**STATE INTEROPERABLE & EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 29, 2017
DHSES - Building 7A - First Floor Training Room**

SPRAGUE: Good morning, everyone. I want to apologize for the late start. We had a Commissioners' meeting at 9:15 and it literally got out just as we popped in the door here. We probably will have Deputy Commissioner Wisely joining us in a few minutes.

My name is Mike Sprague for all those on the phone and everybody here in the room. I'd like to welcome everybody to the SIEC Board. I appreciate the tremendous attendance we've got this morning. This is really heartwarming, so I appreciate that.

The good part is we haven't got any snow this year; so far, so good.

A few things before we jump into the good of the order. Obviously, we're all very important people. So if you would please put your phones on stun, I'd appreciate it. You're more than welcome to take the call, just step out into the hallway. But for the interest of the meeting, please place them on silent or stun.

If there is an emergency, we will all go out this door, turn left, go down into the lobby and go out and go up into the cars to stay away from the building and away from the cross lane there so that the fire apparatus can access the building. We'll all meet out there and do accountability check to make sure everybody is there.

Other emergencies: The restrooms are out across from the elevators. When you go out the door, turn right and the men's and women's room is on the left. I think that probably gets most of the details done.

With that, let's move into roll call.

Board Members Present:
Michael Sprague
Charles White
Colin Brady
Michael Primeau
Col. James Freehart
Bob Terry
Brett Chellis
Joseph Gerace (by phone)
Brian LaFlure
Richard Tantalo
Michael Volk

James Voutour
Marianne Buttenschon (by phone)
Richard Andersen
Kimberly Beatty (by phone)

Board Members Absent:
Todd Murray for Michael Green, NYS DCJS
William Bleyle
Eric Day
John Merklinger
Kevin Revere

Guests:
Matthew Delaney
Jay Kopstein
Joann Waidelich
Angelica Kang
David Kislowski
Larissa Guedko
Robert Gehrer, ITS-GIS
Frank McCarton
Stephen DeChick
Christopher Tuttle
Peter Bojmal
Lee Shurtleff
William Peat
Chris Carney
Alex Rau
Brian Greagan
David Cook
Kevin Hughes
Michael Rowley
Steve Grochowski

WAIDELICH: We have a quorum.

SPRAGUE: Thank you. Okay. Let's move into approval of the minutes. You all received your minutes. I believe there was an amendment to those minutes.

KANG: Yes. So last time we met, we were discussing 7-17 and 6A, and I called it 7A, because I always get the building and statute mixed up. That's been fixed. If that's okay with everybody, that will just be stricken from the minutes that are approved.

VOUTOUR: Make a motion.

SPRAGUE: Motion made. Do we have a second?

PRIMEAU: Second.

SPRAGUE: Any further discussion?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Any other changes?
(No response.)

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

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Carried. Very good. Let me just review the ground rules for everybody's benefit. Board members attending by video conference shall constitute presence at such meetings for all purposes, including quorum.
Participants must make their notice of their location pursuant to Open Meetings Law.
Guests or persons having relevant knowledge or information may attend and speak as part of the agenda upon acceptance of the meeting agenda by the Board. All other guests must be recognized by the Chair before addressing the Board or participating in discussion.
If a Board member is not able to attend in person or by video conference, his or her designee may attend the meeting and vote on behalf of the member, unless they're an appointee not representing the state agency.
A reminder again for those on the phone, please announce who you are and your location when talking.
All right. With that, I'd like to entertain adoption of the agenda.

LAFLURE: So moved.

SPRAGUE: We've got a motion. Do I have a second?

VOUTOUR: Second.

SPRAGUE: Any discussion?
(No response.)

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

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: We have an agenda. Thank you.
Standing Committee Reports. We'll go to the 911 Advisory.
Sheriff Gerace, anything for the Advisory Board?

GERACE: No, there's nothing new.

SPRAGUE: Okay, very good. With that, we'll move on to
NG-911 Working Group. Brett.

CHELLIS: The Working Group is continuing to work on a number
of things. We have regular meetings and conference calls.
We're continuing to work on the legal aspects. As was
reported at the last meeting, the new legal team at DHSES
has been reviewing the New York State Executive Law 7-17 and
6A there as it pertains to OIEC and its 911 responsibilities
and authority.
It's determined that the current language gives the office
broad authority to coordinate a 911 program for the state.
That is a good action that has happened and is allowing the
Working Group to step forward and move more into the next
aspects of planning a roadmap and doing an actual 911 plan
for the state. Holding regular conference calls, there's
been regular updates for the member agencies, one that's
fairly new to the committee is the GIS subcommittee, which
Bob Gehrer and his team from ITS, has been coordinating.
If it's okay for the Board, I'd like to recognize Bob for
a couple seconds to just give an update quickly on the GIS
subcommittee. Is that okay with the Chair?

SPRAGUE: Yes.

CHELLIS: Thank you. Go ahead, Bob.

GEHRER: Thanks, Brett. We have a committee put together
with representatives from GIS, professionals from ten
counties and two from New York City, and we're kind of in
startup mode now. But some of the things we've identified
as deliverables to come out of the subcommittee are a survey
going out to each county to identify where they are as far
as GIS data development goes for those data sets that are
going to be required for NG-911 to fully operate for things
like routing calls to the proper PSAP and PSAP boundaries.
You also need addresses and other GIS data.
So across the state, counties are in a much different state
of readiness for that. So we're going to survey the
appropriate people within all the counties to find out, kind
of a scorecard, where is everybody. And from there, we'll
be able to determine some other courses of action to help
counties get there when the time comes that they need that
data, whether sharing best practices or sharing data that's

already created.
The state has some data that's in very good shape, address points and street center lines. So it's a good group. We're just getting things going. I think we're going to come up with things that are of benefit to the larger work group and to all the counties.

