NEW YORK STATE | **Homeland Security and Emergency Services** | **Interoperable and Emergency Communications**

ANDREW M. CUOMO Governor	**JOHN P. MELVILLE** Commissioner, DHSES	**ROBERT M. BARBATO** Director

State Interoperable & Emergency Communication Board Meeting Minutes
November 17, 2015
DHSES – Building 7A – First Floor Training Room

Chellis: Good Afternoon everyone. I'd like to call the meeting to order, the State Interoperable & Emergency Communication Board. Director Barbato regrets not being able to be here today, he had a death in the family, so he is spending time with his father and attending a funeral. He is unable to attend today and asked me to chair the meeting for him. I'm Brett Chellis, Deputy Director of the Office of Interoperable and Emergency Communications. This meeting is being recorded and will be provided on the website as soon as possible following the meeting. I'd like to introduce Deputy Commissioner Wisely who will make some opening remarks.

Wisely: Thanks Brett. Appreciate it. Thank you all for being here today. It's my pleasure to be here with you today as long as I can. It's an honor to have all of you together to talk about all of the good work you do in the State of New York. I just came from our Disaster Preparedness Commission (DPC) meeting held downtown, where we talked to all our state agencies, preparations and efforts and how we work with all of you folks out in the communities. Communications as you all know is a very important aspect. The work that you folks do is so vitally important as to how we work together out in the communities at a public safety level, whether it is a natural disaster or a manmade disaster or as we now all have in the forefront of our minds is the horrific events that occurred Friday in France. Those things are real; we need to be vigilant always in all of our communities, big and small. Communications and interoperability is huge in how we are able to respond to such an event. I appreciate the work that you folks do and on behalf of Commissioner Melville, Deputy Secretary O'Leary, and the Governor, thank you and welcome to Albany. I look forward to you folks having a really good meeting.

Chellis: Thank you Sir. Ok, we will move ahead with roll call:

Board members present:

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

Gary T. Maha	Sheriff, Genesee County
Michael Volk	Chief of EMS & Communications, Westchester County
John Merklinger	911 Coordinator, Monroe County
James Voutour	Sheriff, Niagara County
Joseph Gerace	Sheriff, Chautauqua County
Eric Day	Emergency Manager, Clinton County

Board Members Calling in:

William Bleyle	Commissioner, Onondaga County 9-1-1

Board Members Absent:

LTC Robert Mitchell	For Maj. Gen. Patrick A. Murphy, NYS Division of Military & Naval Affairs
Joel Eisdorfer	Partner, Real Estate Development Company
Richard Rotanz	Executive Director, Applied Science Director
Michael Primeau	For Howard Zucker, MD, MPH Commissioner, NYS Department of Health
Kevin Revere	Emergency Manager, Oneida County

Speakers:

Brett Chellis	DHSES, Deputy Director, OIEC and Designee Chairman of the Board
Larissa Guedko	Radio Engineer, NYS DHSES OIEC
Matthew Delaney	Radio Engineer, NYS DHSES OIEC
Toby Dusha	Radio Engineer, NYS DHSES OIEC
Joseph Gerace	Sheriff, Chautauqua County (call in)
Michael Allen	Director of Emergency Communications, Oswego County and Co-Chair CIWG

Guests:

Linda Messina, DHSES Legal
David Kislowski, ITS
Jay Kopstein, CIWG Co-Chair
PJ Higgitt, DHSES
Toby Dusha, DHSES
Matthew Delaney, DHSES
Thomas Gallagher, DHSES
Larissa Guedko, DHSES
Joann Waidelich, DHSES
Steven Sharpe – Genesee County
Michael Dunn – Niagara County
David A. Cook – FirstNet
Peter Bojmal – NYC Emergency Management
Mark Concannon – Frontier Communications
Michael Allen – Oswego County
Stephen DeChick – Ontario County
Lisa Madden – Winbourne Consulting
Brian Maney – Ontario County
Eric Abramson – DHSES-Grants
Shelly Brosen – ITS

Chellis: I'd like to entertain a motion to approve minutes from the last meeting, August 26, 2015 that were distributed.

Merklinger: Motion to adopt minutes.

LaFlure: Second.

Chellis: All of those in favor of accepting?

All: Aye

Chellis: All those opposed? (none) Carried. Our first report for the afternoon will be from Larissa Guedko, a Radio Engineer with OIEC on the State Interoperable Communication Grants.

Guedko: I'll give a report on spending and some highlights of the program. The State Interoperable Grant program consists of two pieces, one is interoperability, development, and LMR development, and the second piece is the PSAP. So I'll give reports on both. Round 1 had $20 million appropriation; this one has closed. The Round 2 appropriation was for $120 million of which $102 million was dedicated for further development of statewide interoperable communications for public safety and $18 million was dedicated for PSAP development. You can see that compared to previous meetings there was a slight increase in spending, however, some of these numbers are still low. We encourage counties, and work with counties, to make sure their projects are complete on time or if they need our assistance or extensions, we work with them to accomplish that. In Round 3 there was a $75 million appropriation and out of that slightly over $10 million has been spent, reimbursed to counties. In the PSAP operations grant, a formula based grant, and again out of $10 million, there is only $3.2 million reimbursed. Again, spending is somewhat on the low side. Round 4. Out of $50 million and right now there is no spending under this particular grant. The contracts are still in the development process. There are approximately 4 counties that we are still waiting on signatures from the counties and at that point all contracts will be back to us and we will move to the approval process. The 2015-16 PSAP Operations grant appropriation is $10 million this year and the applications are due on December 11, 2015. This RFA has been posted, last Friday, and right now we are getting questions from counties and we are answering as we go. At the end of the question period we will post all the questions and answers on our website so that counties can go back and can review those questions and answers, perhaps from other counties. Questions from counties are anonymous and only general questions will be posted. With this particular grant application you will see that it is in a slightly different format as well as additional questions. Those questions are not evaluated; this is still a formula distribution with the questions to be used by our office for development and analysis to define which direction we have to go. So please answer those questions honestly and how it reflects the counties situation as it is today. We will move to Grant periods. These are the periods where counties can spend money. Round 1 has ended. Round 2 and 3 Grants have just recently been extended by one year. So the county has up to one year to extend their contract. For Round 2 it has been extended to February 3, 2017 and Round 3 to December 2, 2016. That should allow counties to complete their projects. The Round 4 performance period is based on fiscal year and all future grants will be aligned with the fiscal year. Round 4 contracts are being developed and the spending period, the grant performance period, will start on January 1, 2016. This

