY: Right. So, the state plan lays out milestones from the RFP. I mean, there's not -- set aside certain times, milestone years over those five years. That was envisioned on the -- they originally had to build the network from scratch, install the Band 14 network. So, the whole process changed a little bit when AT&T offered up their AT&T LTE network.

Essentially, they do have five years to do certain things like -- it's not so much about coverage now as it is about feature sets and building out the core. They will be improving coverage over those five years. They will be adding coverage; adding coverage on the commercial side as well. So, they won't be building specific sites just for Band 14 public safety. They're going to build a site that's going to expand the commercial network as well as the public safety component. But it does occur over five years. But essentially, they come into the first milestone with a lot of coverage already built because of the way they offered up their existing network versus building from scratch.

SPRAGUE: Okay. Thank you, Matt.

DELANEY: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: State Agency Communications Working Group. Since the July meeting, the Communications Working Group has not met. Things were way too busy this summer to get the group together. We do have a meeting that we're going to be doing in October, so we'll have more to report on it at that point.
Channel Naming and Use Working Group. Matt, you're up.

DELANEY: I just want to talk about two potential guidelines that need to get developed in our channel naming and use session. It's not really channel naming but I think it falls in the same discussing the channel naming and use. So, the first one is the federal interoperability channels. So, these are the federal, not the national but the federal interoperability channels. These are channels in the 160 megahertz and in the 410 UHF that are available for federal agencies to interoperate. There has been in the last couple years a lot of work done nationally to make these available to state agencies and local agencies when they interoperate with federal agencies. So, if there's a joint incident where there's federal and state and local responders at an incident, these channels would be available to use in addition to the national interoperability channels. So, the way it's being approached is that each state will have an MOU between the state, which is the Office of the SWIC, and the federal government; Department of Interior is actually leading it for the federal side. When the MOU is agreed to, then the SWIC in that state can authorize state and local agencies to get an FCC license on those federal interoperability channels. Essentially, the

MOU becomes the permission to take federal channels and use them within the state, again, only when responding to an incident and working with a federal agency. They can be used when you have an incident, active shooter, with the F.B.I. and the Marshals that maybe use it to work with them for joint interoperability.

So, we have an MOU pending with the feds. It did go through our review process. It hasn't been signed yet, because they don't want the state to sign till they go back and review it, but it's in that review pipeline, step five or so in that pipeline.

So once that is signed -- we really don't have to wait until it's signed, but we have to develop guidelines and policies associated with that MOU.

The SWIC and our office is going to be responsible for making sure people get the licenses and there's guidelines to follow under that MOU. So, this is something that we need to start working on really probably sooner rather than later. We don't have a time frame for when that MOU is going to be approved with final signatures and all that, but there's no point in waiting.

Then, the other one is encryption. We talked about this before. We really need to move on this. Adopt the federal reserved keys. So, Customs and Border Protection, the National Law Enforcement Communications Center has a set of reserved keys and key IDs for interoperability and they are nationwide. There's a process for obtaining them. There's a process for being authorized to use them. They're in federal radios.

For example, like the F.B.I. responds and they actually have these keys in their radios and there are keys that are meant for joint interoperability. For example, on those federal interoperability channels, they have secure encrypted communication. And they are both law enforcement and public safety non-law enforcement channels.

But we need to make sure that those key IDs are reserved so that we don't have people operating their own systems in the state using the same key ID. You can't have two different keys with the same key ID. So, we just need to make sure that we adopt that plan and then we create a plan for state and county local IDs as well, not the actual key.

I mean, that would be up to whatever agency actual key code, it would be up to whatever agency maintains them and wishes to share them or not share them. But you need to keep the ID, so the reference number for what the key ID is called is unique so you can share them if you choose to share them. You can't share your key with someone else if they're already using a key 12 and you're running a key 12. You're going

to override their key. So, we are looking for volunteers with P25-AES experience to assist. So, if you or someone in your system is familiar with creating these -- managing P25 keys, especially in regards to things like key management and key management facilities and stuff, we'd definitely like their participation, we're looking for volunteers. So, if they are, please reach out and let us know that they are available to assist in helping us write that guideline to make sure it works. We want to make sure that we write a guideline that works for everybody.

Any questions?

(No response.)

DELANEY: All right. Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Thank you. Citizen Alerting Committee. One of the things I wanted to make sure I highlighted, there is a national EAS test this afternoon. I don't want to forget that before we get started.