CHELLIS: Thank the Board for, at the last meeting, approving the subcommittee as part of the Next Gen Working Group. As you can see, it's up and running. It's going to make some good progress in readiness for NG-911.
I attended the National Association of State 911 Administrators', fall interim meeting, a few weeks ago. I have a few items to report on that.
In reviewing some pending federal actions, legislation by the FCC and other federal entities. One of them is the Bill S2061 Next Generation 911 Act of 2017 which was introduced on November 2nd and referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.
We want to watch that very closely as it moves through Congress and if it moves through Congress. It does have a number of items in it that will be developing a national strategy for the deployment of NG-911 at both the state and local level, also with the federal government, coordinating from a federal level to assist as needed and see the process enabled from the federal side some of the interoperability and networking. That's going to have to happen to make this go across seamlessly nationwide in a timely manner.
The 911 Grant Program is being updated and there was an opportunity to make comments. NASNA made comments on behalf of the State 911 Administrators around the country. There's been a number of other states that have made comments, and that is opening up for the tribal entities to make applications for the grants. NASNA's comments were that that should be coordinated through the State 911 Coordinators, that there isn't duplication and be aware of what entities are doing with the state as to the tribal entities. A lot of comments around that but we've been watching that closely as well.
The FCC recently has done an inquiry on 911 access routing and location of enterprise communication systems. That's a big issue. Kari's Law, which has been enacted around the country quite a bit to require that multiline phone systems in buildings such as this, someone can access 911 PSAP directly without having to dial 9 or 8 or something to get an outside line.
The requirement would be that the location data is provided with a federal location and an address that might be a whole complex like 1220 Washington Avenue. It would have to give an actual location of that phone set within the complex.

It's meeting resistance, of course, from telephone providers, manufacturers of the CTE and so on and so forth of the sets. But NASNA, and the NYRA and a bunch of entities in a number of other states have pushed in and said, "No. This is needed now. This issue has been around for years and it needs to be addressed."

We'll see how that goes with the FCC, they have put out a requirement on that.

The NASNA meeting, a number of good reports. The FCC reported on Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria. The resilience, or lack of, cell sites and other structures during those storms and the differences between the storms, and actually showed maps of their daily reports of how the stuff held up from actual day of the storm, four days later, two weeks later.

You could see the difference between Florida, Texas and then Puerto Rico. The issues in Puerto Rico that have caused delay in getting a lot of these facilities back online. A lot having to do with the location and also power issues. This did point out that agreements made after Sandy between the carriers to allow roaming at no charge to other networks after a disaster declaration did allow better coverage than would have been otherwise possible. That was an important point.

All the PSAPs, some went offline in all of the storms, some of them came back really quickly, but there are still issues, of course, in some areas.

Moving on, it was reported that the National Emergency Address Database contract which, on October 16th, was awarded to West, formerly Intrado, and they're going to be responsible for building the next NEAD (phonetic), which will basically be a database for location information, address information, for NG-911 nationwide. This contract's actually been awarded; you can see there's progress being made.

April 18th is coming up and is the three-year benchmark for horizontal accuracy. It has to be within 50 meters 50 percent of the time. So it will be interesting to see how the carriers perform with that coming up.

August of next year, the carriers must submit Z plans for vertical location; how are they going to be able to identify where a wireless device is within a high rise in an urban area. There's a lot of movement on that, a lot of research being done.

There were presentations both by Google and RAPID SOS that talked a lot about that and how the technology and the formation within those groups is actually moving ahead of the FCC timeline.

I'll try not to make this too long, but using a bunch of different devices, things within today's Smart phones, they

can use not only triangulation GPS but also Wi-Fi access points, blue tooth features, barometric pressure, pedestrian dead-reckoning, which is like accelerometers and step counters, all of this to determine where a phone is in a building. They've developed it, they're testing it. Google actually in all their Android products now has automatic location using this stuff in their devices and they are already meeting the 2019 FCC mandate through their testing. A different carrier will use the technology; it has to be an issue where the carrier will actually use it. It's live in 14 other countries, testing in 10 more countries and in total population serving 153 million people. It's initiated whenever 9-1-1 and 1-1-2 in Europe is dialed, it watches this Z factor finding, and is working very well. It shows the technology is getting there.

We just have to get it applied to our systems in the United States and so the regulations have to be updated and so on and so forth to accomplish this. So it's very interesting and very knowledgeable.

They didn't provide much information on it, but Google has been meeting with Apple as well to discuss how some of the technology can be shared and can be moved to those devices. They didn't give much information on that.

A little bit about a presentation by a Crisis Text Line where they now have a system where texting 741741 can bring in crisis counselors to someone. It's available in all 295 area codes in the U.S. and it's getting a lot of response. The best demographic for that is age under 25 and most of the conversations are between 8:00 p.m. and 4:00 a.m. The top issues have been depression, suicide, self-harm, family relationships. A lot of them, the calls are from schools, classrooms, homes.

They've done a lot of data analysis with this. They've done 9,045 actual rescues where they've referred to PSAPs that call or text to this after the counselors review who the person texting, they refer them to a 911 PSAP.

They want to start educating the PSAPs because they're getting pushback like "Who are you?", and "What is this?", and it slows the response. They've taken credit for saving over 500 lives already with this Texting Crisis Line.

I'm hooking them up with New York State 911 Coordinators to do a presentation during a meeting for New York, try to push out some information to the New York PSAPs in the meantime.

Texas A&M is doing a lot of research on ESINet interconnection. They're using Texas as an example. The regional ESINets have been built in Texas. They're doing a lot of cost analysis nationwide for NG. The National 911 Program reported on the interstate playbook where they're testing interoperable ESINets between North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota and Iowa, and they've already successfully

transferred texts to 911 across state lines. They did some successful testing there. They're now working on updating a roadmap for nationwide NG-911 implementation and they're getting very involved in the dispatch for assisted CPR guidelines.

They feel it should be mandated and with trained EMD nationwide. They're finding they really find out it is not being done in many, many, many places, many small PSAPs, not a lot of staffing still out there, local PSAPs, PSAPs that claim they do it but tele communicators may kind of surface and not do it completely.

There's been so much science proving the effectiveness in immediate CPR over the phone that it's time to make this happen nationwide and not just make it a good idea.

I think in New York, we have a lot of it out there and working, but I think there's still gaps that need to be addressed.

I know this Board is concerned about the standards and the fact that didn't apply all PSAPs in the state so this is an issue that maybe one can take into consideration of that down the road.

I think I talked about that, the grant program and the model state update.

Any questions?

Sorry it was so long, but I wanted to bring some of this information forward. There's a lot going on.

KOPSTEIN: On the testing being done on the interconnect between the states, how are they handling the plain language issue where a word in one state means something totally different in a different state?

CHELLIS: This would be transferring of 911 calls.

KOPSTEIN: That's what I'm talking about.

CHELLIS: One call from one state to another. I mean, obviously, you have language barriers and so on. I don't know if I'm getting your question right. I'm not talking about LMR, like codes.

KOPSTEIN: No, no.

CHELLIS: Plain language.

KOPSTEIN: Plain language. An assault in New York is this (indicating). In other states, that's a battery. An assault is yelling at somebody where, in New York, that may be a menacing. We have a language issue that's going to have to be addressed or somebody could get hurt.