contract is slightly different with this being a 2 year contract with possibility of extension. The 2012 and 2013 PSAP grants have no extensions and will be ending in April 2016. The 2014 and 2015 PSAP Operations Grant I would like to highlight as they are a one year contract only and can be used for the counties operations including personnel salaries, dispatcher salaries, and PSAP improvement. There are no extensions for the PSAP Grants. It is a one year contract and one year only. Please be sure to relate this information to your counties managers. Any questions?

Merklinger: Larissa, can you go back to that previous slide. Should that last line say 12/31/2016?

Guedko: Yes it should.

Merklinger: We just want to be sure that gets clarified before the final documents get posted on the website.

Guedko: Thank you.

Chellis: Any other questions for Larissa?

Gerace: I don't know if it's the appropriate time to discuss, but I think you know how I feel about the grant system and I know that it's much different now with this Board than when we had the 911 Board. I feel like our Board is in the dark as to what is being looked at, as far as priorities go for the grant program. I believe that it is our goal as a Board to get interoperable communications across New York State. The goal for us is to have Next Generation 911 across the state. I don't know if that's the standard being used to grants that are being looked at, but it seems as though it's more like who puts the best language together. I don't think that's the way it should be done. I think we, as a Board unit, want more input as to what our goals and objectives are, what should be funded and what should be disallowed, to be funded, and then try to get to the end. That's our priority as a Board and to have interoperable communications across the State of New York, and I would hope to get Next Generation 911 across the state as quick as possible. I'm frustrated because I think that it's not staffs' fault, but we have to deal with it. I feel the Board should be more involved in and engaged in setting goals and priorities and maybe in reviewing some of those applications. I don't know what's being answered so I can't throw an example out there, but when you have counties that get completely shut out, that might be very close to finalization of interoperability and Next Generation 911 because they didn't write the grant properly or didn't spell something out and to me that's not OK. And then back to the 911 Board, if we had questions as a Board to a county as to what their application meant we brought them in front of the Board and we quizzed them. Boy they came running. And I've talked about a baseline the last few meetings. We need to know where we are county by county and not only radio operations but also in Next Generation 911. To me that's simple. You send out a survey to us and say you can't apply for a grant until this is complete, and you will get it completed. At every Board meeting we should know where we are, where every county is in these priorities, how close we are, and what is it going to take to get them there. I learned at the last meeting that we have a county in the state that is not Phase 2 911 yet. That is unthinkable. They should be receiving as much assistance from us as possible, technical assistance and financial assistance. Then the same priorities should be set forth for interoperable communications and NG911. That's my two cents.

Guedko: I absolutely agree with you. Those are some great comments. The goals and objectives of this grant program, they are most definitely in the RFA that we just posted, plus we always run it by our working group, committee and also present it at the Board meeting, what exactly are the highlights, like infrastructure development, such as implementation of interoperability channels. That is why Round 5 will be based on the information that will be collected by survey tool. Next grant will be addressing those goals and those gaps that exist in New York State. We are not trying to take a blind approach but direct money where it is actually needed and develop interoperability. Perhaps the competitive grant is not the most gracious, but it is what we have to work and all applications scored against those goals set in grant program.

Merklinger: But I think we are not getting to the goal, even though it might be set out in the program. I'll use my area. We are trying to link 4 counties radio systems together, and 3 of the counties got approved for the connectivity and the 4th didn't. So now we have left out 800 square miles that could have been linked together with the same system. Our goal is interoperability and we just cut a piece out of it, because they didn't write such a great grant. So, I think we have to somehow come up with, you know the people that don't have the talent in house and can't hire a grant writer, how to make sure we get them grant money to accomplish the big picture. I think that everybody is willing to do what it takes to get to those stops but sometimes it leaves people out in the process. We have been very radio focused. Radio is one piece of a 911 operation and it's not even the biggest piece. It's all we've really been able to apply for over the last three plus years. We know from yesterday, we had this NextGen 911 piece we are going to talk about next so I'm counting on, with the sheriff, we need to set the priorities, whatever the 2 or 3 goals are for that, say 5 years, until those are accomplished, this is what all the grants are going to focus on.

Guedko: I think we will be ready for the next Board meeting to present where those gaps are once we do the analysis of the survey that we are getting from the counties right now. And I'll be speaking for Toby's team when I say that I hope the analysis will be done by the next Board meeting; that way we can fit in as to what can be done, what is the next step or what next grant program direction should be taken. And of course we will be presenting that to the Board.