Our last meeting, we had was July 18. It was after our state board meeting. One of the things I really wanted to make sure to stress here, this is a typo. It's supposed to be **New York City Alerting System**. We went over New York City's alerting system. They have a very, very active system. They rely on opt in and they've got over 500,000 people that have opted into it. So, it's a very, very dynamic active network.

They work with IPAWS, RSS Feeds, Atom Feeds. They work off a common alerting platform. They really blend all kinds of things together and make it an active system so that it works and it goes off and people realize that they're receiving stuff from it. It can have traffic alerts. It can have all kinds of different things other than just EAS alerts, but it gives everybody a reason to be on the network and that's one of the reasons why it is such an active system.

They use a mobile app, very user-friendly. As I said, it's very active. They also are in the process of repurposing the old phone booths and putting up information signs throughout the city, building lobbies. They're trying to make it so that it is something that everybody uses on a regular basis throughout the city for traffic directions, for anything that's going on that might impact them during that operation.

It goes out of their watch command and they have some very rigid policies and procedures on how they get the information pushed out, the process to make that happen. So, it was a very interesting presentation and we all learned an awful lot from it.

We looked at the IPAWS and reviewed that. We actually had the first round of New York Respond and OEM training. New York Respond has actually modified a phase within the system that you can put out these IPAWS test alerts and so we actually went through that process. It happened like the day before and they kind of highlighted how that went and the process that we can use and we're looking forward to doing more of that testing.

It's one of the first times I've seen where it not only was initiated but you then get a response back of all the steps and what places that it hit as it went out through the network. So, that was very informative.

We are looking at a New York Alert transition later this year. We're transitioning over to Ever bridge and ITS is kind of leading the charge on that one. So, it's still moving along and we're looking for that to go.

I don't know if you want to add anything to that.

CAMPBELL: We kicked the contract off a couple weeks ago. We had SUNYs, CUNYs, lots of local responders, emergency managers on that in that two-day training; did envision six months from the time they got the contract to finish in February. They looked at the environment.

Phase 1 is just cookie cutter, everything from the existing environment to the new. They think they can achieve that still by the end of December.

Then, phase 2 is mobile and a number of other things. So, we're looking to have active involvement from all of New York State. The Chamber's request is to increase the usage up to about 20 million New York State citizens from the 6 million we have today.

SPRAGUE: Big changes coming with that, so just kind of stay tuned. We'll follow that along.

The discussion regarding New York State EAS Plan with the broadcasters: One of the things we talked about, and it's become really obvious from the things we just talked about a minute ago, IPAWS has come into the process. EAS is not the old EAS, which used to be the old EBS, all that has changed. There's a lot of different components going along with the New York State EAS Plan.

The EAS Plan really is the responsibility of the broadcasters; however, the Broadcaster Association recognizes that it's woefully behind, needs to be updated. So, we, not only with the broadcasters but also internally within New York State, need to update our plan. So, we're going to focus on getting that piece done with the group that we have in place to start looking at it.

Our next meeting was scheduled for October 3rd. We have kept that date, but we're going to do that as a planning meeting more as than just a general meeting in particular because we need to move that plan forward.

That's really kind of a quick highlight of where we are with that process. The key to this, I think, is Broadcaster Association recognizes that there needs to be changes along with us. I don't think there's anybody that really is pushing back saying that, you know, status quo is a good thing.

It's a positive thing and I think we're going to see some changes over the next few months that we can report back to at the next meeting.

Any questions from anybody?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. That committee is becoming very active and I'm really happy that we've been able to put that together. The PSAP and SICG grant updates. I am not Larissa. She is not in today. And what I'm going to give you is kind of a quick breeze-through version of what she's actually doing at the regional grant workshop.

We're in the process now -- last week, we had two of the regional workshops across the state. We're going to continue to roll those out through October, but this is the presentation that OIEC is doing as part of that. I will breeze through this so that we don't take up a whole lot of time.

This basically is an overview of all the grants that we put out so far. It's the timing and the amounts and the project periods, basically. You have that in your slides.

The goal here is to get the magenta and the blue to come together and, in a lot of places, we're doing that. We still have some work to do on some others, but the grants are -- our grants unit is very active and works directly with the counties to help them get through this process. We're keeping the funding moving and that's the important part. So, the overview of the grant: So we have 65 million targeted for formula-based grants this year. 20 is going to go to targeted and 45 is going to go to formula. Very similar to last year. And then 10 million is going to go out to the PSAP grant.

We are working on that right now and, as was highlighted, we have a little bit of a legal change. The contracts are being -- the RFA's being reviewed, but we're ready to get that out the door any second.