CHELLIS: What they're concentrating is tying the ESINets together to make them compatible on neutral platforms so that NG calls, you've still got the caller on the line, can be transferred to the correct PSAP in another state if there's a misdirection.
Where they're doing this testing in North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota and Iowa, you know, can they take a call in Minnesota, send it over the state line to a PSAP in South Dakota or North Dakota?
You still have the caller on the line. I see where you're going, but it's not the dispatcher saying we have -- I mean, I suppose if they're still on the line, they can say we have an assault or a battery. That's a good point.

KOPSTEIN: So we're talking about transferring the call back to the origination and not handling the overall –

CHELLIS: Right. We've taken a call here in New York, but it's about an incident going on in Vermont, we want to send the call to Vermont, and have them answer it. We may still stay on the line.
It's not as easy as it sounds. It sounds like it should be easy, but it isn't. Two of the states are using West for their ESINet and two of them are using Comtech. Now, they've got to get those companies together to make their stuff interoperable and that's where the issues are and the work has to be done.
It's a lot easier where it's the same company; it's working. When you have to cross another company's proprietary stuff, there's issues, which means there needs to be a P25 for this stuff or something to make this stuff compatible. That's where the work is being done and Texas A&M is in on it as well.
Any other questions? Comments?
(No response.)

CHELLIS: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Okay. Thank you, Brett.
Jay, you're up.

KOPSTEIN: Good morning. I'm going to try to go through the agenda relatively quickly. I have been reelected to the executive committee of SAFECOM for another two years. Tony Catalonotto, a member of the CIWG, is also on the executive committee.
We've lost Tom Roach. For those of you who didn't know, Tom passed away in October and it's going to be a loss to all of us.
SAFECOM will most likely recommend that All Hazards IMT

Association concept for COML certification be adopted.
The process is similar to the FEMA national qualification
standard and credentialing format. The director can
explain later on what New York State is doing as far as COML.
We're more and more getting into the issues of data. Data
can be evidence. Data must be preserved. It is evidence
in the first instance. A copy is not as valid as the
original. So in your planning, please figure out how you're
going to preserve data.
The definition of public safety grade is still being
discussed. We're not necessarily happy from the SAFECOM
standpoint on vaguer definitions coming out of APCO and
NPSTIC.
There have been articles in the last two months in Mission
Critical Communications about cellular communications and
emergencies and the like and their resiliency. Please avail
yourself of those articles online. If you need copies, I
can make copies available to Joann and she can get them out
to you.
Cellular telephone issues were prevalent in Puerto Rico and
the Virgin Islands because of the hurricane situation. We
really don't know how AT&T and/or FirstNet will address that
in the future. It's an infrastructure issue. It's a low
power issue. Those people that I've spoken to who were
deployed down there were able to stand up LMR networks
relatively quickly because of the power involved.
We're seeing more cross state border IMT deployment. We
need AARs to take a look at the effectiveness and what has
to be managed there. Again, due to the storms and the like,
debris management and recovery issues have become an issue;
I don't want to talk about debris management across the
board, but debris management of towers and communication
systems on-site that have to be removed before replacements
can be put in place.
One of the points that was brought up in our meeting in
Oklahoma is if we deploy people, we have to be prepared to
take care of the people that we deploy.
TERT should now be incorporated into SCIPs & TICPs. The need
for TERT is growing and people are moving across state lines.
There was another JamEx done this year at the Idaho National
Labs. I'm told that the report will be completed during the
first quarter of '18 and a tool kit is being prepared as well.
Perhaps, Chris Tuttle can expand on that.
COMU 2.2 or 2.0 is still being worked on. We're looking at
the possibility of elevating communications to the section
level within incident command with the COMU being one portion
and having other portions for data and video, etcetera.
There was a webinar yesterday on the national survey, the
SAFECOM national survey. Please; it is imperative that the
survey be completed. We need the documentation to get

future funding. Funding is tied to need.

Those are the grants since '04 (indicating). If we want those grants to start moving back up, we're going to have to demonstrate and document the need. That's what the survey is all about. Please complete the survey. I know it's going to take a half hour or 35 minutes. It's available online. If you need data on the survey, please contact Joann. She will get the website up for you, tell you how to go about it. But as you can see, since '04, funding is half, less than half of what it was.

Last but not least from SAFECOM, the TAs are available again. I would ask the director again survey for need. SAFECOM is asking that the requests be made. If you need the catalog, I'll leave it here for you. I don't know if you picked it up.

SPRAGUE: I've got one.

KOPSTEIN: You've got one. Okay, thank you.

Moving along, NYMAC, we held a NYMAC meeting on the 12th of October at New York City's PSAP 2. Mike Postel of the Suffolk County PD is the new chair.

What's important here is in New York, National Guard, various units within the National Guard, because of Empire Shield, have been approved as non-voting members of NYMAC and they will have access to all six NYMAC channel pairs.

Last but not least, the 2018 PSCR meeting will be held in San Diego during the first week in June. Back to you, sir.

SPRAGUE: Okay. Just to follow on in regards to the SAFECOM survey, I know I put it out, and Jay put it out again. They did an extension till February because of all of the events that have been going on this fall.

I plan on putting it out again between the holidays to try to get everybody's attention on it. We really need to make sure that everybody fills that out.

An interesting aside, when we were in Norman, they actually gave the results; the survey in New York was actually leading the country in replies. Mind you, it had only been out a week or so, but we had three in and we were leading the country.

We really need to get on the ball and start to fill this thing out. It's really important that we do it. I know, Jay, you put it back out again, I plan on doing it again, but I'll do it between the holidays so I can try to get everybody in that mode for that last kind of month to get everybody to fill the thing out. It's very important that we do it.

KOPSTEIN: For those here who are familiar with statistics,

not quite 10 percent of the number of responses that are needed are in for it to be a statistical valid sampling of need, and that's as of yesterday. So please.
SPRAGUE: Any comments or questions?

VOUTOUR: I just had a question. Jay, I apologize, I'm not at the same level you are; you gave an acronym of TERT?

KOPSTEIN: T-E-R-T.

VOUTOUR: Can you please explain what that is?

KOPSTEIN: TERT is the availability of moving 911 qualified personnel from one answering point in one state as a mutual aid to another state or another locality. There's a training and there's a credentialing process moving forward. When you have a significant incident in a locality, yes, day one and maybe day two, your people will be reporting for work, but they have families and needs as well and they have to be relieved.
Where are those relief personnel coming from? They're going to be coming from another community not impacted. So TERT provides for the ability to do mutual aid of personnel from answering point to answering point.