Cumoletti: While we as a Board get update on the status of awards, it would be more valuable to Board members to receive an orientation as to what is going out and a discussion with the Board. The Board members know this is an important position and they want to delve into some of it. It does not mean they want to evaluate every grant, they want to see what the goals are that we want to achieve this year, know what the baseline is, and it is good we will be getting that, we need a regular pattern on agenda that is here is where counties are, here is where the consortiums are so we can help guide this down the right path.

Guedko: I think that is the direction we are going. We want to make informative decisions as to where does grant program want to go next. As I said before, the competitive grant program, just by the nature

of it, it does take into account the county proposal, what exactly they are doing but don't pay attention and evaluate how well they present it. So it's a combination of both.

Gerace: To your defense, this is not a criticism, it is what it is. It would be nice if those counties that don't have resources, individuals that are excellent grant writers, bring them in and let them explain it. We would make the trip. You can't get further away than us. We would drive here to explain to your staff what we are trying to accomplish. Give us that opportunity instead of the subjective system. I realize that there are a lot more requests than there is money but we have to figure it out somehow. That's why I go to the scale of what our objectives are. These are the number one things. If you are asking for desks and CAD software and other stuff, show us why you need that to get to our goal and spelling it out on a piece of paper and a computer, to me, is one way to deal with it, but not the best way for us to get to our goal.

Wisely: This is all a good conversation. Let me be very frank and clear, the goal is interoperability. If Bob were here, he knows it, whenever I peek into his office he talks about when we put that flag in the ground and declare statewide interoperability. We are not there yet. We are always looking at that. We also have legal requirements on what we can do with grants. We can't bring in counties and coach them on how to write a grant. That's not legally allowable for us to do. So there are things that perhaps you should hope you can talk to one another about, such as, I noticed you didn't get this one, do you want some help. There are things you can do individually to reach out, but let me assure you that interoperability is a goal, that is evaluated against with all applications. So it is important. Certainly, I think, as the Colonel talked about, that perhaps we can do a little more, add it on the agenda to view current status, where we are at, and where our gaps are. I just recently a few weeks ago asked Director Barbato for a comprehensive breakdown of where we are, because I want to look at it; where are our gaps in interoperability; where do we need to work on.   Not only between the consortiums, but be able to tie it statewide and not just within your county, your public safety issues, all of the state and all the federal partners that work within a community. That's what interoperability is. So we also need to work on that too. I've asked Bob and his team to work out a white paper for me as to where we are and what the true status of interoperability. But rest assured that information is evaluated during the grant process. I recognize having been a county person I know that going through the grants, the PSAP operations grant stands right out to me, you have a $10 million, one year earmarked for every year that we do and here we are midway through November, with $7 million that has not been spent across the state of New York. That makes it hard for me to go back to the chamber and justify year on year another $10 million segment to be able to continue to do this when we're not spending down what we already have. The OIEC team is very diligent in their evaluations of these grant applications and how they grade them. They truly look at the statewide picture and not one individual county whether we are giving them the money or not giving them money, it is really truly an evaluation. Certainly I think there are some opportunities to communicate some of that information ahead of seeing the press release to the Board, and having some dialog, and also as we have year on build out are capability requirements our goals and certainly we'll be talking about that. We have a lot of new things coming and Matt will be talking about future of FirstNet and the future of wireless broadband and where all that is going. That is more stuff that we will be working on together.

Gerace: Thank you.   Just a point, when I mentioned bringing people in, I'm not talking about coaching them to find out what they are trying to do. If there's a question, bring them in before the Board and ask them, what do you mean by this? during the review process.

Messina: I think the problem with doing it for the Board is that there are inherent complexities in bringing that before the Board.

Gerace: It does not have to be before staff or the Board; it could be in front of your committees.

Messina: And I think that is definitely built into the process where we have verified if there is missing information, but up and to a point. Like the Deputy Commissioner said, we can't coerce the process.

Gerace: I understand the legality of the process. The frustration from this end is that we are trying to get to the goal and there could be a county that really desperately needs this funding, but to get there, but because they didn't technically put an application together right or the way that you see it as evaluated higher than somebody else's, they are shut out and another county might be getting a bunch of stuff that it doesn't advance our goal or help and make it better, but, my point being it doesn't complete the big picture. It completely cuts out the counties that may need that piece, like John mentioned that 4th county connected.

Guedko: I'd like to remind you of Round 3. That's exactly what we did. To address those gaps, we said counties that have already received money from this particular program will continue to work on their projects and were not eligible to apply for Round 3. So those counties who didn't receive any funding before this program they were able to apply. We only have so much money to go around. You know that the project to develop interoperability can cost a lot of money.

Maha: You mentioned that out of the $10 million of the PSAP grant, only $3 million has been spent. Why is that? I can't understand why counties are not spending down that money. The way I understand it, is that if we don't spend it down, we all might not get it next year, because you don't need it. Have we contacted those counties to find out why?

Guedko: John Merklinger has actually called every county.

Merklinger: Yes, I actually called every county that has not spent the money. There were a couple of key areas in my mind that came out of this. First of all, many of them specified it for a specific purchase versus just using your salaries, for example, giving the money back to the county. I think you are going to see a pretty big deluge come in pretty soon of reimbursement requests. The other big thing that I got a very heavy earful about was MWBE, particularly when people were buying equipment off of state bid. So one county said we bought monitors because we needed to replace our pc's monitors, we bought Dell because it's on New York State bid and I have to try and get Dell, an international company to say they are a MWBE company to get reimbursed for it, and there's no way to do that. Should the state have already vetted that? They've already been through the state bidding process. Those are the areas I basically told everyone to go back and pull your payroll records, go back and pull your phone bills and your maintenance agreements, put it together and send it down to Larissa and Tom and get the money

in. Even if, internally, your procurement folks think you are buying a widget, use your salary, get your money into your county before the end of the year, so that money gets spent, and gets credited to your county where it should be.