The formula grant's, basically, this is what's in it, development of interoperability, the communications

infrastructure, improvements public safety answering points towards Next Gen, governance and SOPs. We're hammering hard on CASMs. We had a symposium last year, we did a training throughout the whole thing, trained 40-some people. We're trying to push that. Because the more we can get people to push into here, the easier it's going to be to develop our tactical interoperability plan.

We have two regions right now that are going out and refreshing those. But as time moves on, these different things come into play, we need to get more in there, so it updates automatically. CASM will do that. Then, it also does the field operation guides along with that. There's a lot of push on that.

The idea was out of those 40-some people, somebody in your region can help you get that information entered into CASM. The formula grant is 45 million, and this is really what it's allowed to go for. One of the things we've been doing is actually going out and meeting more with the counties and in our meetings, we have been able to, through discussion, kind of highlight some things that are eligible that some people didn't know they were.

In a couple instances, we've met with people and had that conversation and they came away with, oh, I can spend money for that. Absolutely. That's what our whole purpose of this is to do.

How is it looked at? We do it from a population tiered approach, then there's segmented pieces that go down through this. List of towers and structures. If you've got a lot of towers, a lot of structures, obviously, you need more money to support it. That's one of the things we look at. The interoperability channels, the more you have input, the more we want to support that.

How many state agencies? This is one of the things we started looking at last year and a lot of counties provided support for state agencies on their systems but never really got credit for them. That's one of the things we're trying to fix.

Monitoring the national interoperability channels are some of the things we look at.

One of the things we've done here to try to improve this, there's a lot of questions that came up last year about what is the national interoperability channel and do I monitor it and how do I figure that all out?

We've made it into a check box this year. Basically, go down the list, if you got those, check them off and you're done. And we tried to make the application a much simpler process to work through this year.

How many users P25? And is everybody in the CASM? Again,

we want to keep hammering on that CASM.

Some of the key components: Facilitate interoperability between systems. We're trying to promote interoperability whenever possible, ISSI networks, technology-neutral. We are trying not to lock anybody into a particular vendor. It still needs to be P25, but you can still work with a lot of different vendors. We do still require P25 compliance. So, interoperability roadmap. How are we trying to get that? We're trying to implement hailing and command channels statewide. 24/7 monitoring. Somebody's gotta be listening. That doesn't mean everybody's gotta be listening. Whether it's done regionally by each county or however, we're willing to have conversations about that whole process.

Obviously, if you're going to do it regionally, somehow, you have to have backhaul to be able to move it back and forth. That's definitely part of our picture that we're looking at for the roadmap.

We're looking at implementing tactical channels on a statewide basis, developing governance. As I mentioned, right now, we've got a couple of projects going on out there right now where OIEC has facilitators in that are working on developing those TICPs. I know the New York City area is working on the TICP as well. There's a number of different things going on and then, obviously, statewide engagement in CASM. It makes it a whole lot easier if we can get there.

Just a few slides. This really kind of gives you a quick snapshot of where we currently are. We'd like to have four colors in all those boxes. In some places, we do and in some places, we don't.

One of the things we're able to show when we went up to the Can-US meeting was the lack of that ability in some of the areas on the northern border, because that also has a huge impact on where we are. There has been some easing of that to some extent. It hasn't officially been done yet, but we have had communications from -- the communications coordinator from Canada actually called us and has been working with Larissa to try to find some common channels across the border that we could actually put in place. So, that discussion is open. That's a huge step compared to where we used to be.

And we'll see -- you know, nothing has been decided at this point but, you know, they've ruled out the national interop channels, but they haven't ruled out other channels that may be available.

There's been some in the northwestern part of the states and we may be able to use some of those channels. So, that's

a huge positive thing for us.

These next slides really just kind of give you an idea of where some of the calling channels are. So, you can see New York Law 1 is probably the best and 45.88 are the two best we've got statewide with coverage. There's a lot of capability.

Moving ahead, we're looking at backhaul enhancements, implementation of interoperability channels, expand governance, recurring training and exercises. I know there's a training exercise that just went out, I think, out in Oswego County and in the Onondaga region; the non-proprietary open standards and the regional interconnectivity. A couple of things we're looking at. From the PSAP side of the world, this is the PSAP grant that we're looking at right now. Facilitate PSAP consolidation where possible. We're looking for NG911 strategies, technologies, development of governance and SOPs, and multi-jurisdictional PSAPs, if possible, throughout the region. Those are some of the things we're looking at. 10 million dollars is available. And it goes through maintenance and sustainment so far, CAD upgrades, GIS enhancements, governance and implementation of technologies towards NG911. Those are some of the things that that's eligible for.