VOUTOUR: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: It's actually a nationwide initiative through 911. Our 911 Coordinators Association has actually initiated it within the state, but we've not been able to get the legal piece of it for them to leave the state. They have on a number of occasions gone and supported different counties during disasters.

KOPSTEIN: I think you'll find out that over the years since New York State joined EMAC, EMAC deployments have been going up linearly every year. And I believe they're going to continue to go up, because personnel costs are so expensive that we're going to be sharing more and more resources across county and state lines. And across the state lines, for political reasons, it may not be FEMA but may be EMAC.

WISELY: Jim, TERT is Telecommunications Emergency Response Task Force.

VOUTOUR: Okay. Thank you. One more time?

WISELY: Telecommunications Emergency Response Task Force.

VOUTOUR: I apologize if I showed my ignorance.

KOPSTEIN: Not at all. We'd much rather you ask the question and know where we are than fall behind where we are.
VOUTOUR: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Any other questions or comments for Jay?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. Matt, you're up next.

DELANEY: Good morning, everyone. I just have one slide here today. So DHSES, working with our evaluation team subject matter experts, we had about 40 subject matter experts, reviewed the final state plan delivered by FirstNet. That plan was delivered in September and we reviewed it. We generated an evaluation report, recommendation report and provided that to DHSES executives for the Governor's review.
The Governor has not made an opt decision yet. The Governor actually has until the end of December, December 28th, to make that decision. You know, 33 of 56 states and territories have made an opt-in decision, the rest have not made a decision yet. Nobody has opted out. There's still about a month to make that decision. If there's no decision made by the end of December, then by default, it just becomes opt in.
One of the things that we're working on is our SLIGP 2.0 grant application. SLIGP is the State and Local Implementation Grant Program. We've had a grant award from the federal government since 2013 for broadband outreach, developed our website, our working group, a variety of other things, our meetings we did this summer for those of you who went to one of our outreach meetings this summer. That was all funded under the SLIGP grant. It will be expiring in February.
NTIA is going to release a new grant called SLIGP 2.0 effective, well, planning March 1st, 2018. That grant award will be not so much outreach; it will be more for adoption and transition planning purposes. The actual marketing and outreach is the responsibility of AT&T in an opt-in state. States are not expected to market the network, but they are going to ask the states to help with transition, data sources, databases, applications that would want to be carried on FirstNet, how to bring that over, identification of gaps in coverage need.
We want to look at creating some sort of portal where user agencies can enter in coverage gaps and we'll forward that along to AT&T/FirstNet to opt in.
Then, the other thing is moving the Public Safety Broadband Working Group into more of a user advocacy and user working group. We probably would look maybe in the April 2018

meeting to look at voting and changing the charter from a mission of the working group that's currently more about outreach and consultation of FirstNet into more of a working group of user agencies who would be engaged in providing their needs to FirstNet as people adopt the network. That's all I have on updates for this meeting. Obviously, by our next meeting in January, we'll have an opt decision, either opt in, opt out or default opt in by December 28th.

LAFLURE: Matt, where are we at on discussions of what Verizon's been selling around the state?

DELANEY: Verizon is offering, publicly offering, a similar product to AT&T/FirstNet for public safety broadband; a little different in that they don't have access to the Band 14 spectrum if the state opts in, but they have indicated they will offer a priority on their existing network. They will be developing a core for public safety that will be different than the AT&T/FirstNet core. There's been a lot of discussion nationally about what that means for interoperability going forward. Will there be applications that reside in one? Will there be a way to share data with others?
Say you opt in but choose to use Verizon -- because there's no requirement -- in a state that opts in, there's no requirement for anyone to subscribe to FirstNet/AT&T. They can continue to use a competing carrier if they choose to. If they subscribe to a public safety service from that competing carrier, what does that mean in terms of interoperability with another agency that subscribes to FirstNet/AT&T public safety broadband?
But you know, I think that as that market's developed, how that particular issue is resolved, that's a national issue that's going to have to be resolved, because both FirstNet and Verizon essentially offer nationwide services. So it's not unique to New York. Any agency anywhere in the country may choose to subscribe to one or the other and how does that concern interoperability and what does that mean for roaming from one state to another?
If your state opts out, they still have to utilize the AT&T/FirstNet core, whoever they end up choosing for their RAN network provider in an opt out. But in an opt-in, there's no requirement to subscribe to that FirstNet/AT&T solution.
You could end up with neighboring jurisdictions, AT&T/FirstNet and Verizon, whether they're in the same state or an adjoining state. How that is all going to work out is yet to be determined.

LAFLURE: Verizon is working very hard down on the level

which we're seeing in other instances where they're talking
to sheriffs' departments and boards of supervisor's way down
on the local level.
And if you convince some of those people that "I have the
better plan" and then we, as a state, or whoever, come in
and say, "Well, no, we've opted into FirstNet", now, we've
got this follow between "Well, no, these people told me they
could do it and they can do it cheaper." They will tell you
that right to your face. And I saw their presentation and
they're selling really hard.
And I just get concerned that we're going to end up with the
same thing we had before where we really don't have
interoperability. It's going to be a price war, basically.
It's going to come down to if you give it to me for $2 cheaper
a month, I'm going with these guys.

DELANEY: If you host an application yourself, your agency,
and your cellular provider is just a transport mechanism for
that, in reality, it probably shouldn't matter who's
providing that service to you from an interoperability
standpoint. I mean, it comes down to price, it comes down
to coverage and service, level of availability, at least to
choice.
The issue becomes applications that are residing in a core
that one or the other operates. Today, those applications
really don't exist. I mean, that's a future-looking thing,
because both carriers don't have that public safety core yet.
I'm not sure what Verizon's timeline is. I know FirstNet
is in the spring to turn on the public safety FirstNet core.
Those applications don't exist today.
Even once those cores get turned on, there will be a period
of time when applications start to become available, apps
that will be network-specific will be available. Then how
will that affect interoperability from a standpoint of, all
right, I'm here, I drive 300 miles and I get out of my truck.
What does it mean? I have a data service from one or the
other, but I don't know of any of the native users or
applications. Is there something about that core that makes
it unique that I can now just start, you know, using their
data application? I'm tied to their CAD system, because I'm
on the same core. Those don't exist today.
Will they exist in the future? We'll have to see. We'll
have to see how that resolves itself where you have two
different potentially competing cores and will there be
interoperability between them.
If you run your own application, it will be no different than
we had in 2016 because it's just a transport mechanism.
It is certainly something we have to keep an eye on, but it's
also something that doesn't -- it's a problem that doesn't
exist today. We have to start to forward think and think

what technologies could create this problem and are they actually solving something or not.