Guedko: That is exactly right. There are certain procurement rules and regulations that have to be followed. We are hoping you can dig deeper for salaries, get that money into the county to use reimbursed monies for purchases of equipment.

Merklinger: I'll speak now for my county. It was very easy to get the money in. Your salary is a paper record, you fill out the form; one week later we had the check for the full amount from the state. Very easy. No MWBE paperwork, no jumping through hoops, it was one of the easiest things I've done to get money back from the state. It was awesome.

Wisely: So let's move on. I'm noting the MWBE constraints, there shouldn't be any on state bid stuff, and we will look into that.

Merklinger: We do appreciate all the work the staff is doing.

Chellis: Thank you. Any other comments or questions?

Gerace: Can I ask that the Board be given a list of what counties and how much are outstanding because sometimes that could really help? What I'm trying to say, is that the old 911 Board would actually dive into the details and ask why is this person not reimbursing and what is going on instead of issuing a blanket extension, those counties as to comment before the Board and explain why they needed that extension, on a case by case basis. That's where the Board exercises its authority.

Chellis: I would like our attorney to talk to that because there are different things in finance law and some things have changed. Please go ahead.

Messina: So under the construct of the old Board it had a lot more authority over the funding and reimbursement. Under the current scenario, the majority of the powers are actually given to the Director of OIEC. Some changes did come about and while we may not wish that it happened, it did happen. We have to follow in line with that. I think there probably can be a lot more structure along the way, but the key decision points, as the Deputy Commissioner said, there are very valid reasons for maintaining some of that in house at least at the deliberative stages.

Guedko: What I can say is that looking at the counties that have difficulty spending money or can't spend it all, it might affect their, and it was said right in the RFA, future awards.   If we see that counties are not spending their award amount it can be reviewed or eliminated.

Gerace: What I'm looking for is if we can get a spreadsheet to show where the counties are with reimbursements outstanding, and all of us can look at it, and it could help me go back to my county and address issues.

Chellis: I don't see an objection, but we can check with counsel as to why Eric's report from finance section, unless you see or know of something Eric that couldn't be provided to the Board members on the status of the counties.

Abramson: My spreadsheet can be provided.

Guedko: If there are not constraints, we will have it ready for the next board meeting. We do have all the information.

Chellis: The Chair would like to recognize Commissioner Bleyle who is on the phone.

Bleyle: Yes, good afternoon. I just had a quick question for Larissa and I've been trying to ask the question and hadn't been able to get through. You were talking about a survey, and I was just curious as to whether or not that survey was the survey that went to consortiums or another survey sent out for Round 5?

Guedko: This is the consortium survey. You are right.

Bleyle: Thank you. I appreciate it. Hello everybody. Sorry I missed you.

Chellis: Thank you Commissioner. OK, we will move on to the next segment which will be Radio Engineer, Matt Delaney reporting on Public Safety Broadband (FirstNet) Update and Mutualink.

Delaney: Good Afternoon everyone. I have a couple of slides on each, so we'll go through the current status of FirstNet. FirstNet Public Safety Broadband Network which we've talked about frequently; so FirstNet drafted their RFP. Just a couple of updates here, the recent FirstNet Board meeting eliminated the regional model, allowing only a nationwide integrator approach. FirstNet originally had the intention of allowing bidders to either bid at a national level to build the public safety broadband or sort of a more regionalized model in different parts of the state. They limited that and are now looking at the National model. The actual RFP release is still planned for release around the end of this year. There is no exact date. If there are some issues with some of the data collection coming in, and I'll cover that in a moment, and cybersecurity stuff they are working on, they could delay some, but they are working really hard, shooting for the beginning of the New Year. Assuming that they do actually release this in the beginning of January, they are pressing a May/June time frame for submissions to be due. There are actually a bunch of steps in between at the national level for the bidders to ask questions and to do pre bid conferences and all that stuff throughout the spring, but the May/June timeframe is when the actual nationwide bid submissions will be due from the integrators. They will take the remainder of 2016 for FirstNet to evaluate the responses. In preparation for releasing the RFP they did have a data call from the states. They asked the states to prepare information. They provided every state with draft coverage information, draft statistics they had from public sources they aggregated. They asked the states to verify those data sources or change or update them as necessary, or provide more specific data and supply some data on coverage priority; where they would want the network to be built first and so forth. So we worked on that along with the State GIS office, Jason Baum and Karen Henry from State GIS who put together some data sets and this data will be used to refine the RFP and inform potential