How do we look at it? From county population, land area, crime index, PSAP call volume index, PSAP incidents/events and these are a couple of the things that we looked at last year. There was a lot of concern/questions about how do they apply and what is a call, you know, what's a call for service, all that kind of stuff.

We had a working group, as you may recall, that actually went through and looked at some of that. We took those recommendations and implemented those into this round. Hopefully, that will clear up some of the questions. There will always be questions and we'll just keep working on trying to get it clarified as best we can. Text-to-911. And the other thing we want to make sure we take a look at this and recognize it, Monroe County last year was the first county built with the ASAP system, and the idea was to cut down some of the burden on the tele communicators. What we don't want to do is punish them because their call volume went down. They're actually doing something proactive and a lot of people may wind up going that direction, so we want to recognize that and we've been trying to factor that into this as well.

These are just rough numbers. Obviously, as time goes on, this will be outdated. But at the time that we did the grant last year, there were 20 counties that had text-to-911

services in one version or another. The spending rate, we've been able to, as you can see from before, the spending has been keeping up, improvements in connectivity with PSAPs and also some implementation of backup solutions.

There are a number of places that have backups. We could do more with NG 911. A PSAP grant development workshop is something else we can look at.

This is a moving target and when we get into PSAP operation and NG 911, it's going to continue to move, it's not stagnant, it doesn't stay in one place. All of these topics that we're going to be pulling information out of are going to continue to develop the grant needs to evolve as well.

We tried to clean up some of the definitions and some collected data as well, so we continue to try to improve it. Where are we from here? Literally, a couple of different things. One thing that happened last year, and I think a lot of it was a factor that was the first year for these formula grants that went out. It was difficult for people to know what their number was going to be, how much money they were going to get.

The idea with the formula grants is they're going to stay relatively consistent and if they stay relatively consistent, it's going to get easier to understand what the budget is going to look like.

Once you put out the RFA, people submit to it and we award a grant, we make a budget within a certain period of time, a lot of people have trouble getting that budget together. Part of it is because I don't think they had an idea of how much money they were going to get, which is really tough to put a budget together. That's one of the things that we're working on this year is we need to make sure those budgets come in in a relatively quick time frame, because that's what gets the contract done. Once the contract is done, then you start spending money. We're trying to work our way through that. The grant monitoring unit is excellent in working with your folks.

The grant extension form is new this year. Anybody who's done a grant extension, we talked a little bit here, we went through an OSC audit of our entire communications grant program this year for the past year. We came out relatively unscathed. Probably the biggest thing they found any kind of fault with was we didn't have a consistent grant extension form. We redesigned that and we handed that out, and everybody has probably seen the effects of that since.

It just clarifies the process, makes it much more organized. Otherwise, we came out in pretty good shape. The one thing I will say it that it became obvious to some of us that while our grants guys and our folks on the grant side of things

financially keep really good track of things, from the program side, we could have more visibility of what's going on with the projects that are out there.

One of the things that we're going to start doing is we're going to start coming out a little more often and meeting with you and finding out where you are with your program and project, not to create any sort of a slowdown or anything, but as I mentioned, we already met twice with a couple of different counties and came up with things that they didn't realize they could spend money on.

Once we have an idea of what you're doing and where you are, we can help you through that process and have a better awareness of where you are in the long scope of the program. That's something we're going to be doing more of. It's not to make more work for you. We're not going to come out and look for additional paperwork and all that kind of stuff. We just want to be more in tune with what the projects are that are going on.

Any questions about that?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: PJ right now -- everybody probably knows that Toby retired, Toby Dusha. PJ is now the person handling a lot of our COM-U and our CASM information. Feel free to give him a call if you have any questions on any of that stuff. Our note to the counties is: Spend your money. It's nice to be able to tell people to spend money. Any questions?

SPRAGUE: Thanks for bearing with my voice. New business.

MERKLINGER: A couple things that I'd like to bring up. The first thing is just keeping it on Angelica's radar is just the paperwork on the agreement for TERT. There's 10 steps you have to meet to be recognized nationally for the TERT program. New York met 9 of the 10. The only thing holding us up is the one-page statewide agreement that we need to finalize, so we can be deployed.

So, other states were deployed to Florida with some dispatch assistance but we could not, because we're not technically TERT-recognized even though we've been doing it within the state for a long time now under those powers under Article 2B and so on. So just kind of keep that on the radar screen as you're doing the legal review.