LAFLURE: In the Verizon world, they're great salespeople. They come in and they say, "I'll tell you what; we're going to work on this and what we're going to do is you give us a list of all the buildings in your county that need a distributed antenna system and we'll put it in", there's a hell of a selling point right there. Now, if they actually do that or don't do it, I don't know.
You know, the new code says you have to do it for all communication types, LMR, whatever. But if they say, well, it's for our -- I can't use the term FirstNet -- for our public safety brand system, okay, here we are, we're expanding it into every one of your buildings. That's a hell of a selling point.

TERRY: It might also force the issue, though, for AT&T to allow Verizon to connect the two cores together, which if they don't want to in the beginning, maybe the government can push that to be able to happen so the two cores can coexist together.

DELANEY: That may happen. As we see what the cores do in the application, there may be core-to-core interoperability. Just like you're on Verizon and I'm on AT&T, I can text you, I can call you, because there are standards that exist to tie those features together. Will that design allow the tying in of different public safety cores together?

SPRAGUE: It's really important to remember that an opt-in decision, whether it's affirmative or passive, just gives AT&T the okay to move within the state and use Band 14. It doesn't require the state or anyone else to do anything other than just that.
If you look at their build-out schedule, you know, their coverage right now is not where some other companies may be at the same time, and that will change over time. And they have a five-year time frame that was built in this for them to move through that.
The whole thing is going to kind of balance and drive itself to some extent. If you've got coverage, that drives a lot of what you're going to do. If you don't have coverage, it's really hard to buy into something. The market is going to be shifting and changing. It allows us to use either service and opens up the market, I think, to some pretty impressive competition down the road. We'll just have to see where it all goes.

DELANEY: The lifecycle of the mobile wireless data is much shorter, equipment lifecycle, service plan lifecycle, technology lifecycle, than LMR. In one generation of LMR systems, you're probably in multiple, five or six lifecycles of equipment and technology. You know, talking about 5G, 5G is more of a buzz word than a reality right now. But you know, in a few years, what's technology going to look like? You make a decision today, you choose a particular carrier or a particular choice today, three or four years from now, you're looking at having to replace your in-car modems and service plans and reevaluate based on what's the best available both coverage, price, application, services in two or three years. It's not like you say I made a commitment to a radio system for 10, 15, 20 years. Probably every few years, you're looking at essentially reevaluating the choices of data wireless.
Any other questions?

SPRAGUE: Any other questions?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Thank you.

DELANEY: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: State Agency Communications Working Group.
There has not been a meeting since our last meeting. We'll be having one shortly. We will put one on the agenda shortly.
Channel Naming and Use Working Group. Matt, you're back up.

DELANEY: I don't have any slides on this. One quick update. We had scheduled for next week a working conference call to discuss encryption, specifically creating an encryption guideline for AES key references, just to make sure. Because an encryption in P25, you have to assign basically a key ID. It's not the actual encryption string, but it's a reference to what your encryption key is, where to find it essentially in the radio. We just need to make sure that everybody in the state, there's some coordination so that everybody doesn't use, for example, key one.
Just like your phone number is unique, you have to make sure that you have a unique key ID so that two neighboring counties don't both choose key number one for their SWAT team and then they decide they want to share that encryption key to make it available. You can't do that because you're both key one.
In addition to the fact that there's a set of federal reserve keys, we also want to make sure that each county has a group of reserve.
Nothing in the guideline will prescribe use of encryption

or anything along how you use it, or who you have to share it with; just simply like a chart essentially that says if you're going to use encryption, here's a set of key numbers to choose from. It's not the actual encryption string. It has nothing to do with the quality of your encryption or the security of your encryption. It just allows you to be able to choose to share it.

It also benefits the state agencies, because they need potentially to communicate in several counties and they can't have the same key number from different counties in one radio. Same problem. If every county had a unique group to choose from, it would alleviate that problem as well. There have been two plans that I know of worked on in the state by different county consortiums that were based on FIPS, the county FIPS codes. They were different theories and there's one question about one of them about whether the full range was allowed in the P25 standards. That's the kind of thing to discuss, try to set a guideline, real simple, just here's basically the chart to choose from if you're choosing to do encryption. That's all I have on that.

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

SPRAGUE: Thank you. Citizen Alerting Committee. The Citizen Alerting Committee originally was scheduled to meet in October, but as part of the group, it was decided that they wanted to actually work more on developing and really looking at the state EAS plan and the public warning annex. We used that same group, those same people, and actually met and actually started working on that particular piece, which really kind of goes into the larger picture of this.
There was a meeting in October. There was an agreement by the group that we needed to work on the New York State Public Warning Annex, bring that up-to-date. There's a couple pieces. There's a public warning access and then there's also the New York State EAS plan, which is kept by the broadcasters, so that actually is their piece.
The warning annex kind of dovetails together. It was suggested, requested and granted that Dan Miller in the OEM planning shop be assigned to help work through this process. There was another meeting held in November and Dan had put out an initial draft of the public warning annex to look at. There was a draft of a public warning table that was circulated. That actually was a lot harder than it sounds, because who's actually doing what was trying to be identified and what those roles are as everybody does it throughout the state with EAS activation and stations and broadcasters and relays and all those things that go into that.

He's been working diligently on that. Right now, they're looking at putting that information together towards a report to the CAC. I'm going to throw it over to Bill, if there's anything additionally you want to add to that.

PEAT: I can't think of anything that I can add right at this moment. Thank you.

SPRAGUE: That's kind of what's going on at this point. This was embraced by the Broadcasters Association. We've had cable operators in on this as well. That part has been kind of refreshing, that they're willing to dig into it. They realize that there's plans that need to be modified and things that need to be done as well. I think we've made some pretty good movement on this. We've been looping in our partners with New York City and a few other county agencies or counties that are very active in an emergency alerting system and warning information. I think it's been a good program so far. That's kind of where we are.
Any comments or questions?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I look forward to hearing more out of this group. I think it's going to move forward quite nicely as time goes on. Okay, Larissa, PSAP and SICG.