bidders. It is very likely that there will be future requests for data from the State, especially once they announce the award or award to an integrator or integrators. Obviously if they start to design and build the network they will probably need more specific information. This allows them a sort of baseline for their bid. So, 1st and 2nd notice interpretations, this will be where the network revenue goes, and opt-in and opt-out process. Basically, the law that created FirstNet in 2012 was a couple of pages, essentially if you printed it, a couple of pages for a nationwide network, so there were some public notices, three of them so far, that have announced their interpretations on the 1st and 2nd notice. So this is some of the things related to where the revenue goes for the states that would opt-in or opt-out, what the progress would be like, if a state were to opt-out how they would acquire the spectrum from FirstNet and build the network themselves if they chose to. The Act had very specific times in it but did not have number of days from a particular point, so what did that mean; whose to make those decisions, it had to commit multiple parties, would have to be on the same day; those kind of details that were interpreted by FirstNet through a public comment period. So we are still waiting for the 3rd notice interpretations, who are our public safety eligible entities, this is who can use FirstNet, who has access. Everyone assumes that it would be police, fire, EMS or those in a traditional first responder role, but how about the rest of the government enterprise? What about utility companies or the others that are maybe private companies with critical infrastructure key resources role? You are either a user of FirstNet or not a user of FirstNet. And if you are not a user of FirstNet, you would either be just a commercial user of commercial services in use today or you could be a commercial user through FirstNet spectrum - essentially resale. When public safety is not using the network, the spectrum through the integrator will be resold and you will be basically a commercial entity. So this is key to how big a user base will be. This has nothing to do with priorities. Priority users are a separate discussion and will be set separately, but anyone who is considered eligible to use FirstNet would then fall into that priority structure. FirstNet named a CEO, Michael Poth. They moved T.J. Kennedy, who was the Acting Executive Director, to the new position of President. Now they have a CEO and President. The next FirstNet Board meetings will be December 8 and 9, in I believe Houston, TX.   We have Dave Cook here today. He is our FirstNet Region 2 Outreach Coordinator for New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

I will switch topics now to Mutualink. So each county as I've said before whom elects to receive Mutualink will receive 5 software licenses and two radio interfaces and some counties will receive video interfaces if they have video available. And this is a new item, as part of the NY Responds initiative, up to 10 more licenses will be made available. Depending on how this is to be deployed in your county, the structure of the county, in terms of up to 10 more licenses will be made available. We are working through the details on that, so no paperwork has been done on that yet. Right now we are just starting on the rollout. This will be pretty easy, when we roll this out this is just a software type change, basically instead of having 5 you'll have 10 more to choose from, you'll have Edge device manager training, you'll have more licenses to choose from. So we are still working to develop some high level guidance and SOPs. We are working with Mutualink on developing a winter storm exercise scenario. What this is as counties roll out Mutualink, it may or not be used right away intercounty, and they may not be sure how to use it. We thought it might be good to have a series of exercises and we picked winter storms simply because we are going into wintertime here and all parts of New York will be effected one way or another by winter weather, so we tailored a couple of exercise scenarios as to how it will work in your

region and throughout the state. You'll hear more about that soon. So each county in the State received a letter and MOA to return. And let me just ask Joann if these numbers are current as of today or last week. Joann?

Waidelich: The 50 is current. The 38 is 40 as of today.

Delaney: So we have 50 signed MOAs returned to date out of 58. NYC counts as 1. Tom has been reaching out to the counties that haven't submitted MOAs. For the most part, it is either in process, or there were some questions in which we have scheduled some demos in the near future. So that number should be 58 or very close to it very soon. So once returned it goes to the Office of the Attorney General and the State Comptroller for approval. Now 40 have been approved to date, and the rest are in process. After approval, Mutualink contacts the county to begin the installation planning.   I don't have a number on here, but I'd say it's maybe 10 to a dozen that are probably complete and a bunch more that are in the install process, either the county has received the Edge device manager training or Mutualink actually has the state scheduled to get the radio interface installed.   Reminder that we have our public safety broadband website, psbb.ny.gov , where there is an explanation of FirstNet, public safety broadband, new items, and so forth. Are there any other questions on FirstNet or Mutualink? All right, thank you and as always you can call me with any FirstNet or Mutualink questions.

Chellis: Sheriff Gerace, Chautauqua County is going to be next to talk about the 911 Committee Update.

Gerace: The focus has been on the standards. Our sub-committee has been working with Brett on getting the standards ready for our final approval and get them published. We have a new goal, in my opinion and that is, this committee has really worked hard developing a plan for Next Generation 911. So I am hoping we can expand the membership in the sub-committee, we're very thin on the eastern part of the state. I tried to do some recruiting yesterday, by the way, thank you very much for the Next Generation Workshop that was held yesterday and see a lot of you were there as well. It was very enlightening and helped to reinforce and spark some great conversations. This set us on the right path to start looking at developing a plan. So that is our next big jump for us to look at.

Chellis: Well, on behalf of Director Barbato, I know in our conversations about NG911, he asked me to get my arms around it, to work with your committee, he would like this process to be through this Board and through this committee because that is the statutory process that we can weigh in on it as a state and help develop a plan statewide. The whole idea yesterday was based on level setting, what is the roadmap in devising a plan statewide. There are ways, as we learn, that the State has to be involved in terms of this rollout. It can be done county by county and try to put a system together at the end; it has to be done with planning and there are so many factors involved, both technological, legal in terms of tariffs and other issues that have to be updated to ready the counties for a change from the landline, traditional 1968 design we've all been working on for 911 to the Next Generation, which is going to be quite a change. In order to move and get to the point where the Verizon's and the Frontiers can shut down those vintage selective routers and we can say as a state that we are NextGen 911, there has to be stuff done, a lot of preparation, technological, legal and planning wise. So it's a big list, but we certainly stand ready to move forward on it and yesterday's workshop, I want to thank everybody who