I also make the offer, if the Board wishes, I did have one of my staff members that was on the National Training Committee for the standard development, if the Board would

like a presentation, I could bring him to a Board meeting and they can do a presentation. So, I just make that offer. Then, the third thing, if I may, we talked about the Next Gen 911 committee and I would like to make a formal motion that we create a new subcommittee of the Next Gen 911 committee specifically for GIS.

We've made great progress, but as the information has been fed back from the state to the locals, in many cases, it's just stopped. And we need to actually get far more granular in the data and far more accurate, if you will, to get to that long-term vision for Next Gen 911 and to meet that NENA i3 standard for the call routing.

I would make a proposal that we create a subcommittee and bring some of these GIS professionals from around the state that support our different 911 agencies at the state and local level.

Then, I would ask that they work on some action items. The first thing, I think we need a report card to know where we're at and where we need to go; work on identifying some of those tools and best practices and how to keep this data up-to-date.

So, data's only as good as it was five minutes ago when you entered it. It's a constant evolutionary process to maintain it. Obviously, we need in that report card come up with our current status and progress of where we are with Next Gen 911, so report the GIS piece up to the bigger Next Gen 911 committee.

And there are some issues right now with some of the CAD vendors around -- you know, if you ask them if they're going to adopt the NENA i3 standards for GIS and the national address database standard, quite obviously, every vendor I talked to skirts that and will not commit to that.

So as a group, I think we're going to need to push the vendors to comply with that as that rolls out across the country. And then just have this group form that subcommittee. I know it's a long motion, but the base of the motion is that we form a Next Gen 911 GIS subcommittee.

SPRAGUE: I was going to say can we pare that down to that? Then, we'll come up with action items.

MERKLINGER: Yes.

SPRAGUE: I'd entertain that motion. Do I have a second?

BLEYLE: Second.

SPRAGUE: Any discussion?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All right. I'll call it to a vote then. All those in favor?

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. What I'd like to suggest is that you frame out the objectives that you'd like to have. And also, if you'd come up with a list of -- together, through the NG committee, come up with a list of proposed members for that, and we could move forward.

MERKLINGER: Okay.

SPRAGUE: Sounds like a good idea.

Anything else for new business?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I'd just like to highlight something that really kind of goes a little bit back to what Jay was talking about earlier in his CIWG meeting, or discussion, but something that kind of came to fruition with state fair this year and that actually played out even further when it came to Harvey and now with Irma and all these different events that are going on.

At State Fair this year, there was a desire to support traffic management with drones. And so there was a question of how we could share that video and how to make that all work. It was a combination of DOT, DEC and us working together to try to make that happen.

We looked at trying to use Mutualink and a number of other things, but the end result it came down to is we wound up building our own network, and that network supported the video back and forth from the drone to the actual command post. And you know, it turned out to be an interesting evolution to make it happen, but we pulled it off.

And actually, to my understanding, it helped State Fair quite a bit with their parking and operations. But not days later, that same thing played out in Harvey with our incident management team that went down to Harvey and wound up using drones to do damage assessment within the incident management team where they were and we wound up supporting some of the ability to bring the video back and forth.

I just add that because your discussion about the COM-U and how COM-U evolved and what's the process and where's it going, that's just another piece that all of a sudden is taking front and center role in a lot of these deployments

that, you know, we're talking about that stuff a little bit for the last year or so, but now, it's almost become one of the tools of the trade and how do we support that. As communications move forward, you know, the role keeps evolving and how we push that. Is that our deal? That's a good question. But we're there and we have the technique and capability to support it. It's an interesting observation.
 Anything else for the good of the order?
 (No response.)

SPRAGUE: Again, I apologize for my voice. At least nobody will be able to use voice recognition on me. One thing I did want to mention, the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner both wanted to be here today. The Commissioner is actually out for the Excelsior challenge going on, a huge operation out there. Deputy Commissioner Wisely is in residence but he could only talk to me for about 30 seconds at a time on several calls this morning because of all the things going on with the different deployments and different operations going on. He wished to be here but wasn't able to. Anything else for the good of the order?

MERKLINGER: Motion to adjourn.

SPRAGUE: Motion made to adjourn. Do I have a second?

TERRY: Second.

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

SPRAGUE: All those opposed can stay. Thank you.
 (Whereupon, the Meeting was adjourned at 11:33 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, CSR, RPR, RMR

Dated: October 1, 2017.