GUEDKO: I will give you just a summary update for grants, PSAP and SICG overall. This is an overview overall. We have programs that some have been completed and some are still open. They're all here. Those that you see highlighted in yellow, those grant programs are still open. Now, there's a star on the 2016 SICG formula grant. I'll talk a little bit about this later in my slides, but this star represents some issues that we had with this process in the grant program overall, and so that led us to change our procedures how we administer the grants in general. Those issues involved budget submission. The key is for us to develop contracts under those programs, we need counties' budgets. And we had four counties that actually submitted their budgets after delay of almost six months.
Right now, those budgets have been submitted. They are still being looked at by our state comptroller office. They are in the state approval process. But it took a long time. As you can see, the program started in January and, here, we are at the end of the year and still a few contracts have not been approved.
Those reimbursement figures right now, since it's the end of the year, they're changing rapidly. They're actually going up every single week. It does -- it's looking good for 2016 PSAP. Right now, just by talking to counties, we know

it will be spent by the end of the year. There are a couple programs here, Round 2 and Round 3, those project deadlines, which this one is February 2018 and this one is December 2018, they have been open for about five years now and we do not anticipate extending the grant performance period beyond those dates that you see here.

This is just a graphic representation of what we have right now, spending versus appropriation amounts in relation. Total, it was 340 million. Now, we have 2017 PSAP and 2017 SICG program already the RFAs have been announced. We have received applications and, right now, we are in the analysis and evaluation process of all those applications. That adds another few million dollars here. Those few million dollars explained right here, there's 65 million overall for targeted and formula based grant programs for the SICG, Statewide Interoperable Communications Grant; targeted 20 million base and the formula is 45 million. This is going towards sustainment but also to improve interoperability between counties and regions. In addition to that, counties can utilize the funding for any improvements for the system as well, any large project. The 10 million PSAP operating grant, this is annual appropriation, also formula driven as they'll stay the same for the last couple years.

We had a lot of discussions about the announcement of the grant program. In the past, it has been different time periods when we announce those grants. We are looking into a firm time period when we're going to announce those grant RFAs. We are looking at May-June timeline.

The RFAs for the PSAP and the SICG program would be announced during that timeline and that will give counties enough time to submit the applications, for us to evaluate it and develop contracts. By the time the performance period will start, everything will be all ready, contracts will be developed, counties will be ready to work on their projects.

The targeted grant program is a little different. There is no RFA process that counties will have to go through; however, there will be a contract developed with counties receiving targeted grants.

We will be having a series of meetings with counties that was targeted for interoperability improvements. And based on those meetings, we will develop projects to improve interoperability in those counties. That tells you that those amounts for the contract will differ from county to county.

Right now, we have 25 million from last year appropriation and an additional 20 from this fiscal year.

Those are highlights of the grant goals for the SICG program. There's one in particular that I'd like to mention, and this is CASM. This is Communication Access Survey and Mapping tool.

The state has been giving a lot of attention to this particular program which allows us to have insight on access on a system that counties have. It also helps us to develop SOP, state SOP, which we are finalizing and it should be done in the beginning of the upcoming year. But counties have to enter the information using this tool for us to actually finalize the SOP. We will take data, input it by counties and some of it will be included in our operation guide. This is essential for us. This particular grant program does allow certain expenses for 911 developments, but we took a careful approach when we allowed those certain expenses and they're explained in our RFA.

Since Brett Chellis is leading the NG-911 development for the state plan, we want to make sure that when we open up to expand the 911 to multiple different areas of spending, the counties have very precise guidance what exactly to purchase, how exactly to improve their 911 system to move uniformly to NG-911. We don't want -- as Brett mentioned, we need similar P25 approach in the NG-911 development as it was done with the radio system, land mobile radio system.

I mentioned in the beginning that we did some changes, improvements into our process, the grant process in general. The biggest one is we implemented 30 calendar days after there was announcement for counties to submit the budget. If a county does not submit the budget during this timeline, there's a danger of losing the award. We have been getting a lot of questions through our RFA period, plus during the project period as well, and I'd like to give a message that our grant unit does a lot of upfront work with counties and the main contact should be the grant representative for those counties and, by now, all counties know who their grant reps are.

If you have any questions about grant monies during extension requests or any existing contract, the first person that the county needs to contact would be a grant representative. If the grant representative cannot answer the question right away, they will come to OIEC and we will provide the answer. But still, the grant representative, as this is your main contact, they need to know what that answer is also. It's a learning process as well.

Now, if the counties have general questions about LMR, PSAP, there's no reason why they cannot contact OIEC directly. We do assist counties in technical development of their LMR system with their 911. We do have statewide experience and we have a big picture what exactly is done in New York and what exactly is working and what doesn't. If you have those related questions, please contact OIEC, specifically Michael Sprague, Matt Delaney. Kevin Wisely is our SPOC, but he's always involved in all issues of the development regarding FirstNet. If you have any CASM-related questions,

please contact PJ Higgitt. His e-mail and his phone number
is right here. Any questions?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Larissa. Any questions for Larissa?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. What I'd like to do is take a couple of
minutes to kind of recognize some people. I left it in with
the grants because, really, the consortiums were developed
from the grant process initially. That's one of the things
that every county that signs up for a grant also checks a
box that they're going to attend the consortiums and work
together as a group to facilitate communications within that
region's consortium.
One of the things that kind of goes off to the wayside but
has become really very prevalent and done a great job for
us is the consortiums. The consortiums really kind of
pulled together and they've networked and kind of resized
their regions and done a number of things to make
communications amongst themselves better.
The process has kind of gone on its own and it's really kind
of developed a life of its own. One of the things that I
really wanted to do was a couple of things; recognize those
consortium chairs. The consortium chairs are usually the
person who doesn't step back fast enough and gets appointed
as the chairman and then kind of is stuck with it for life
because nobody else wants it.
By the same token, they're the guys that bring the counties
together, chair those meetings, get everything going and
keeps the ball moving and helps with the whole process.
So one of the things I wanted to do is actually put together
a group of those consortium chairs. We came up with this idea
for the C3 group. We held our first meeting yesterday
afternoon. We were there from 1:00 to 5:00 and almost didn't
get out the door. There was a lot of discussion.
The purpose of it really is to get the chairs to meet each
other, to share ideas and initiatives between them, foster
inter-consortium collaboration and, really, that ends up
being a holistic look at what are we doing statewide and how
can we impact that?
One of the issues that I can see developing over time was
these consortiums doing a really good job. They were
starting to ask questions that other consortiums had
addressed. What was the mechanism for getting them to
cross-pollinate or talk to each other?
That's when we came up with the idea of having this particular
meeting. From what we had yesterday afternoon, I think it
was a really good success.
What I'd like to do first off is make sure that the Board

recognizes those chairmen. They're out there. I asked them to be here today so that they could be here for a Board meeting. Some of them have, some of them have not. What I'd like to do is have you guys introduce yourself. Steve, if you would start, just your consortium chair, where you're from.