participated yesterday because it was really educational. And the team from the federal office of emergency communications did a good job. One of the instructors has been through this. He was in the first county in Florida to roll out NextGen 911. We thank them very much for going through all the pains that they went through as a beta site. They learned the hard lessons, and probably spent money they didn't need to. We can all learn from that. That's why the federal office has him teaching us now, bringing his learning and sharing it. They also talked about what some of the other states are doing, where they are at and lessons learned there. I think we are in a good position, even if our state is a little more complicated. We are a home rule state and the counties run the PSAPs or the localities. However, we have a variation statewide of systems and how they are run, managed and governance. We certainly can take the lessons learned from other parts of the country and what's being developed at the federal level in terms of guidance and move forward. I look forward to working with your committee Sheriff and I'm glad you're adding some members to it. Yesterday we talked to some of the representatives (four) from New York City and that was great to have them in the room as they are important partners to work with us. We can't do this in two different silos, we need to do this together and with a plan that works for everybody; from a rural county in the North Country to the metropolitan area of the city. With that we do have a resolution on the Standards. The Standards were distributed to all the Board members and if you don't have a copy with you, I do have some available. The Standards have been updated by the committee after a year or so of reviewing. I don't know if John or Sheriff or I try to give some of the highlights of what was changed. It mainly was updating the language. I do want to say that it does not reflect some of the things the committee has been working for, as this requests a statutory change so the regulations would apply to all PSAPs not just wireless. So we can't jump ahead and make the Standards request something the law does not allow. The Standards are still for wireless, I want everyone to understand that. Mainly they are updating the training, moving the courses that the Board has approved for minimum training to an appendix, eliminating a whole section, renumbered 5204 to reflect change. John or Sheriff? Do you see any other changes to address?

Gerace: We just tried to clean up some of the language. I see us doing this project again when we roll out NextGen 911. We'll have another whole set of changes. I'd like to move on the resolution.

Merklinger: Second

Chellis: Any questions before we vote? We have a motion by the Sheriff to adopt the Resolution that is before you. Seconded by John Merklinger. Are there any discussions?

Maha, Cumoletti, Merklinger, and Chellis: Some typos that need to be fixed, changes made and Resolution voted on based on amended document. The amended Standards will be sent out by email for approval.

Messina: The Resolution is essentially forwarding this to the Division for consideration and action so it is OK if there are grammatical errors, but if there is a change that may change the substance that should be discussed and voted on.

Cumoletti, Maha, Messina, Merklinger, Gerace, and Chellis: Went through the standards and noted the grammatical errors.

Chellis: Counsel has advised that due to the number of errors, this cannot be posted. So this resolution would probably not be in good order. The Resolution is actually to post and adopt this document as it sits.

Messina: Actually as the resolution is written right now, it is for forwarding to the Division for consideration of posting and we would be OK with accepting this, making changes and then consulting back with the Board prior to any actual action.

Gerace: Why can't we pass the resolution and make those changes right now?

Messina: There are so many changes that you are not really voting on a document at this point.

Gerace, Maha, Cumoletti, Chellis, and Messina: Discussion on whether to vote on the document with amendments pending or changes to be made and the resolution as modified.

Chellis: If I understand you correctly, Linda, we can pass the resolution, clean up the document, send it out to the Board members, see if there are additional comments, at that point the resolution will stand and at that point we can pursue providing to the Division.

Gerace: Can we do this by email?

Chellis: Yes, we can do that by email. So we have a motion from the Sheriff and seconded by Merklinger. Is there any other discussion?

Maha: Just one question. You mentioned earlier that this is strictly for wireless PSAPs, should that state it at the top then? In the heading? It just says Public Safety Answering Points.

Messina: That title is consistent with the current title.

Voutour: Are we doing anything about changing that to include secondary PSAPs? Are we going to ignore it or are we going to do something about this legislation. It is ludicrous that this Board puts regulations on one piece and while they are a mile away they are doing the exact same job. It is not fair to our citizens that we represent. Absolutely not fair.

Messina: Director Barbato is obviously well aware of the issue, and he is discussing it internally if anything and what can be done.

Gerace/Voutour/Chellis/Cumoletti/Volk: Discussion on push back with these issues. Some can't meet the standards, limited capability, OFPC is working to bring back 911 training, outreach or whatever is needed. Secondary PSAPs are not bound by regulations even though they may be running perfectly. What authority do we have to change, run compliance checks, what is the process? Can it legally be tied to funding? That's one mechanism along with accreditation, regular reviews.

Chellis: I will take your suggestions back to the Director and see where to go. Larissa and I have talked about a few instances about what the process will be for following through on this.

Sharpe: It's not even a right. They have an obligation to insure standards are followed.

Chellis: Steve, I don't mean to, there's a point of order, only the Board members are allowed to speak unless I recognize you. You can raise your hand and be recognized. Any other comments on the motion? All those in favor of the Resolution?

All: Aye

Chellis: All opposed? Clearly carried. Next on agenda I would like to recognize Michael Allen from Oswego County. Michael has been a big proponent of an ESInet pilot project and he is going to do a short overview on proposing a white paper that was distributed to the Board members last week. At the end of this, I am going to entertain a motion for the Board to forward this white paper to our office for consideration in funding a feasibility study to conduct this ESInet pilot project. So Mike would you like to start?