STEVE: Good morning. I'm Steve DeChick from the Finger Lakes Regional Consortium. I'm chair, County 911 director.

FRANK: Good morning. Frank McCarton. I'm the Deputy Commissioner of Operations but also sit as chair for the New York City ICC.

KEVIN: Good morning. Kevin Hughes, Erie County Emergency Services. I represent the Western New York Interoperable Communications Consortium, which is the eight counties of Western New York.

BRIAN: Brian Greagan. Albany Police Department representing the Capital Region.

LEE: Lee Shurtleff. County emergency response director and the southern tier east which is essentially an overlay of the seven-county Troop C region.

ALEX: Alex Rau, Sullivan County 911. I represent the Catskill consortium nine counties. We're in the Catskills dipping down into the Hudson Valley as well.

CHRIS: Chris Carney from Orange County Department of Emergency Services representing the Hudson Valley.

SPRAGUE: Brian, you're not going to get away.

LAFLURE: Brian LaFlure. I'm from Warren County. I'm the chair of the 14-county Adirondack Regional Consortium.

SPRAGUE: It should be pointed out that we started out with fourteen. We're down to nine. That has been through their encouragement, through their organization and through the way they work together. It's actually come to that. I'd like to touch on a few of the key topics that we pulled off from yesterday's meeting, because I think it's really interesting to kind of get a flavor of where this is going. One of the topics that was really prominent throughout the discussion was linking of counties and linking of consortiums. There are networks out there that are being built and there are some counties that aren't linked in, some counties that are.

The northern district region is very far ahead on linking their whole region together and there was some really interesting cross-pollination that happened right there as we were talking through it. It was really interesting to watch how the conversation kind of weaved. The other thing was synchronization of counties that are in different stages of development of the communication systems. Some counties have you know, three counties that are really well developed but two counties that aren't connected and they haven't really started to build their systems. How do you pull that and merge that actually together across that?

Continuing issues with multiple agencies that still are not really sitting there and, you know, it was mentioned 16 years since 9/11 and we still have some agencies that are not talking to each other and we need to work on that. It goes without saying, but it does happen. The line A issues, T band issues are a couple of the things. Some regions, some consortiums are developing tactical groups and really diving into issues and I think that was kind of shared back and forth how that actually works. I think that was good. What I found really interesting, there was a discussion that came up towards the tail end about succession planning. It seems kind of obvious, but on communications, I don't know as it happens all that often. That's not only from the consortium chairman position, because usually, no one else wants it, but the other part of it is from the different counties that are in there and as you see different directors retiring, how does that affect and how do we manage to make sure that the information that's built into these consortiums doesn't disappear when that person goes out the door and there's a new person? How do you bring that together?

I thought that was really interesting. A few of these things we're kind of looking at as maybe some topics we can use during the symposium to kind of pull some of this information.

There was discussion about the history of the consortiums. We've got some new guys that don't really know how this all got started in the first place. It's not a hard thing to do, but we probably should be documenting it and putting it together and maybe doing a little spiel on that.

Then there were some consortiums that have very strong governance and some that have none. One of the things we're going to do is we're going to share that across the board. You know, if no issue is popped up, governance isn't really an issue and nobody knows it until, all of a sudden, there is something that pops up and a couple of regions that run into that. It was just some real interesting conversation that came out from the group as a whole.

One of the things I was really hopeful to do was that we would get a lot of good enthusiastic conversation. We did. We

had to bring it back sometimes, which was actually -- that was really good. We're going to try to meet three times a year.
I think we're going to do the next meeting with the consortiums, so everybody will be kind of in the same place. And we're going to try to keep fostering this relationship along. We really asked for their input as to what we want to put into the symposium. We got some really good suggestions. I think from my perspective it did what we were looking for. I don't know if any of you guys want to comment one way or the other.

FRANK: I appreciate you bringing us together. I think some of the issues that you bring to light are some of the concerns that we all, I think, expressed yesterday we have.
I want to thank you for your leadership and putting us together and actually getting in the room with these guys was actually beneficial for me, especially coming from downstate to upstate to see some of the things and the challenges that these guys have day in and day out.
So I appreciate the state's leadership on it and I look forward to working with you guys to continue that relationship with all of us at the table here to try to maybe work together when we do have some issues that maybe don't apply downstate but may apply upstate and how do we work through some of those issues. So thank you for doing it.

ALEX: What Frank said.

SPRAGUE: Okay. I just really wanted to highlight that and I think it's important for this group and this group to have cross-communications.
We look at a lot of things and we try to provide some direction. These guys are out there almost boots on the ground trying to shape their regions and do communications cross borders. I think it's really important that we keep this line of communications open. Thank you, guys, very much. New business.

VOUTOUR: Director, they're always welcome to attend our meetings; correct?

SPRAGUE: Absolutely.

VOUTOUR: Just so you guys are aware that you're always welcome.

BUTTENSCHON: Mike, I just have one question. This is Marianne Buttenschon from Mohawk Valley Community College. Is there anyone representing Oneida County with that group

or have you heard from anyone?

SPRAGUE: Yes. Paul Hartnett actually represents that group. I don't think he could be here this morning, but he was here last night and brought up a lot of discussion from that region.

BUTTENSCHON: Okay. Thank you very much.

SPRAGUE: Okay, thank you. In your packet, you should have Resolution Number 2017-1129-01. Essentially, what that resolution is doing is it's modifying the communications COMU credentialing policy, which I have a copy here, that what we're doing is since Toby retired, we've stepped back, taken a look at that entire program and we're trying to refresh it and get it out there and really go through the process.
What we changed on it, essentially, is the review committee, the makeup of the review committee. Over time, it's been difficult to get all the parties of that review committee together. We've adjusted it so that it further holds it into communications well and, otherwise, there's no other changes. That's really kind of what the whole change process is.
We do plan on -- actually, we pulled through all of our files and brought out all the applications we've received over the last couple years, we touched base with everybody and we're ready to really start going through that. We just wanted to make sure the review committee is up-to-date as part of this change. So any questions, comments?

KOPSTEIN: Mike, if this gets approved today, am I free to share it with SAFECOM?

SPRAGUE: Sure.

KOPSTEIN: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Yes. No problem. I'll entertain a motion –

CHELLIS: I have a question. Since we're going to be voting on a matter in the roll call, I was designated as representative for the Commissioner. Should that be Deputy Commissioner Wisely now since he is now in attendance or do I retain that? Am I supposed to vote? Which one of us should vote for the Commissioner, I guess, is my question.

SPRAGUE: I think it should be Deputy Commissioner Wisely. Joann, would you call the roll?

WAIDELICH: Yes.
Michael Sprague.

SPRAGUE: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Chuck White.

WHITE: Yes

WAIDELICH: Colin Brady.

BRADY: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Michael Primeau.

PRIMEAU: Yes.

WAIDELICH: James Freehart.

FREEHART: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Bob Terry.

TERRY: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Kevin Wisely.

WISELY: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Sheriff Gerace.
GERACE: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Brian LaFlure.

LAFLURE: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Richard Tantalo.

TANTALO: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Michael Volk.

VOLK: Yes.

WAIDELICH: James Voutour.

VOUTOUR: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Marianne Buttenschon.

BUTTENSCHON: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Richard Andersen.

ANDERSEN: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Kimberly Beatty.

BEATTY: Yes.

SPRAGUE: Okay. Thank you, all. I appreciate that. That'll let us move forward with the program. You know, it's kind of a timely process at this point.

The COMU program -- and Jay actually spoke to this a little bit before. When we were down in Norman for the SAFECOM NCSWIC meeting, we had several workshops on what they're calling COMU 2.0. I'll just show a couple of brief slides of it here.

As Jay kind of mentioned, right now, the entire COMM program reports to the logistics officer, the section chief. And what they generally have found across the board is that when it comes to the logistics section chief to report on what's going on with communications, they immediately turn and look at the COMM guy because they really can't explain it. And in particular, if you start looking at the way this is kind of laid out now, you notice this even more with what happened in Texas and Florida, is that now there's a whole section that's starting to come in that's broadband based, and its data, and it's like how do we incorporate that along with the LMR and make that a part of this whole operation?

That's what they're looking at this point is something along those lines that is going to come out that way, and they're really looking at the idea as being well received by FEMA these days to actually bring it up and put it on at the section chief level as opposed to reporting through logistics.

There may be that fifth level that shows up at some point in time. They're in the process of making a pitch to it. The last round, FEMA did not want to entertain it because they wanted to update. Now, they're looking at a complete adjustment to this and coming to the same realization that this is playing more and more and more of a role in the process and to take that little piece for the IT side and bring it more into focus depending upon the type of incident, you know, the amount of support you need to do for broadband and systems and that type of thing, you know, just grows exponentially to the size of the incident itself. They're really trying to take a look at this. There was a lot of discussion about this particular slide. Help desk really kind of cringes a little bit in there, but you know, the support that goes on and will need to go on, you know, really

needs to include all of these functions along with it.
They're really making a deep dive into this.
Expect a lot more to come down the road. One of the
discussions about the help desk is this is the help desk just
for IT. It doesn't talk about help desk for LMR. There's
some discussion about maybe bridging those assistant points
rather than help desks together at some point. There's
going to be a lot to be developed out of this.
Jay.

KOPSTEIN: Just as a point of information, there are some
federal agencies that have already adopted this. They've
done it on their own. One agency specifically within DHS
has adopted the IT management concept. So it's moving
along. And like most of interoperability, it's being driven
by the user up rather than from the bureaucracy down.

SPRAGUE: Yes. There was an interesting presentation done
by the folks from Texas from Harris County and from FEMA,
and they talked about how the operations out there went. They
put together what they called the CCG, Communications
Coordination Group, that was functioning under DHS and that
included the commercial carriers and everybody else along
with them and that function seemed to work very well.
It was one of the first times that at the end of the operation
when they started doing after actions, communications was
not the number one problem. It actually worked well.
They're trying to now as fast as they can capture what they
did before it fades off into the ether to really kind of push
that into the operational process. I don't know if, Chris,
you want to touch anything on that.

TUTTLE: Sure. I think that there's going to be a lot of
varying information that comes out of Irma and Maria in the
Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, being mission assigned 60
days, being deployed over 30 down there, seeing a lot of good,
a lot of bad, and a lot of lessons learned.
The federal coordinating officer in Puerto Rico considers
it a response phase. We're still learning and still acting.
I'll be down there Monday actually for another round. I
really think by the time we get to the consortium symposium;
I think we'll have a really good opportunity to really
provide some very interesting information as to what we
should be looking at in the future.
As a first responder, you always want to take lessons learned
and obviously always want to highlight what went very well.
I think the Texas situation went very well. It's not that
Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands did not go well. They
just had a whole host of challenges that we are not used to
ever seeing on all levels of government.

It provides us with a very good opportunity to take those lessons and how do they apply conus, whether it be New York, California or whatever, and look toward the future, both from the data side, the LMR side, the commercial coordination piece.
Quite honestly, it comes back to the simplest things. Anyone in emergency management has always been told all emergencies are local, and that's what this was. You have to have governance, you have to have the right partnerships, stakeholders around the table, hit the ground running after the incident. I think that's what you're seeing in the new COMU functions, starting to bring this whole host of characters together right from the start to start to work on these issues.
So I look forward to addressing the group in the future, whether it be at this venue or at the symposium, on a more detailed level, but it plays right into the new COMU functions in the future.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Any comments, questions?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I just wanted to kind of highlight this because what we're talking about really is right along this.
All right. Thank you.
Before we close, one last thing to discuss. We have in your packets the listing of the meeting dates for next year. There's a calendar in there and they're highlighted.
So the next meeting, if I'm interpreting this correct, would be January 31st, then we would meet on April 11th, September 12th and then November 28th.
Anybody see any major issues with those dates at this point?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: If not, I guess I'd entertain a motion to accept those.

TERRY: I'll make a motion.

SPRAGUE: Thank you, Bob. Motion made. Do I have a second?

LAFLURE: Second.

SPRAGUE: Brian.
Any discussion?
(No response.)

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

THERESA L. ARDIA, CSR, RMR
OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
518-453-6999

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Carried.
Very good. Thank you. I just want to again thank everybody
for coming. This is a great turnout. I really appreciate
the consortium chairs for sticking around for this and being
a part of the meeting. As was said, you're always invited
to come and any way we can facilitate that, we'd be more than
happy to do it. I thank everybody for taking time out of
their day to do this. Thank you very much.

* * * * *
(Whereupon, the Meeting was adjourned at
11:32 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: December 3, 2017.