Allen: Thank you Deputy Director and Board Members for the opportunity to make this presentation. Again, by way of introduction, my name is Michael Allen, I am the Director of Emergency Communications in Oswego County, I also Chair the Central New York Interoperable Communications Consortium and I am also one of three Co-Chairs of The Communications Interoperable Working Group. As a topic of discussion within the working group, we discussed implementation of Next Generation 911, and an important component of that is Emergency Services Internet protocol network. So we formed a subgroup of that subcommittee and met on several occasions over the course of several months and we developed the white paper that you folks have in front of you. We widely distributed it amongst our working group members as well as Board members, and many of you serve on both, so you are very familiar with the document. The document is basically an executive overview of Next Generation 911, the importance of coordinated efforts to build a statewide emergency services internet protocol network and we also touch on the importance of the ESInet development of FirstNet. So the document is very high level, certainly can be used to educate local legislatures and includes a feasibility study and some things we want to try to capture, a lot of what was discussed yesterday in the Next Generation 911 Workshop if you were able to attend that. Again, it was very informative and we have a lot of work ahead of us. This facet, the creation of ESInet is very important in the implementation of Next Generation 911. There is a bunch of drafts of that being handed if you hadn't seen it already if you hadn't already seen it. Like I said, it's been widely circulated and there have been a number of modifications to it, actually if someone would like to look at the scope of work found on the last page of the document, it was brought to my attention that we have a very good point to make. The second bullet in scope of work, to compile information on ESInet deployments among other jurisdictions (state & local) across the U.S.; I think it's important to include to compile international information because we are a border state, most particularly for New York State, how ESInet may or may not be being deployed in Canada, or how we could reach out to those folks and see what they may or may not be doing.

Chellis: How about if we add in Canada or other countries, at the end of that?

Allen: I would suggest, State, local and international in parentheses, but you can certainly do whatever you want. If anyone has any questions, I'm here to answer any of the Board members or the Interoperability Working Group as well as any others on the agenda.

Chellis: I'd just like to add from yesterday's workshop that the Federal Office of Emergency Communications actually in the 911 workshop recommended a pilot of ESInet as a way to start the test process locally and of course working with the phone companies gets the whole process to the table and we are more apt to be successful doing it as a limited project than rolling out a statewide ESInet all at once.

Allen: I would characterize the feasibility study as proof of concept. It gives the impression that we are going to continue to move forward with an ESInet proof of concept feasibility study. In a feasibility study one could decide that it's not feasible. Well this is something we have to do, so let's call it a proof of concept project.

Maha: Mike, can you explain what the last sentence on the last page, schedule, and completion of all project deliverables within 6 months of execution of contract?

Allen: I think we were looking for a broad, rather accelerated completion date. Once a vendor is chosen, and that is what we are suggesting here, that we get someone onboard to assist us with it, that we would narrow it down to 6 months. We don't want it to drag out 12 months, 18 months, so we'd like to see some positive results in a 6 month window.

Gerace: I just want to thank Mike for the work.

LaFlure: I will say Mike, the event yesterday, I had no idea until yesterday, how incredibly important the ESInet is to make NextGen 911 work. Because NextGen 911 is location based, not number based, there is no alternative other than you have to have everybody. I support this 100%. That's the only way it is going to work.

Gerace: It has to be synonymous with the term interoperability. We talk about that with radios.

Chellis: Yes, your point is that we talked about your building these tunnels between jurisdictions all depending on the governance and rules and technology you can build partitions and use some of these connections for multiple purposes, if your design so allows. Some people would recommend it, some people wouldn't, that is a concept out there as you are building these pipes between all jurisdictions, and be used for CAD, and it can be used for different operations other than just a 911 call.

LaFlure: They talked about this from the very beginning, our consortium and everyone else is doing the same thing. We want to build a public safety intranet. Not the internet, we want an intranet, so there is a way to transfer data from county to county, whatever it is where we are not going out on the internet. I think that's what we are building, what we need to build.

Chellis: Counsel has advised me that if anybody besides a Board member has received a copy of the draft ESInet Deployment in New York State please return it after the meeting. Board members are

allowed to keep them, but due to legal restrictions with vendors and so on, we cannot really distribute this.

LaFlure: Would a motion be in order to promote this through?

Chellis: I would entertain a motion for the Board to forward this white paper to OIEC for consideration in doing a feasibility study on the proof of concept project.

LaFlure: I agree, motion to move to OIEC to look at possibility of making this draft into reality and proof of concept.

Gerace: Second

Chellis: all in favor?

All: Aye

Chellis: Opposed?

Chellis: Carried

Chellis: OK. Next on the agenda we have a consortium update and a discussion of training and exercises presented by Radio Engineer Toby Dusha

Dusha: Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen; a couple of updates. We had some discussion earlier about the consortium interop survey or more correctly known as the county communications interop capability survey. The project has been underway since late spring and it's an attempt to determine the state of interoperability in New York State. Who has what interop channels, what capacity, mobile, portable capability, basic interoperability functions for land mobile radio public safety users? We went out initially with meetings with 9 of the 10 consortiums. The final meeting with a consortium will be conducted with New York City. We will be discussing that tomorrow on a conference call with the city ICC. That will convene 5 counties in the lower Hudson valley metropolitan area to review the information. The channel capability survey that was issued, has had mixed success and we had to pester the counties to submit their documents. We currently have a 75% return of these documents which is still a little bit low. We will be following up with additional phone calls. We have already had at least 4 rounds of phone calls; I, Tom Gallagher and some other folks have reached out to counties. The next step is to actually go out, knock on the door and sit down with a piece of paper and say we're going to fill this out. It is a necessity to achieve 100% participation for this. As was discussed the purpose of this is to identify gaps that exist in interoperability. We had discussions earlier about the goal and objectives of achieving interoperability, so if we can identify the gaps, we can focus on grant funding to fill those gaps. This is another tool to help us or lead us in that direction. The results that we have now are being compiled. We hope to put that out in a rather easy to use format graphically, probably several pages, but easy to read as opposed to a large cumbersome spreadsheet. We had mixed review with some of the accuracy of the information received. Through personal knowledge we have been able to determine that some counties forgot key interop channels on their list where others checked off radio channels

that do not exist in their region or they are not capable of utilizing in their region. So we had to go back and talk to these folks and try to get the accuracy needed to make these reports clear. It has not been an easy process, but it will have a conclusion as has been mentioned by the Deputy Commissioner as he is looking for a white paper summarizing the current status of interoperability in New York today. I can tell you it's not 100%. My personal view, we will never achieve 100% interoperability anywhere in this State or anywhere in this country until we are all on one spectrum, one platform, and one radio network. There are too many variables, people issues involved, operational capabilities, and we are topographically challenged in NY State. We drive 20 miles north and it won't work, what works here in the Capital District, won't work somewhere else.

Merklinger: This goes along with what Mr. Wisely was saying. OIEC has done several surveys over the past two to two and a half years. I think it's going to be important to get that into that white paper or into that data base, because a lot of that will apply to this ESInet into NextGen 911. So we have to look at everything. So in our survey with FirstNet, networks that are out there, the SAM office have been mapping fiber for example. I think it's important to pull all pieces together it's going to be critical base information. The good news is you guys have done a lot of that work only to use for this process.

Chellis: My request in discussions with the Director, Commissioner and Toby is getting the picture of the status of the LMR projects, the status of the interop base channels and making sure the counties understand what the feds want so they can be interoperable. And then connectivity; building those pipes, whether it be microwave drops to the counties, fiber or some other means to reach connectivity. To Toby's point, it is tough when you have a checkerboard of systems. Need to be realistic and plan statewide to also include state agency participation. They work daily in your counties. So we all have to be in this together. Any other comments, questions?

Dusha: What we are looking for here are those common denominators. If they exist, is there a pattern that we see and can we standardize on those common denominators to achieve interoperability. Simple is better, which will lead me into our next topic.   It's of little value to spend millions and millions of dollars on technology, equipment, tools, toys, you name it, applications if there is not clear policies, procedures, protocol and training on how you use this equipment. To that end, training is important, and we have implemented training over the past few years with the assistance of Chris Tuttle and DHS-OEC Office providing technical assistance. We have provided a number of training courses and this is just a summary of some of the activity lately. The first one is the COMT, Communication Technician course that was conducted at the Wildfire & Incident Management Academy in Long Island, in October. Fifteen students from Nassau and Suffolk and New York City attended. This brings up to speed 15 additional communication professionals in that area that can be serving in a communication technician or a specialist role during emergencies. As you know, they have had their fair share of issues down there. More importantly, if an event occurs upstate they're available to come in to support the locals and vice versa, upstate can respond to the city, western New York, wherever needed. That is the intent of the COMU program. The second training was a COMU/ICS Integration Workshop, that was conducted last week. It was a one day workshop, a communication leader program. It served as a reminder for all the communications professionals who are assigned to a communication unit of their duties and responsibilities and there function. We walked through some of the bureaucracy they have to navigate,

the paperwork, and calculating communication requirements. It was a good refresher on the need and function of the COMU. There were folks there that were seasoned veterans, some are in this room. Some were brand new, and it was an eye opening experience. They thought it was just a matter of going out and turning on a radio and talking. That is only half the problem. The next training course was the Next Gen 911 that was discussed earlier. It was conducted yesterday, and again, an eye opening experience. TIC Plan Development in the Hudson Valley, a technical assistance offering by the Feds. Nine counties in the lower Hudson Valley are participating developing a regional consortium wide Tactical Interoperability Communications Plan. This lets each other know what the assets are, what their neighbors are using, how to use it and when to use it. It will be a good plan moving forward. The second to last and last item is the COML & COMT, Communication Leader and Communication Technician course. Orange County through grant funding will be conducting two or possibly three of these training courses in 2016. That area has been somewhat delinquent in providing students for this training and they hope to be filling all two or three courses with students from the lower Catskill, lower Hudson, Capital District and the New York City area. And the last item is the COML & COMT courses administered through this office. We are looking at conducting additional courses for 2016, probably a minimum of one each, COML COMT. We will also be conducting an AUXCOM, Auxiliary Communications course, a technical assistance course provided through OEC and to be conducted up in Warren County. Again, this will probably be conduced the first fiscal quarter of the year. Any questions regarding that?

Chellis: Thank you Toby. We'll move on to new business. We have two items, one to set dates for our 2016 quarterly meetings. We have a proposed document, calendar in the folder with proposed dates highlighted. We just have to decide what works.

Dates that worked include February 3rd, June 8th, September 13th and November 30th after discussion. All meetings will be at 10:00 am also after discussion, and consensus.

Chellis: Next item. The Director asked me to throw out the idea of the Board giving recognition certificates to people in the 911 or radio community, county or local, that you feel is someone who has stepped up above and beyond in a particular project. Are there any feelings for that process, against it? It would be something given by the Board at a future meeting and if so, what type of categories would you have? We don't have to decide it all right now, but any quick comments or thoughts on it?

Gerace: Recognition would be nice for some of the individuals who do the work behind the scenes.

Merklinger: I am in favor. I sent some potential names to Bob as to why they should be recognized. I do think there are a lot of people who do work behind the scenes, and it is amazing what a little certificate of recognition does for reenergizing the people involved.

Maha: I think it's a great idea.

Chellis: Is anyone opposed to the idea? So, if you have a category or nomination that you want to move forward please send it to Bob. Do you all want to somehow review this? Or do you want us to make the decision?

Gerace: When you have collected a few, can you just ship them out by email and let us take a look at them?

Chellis: OK, so we will share them with you.

Tuttle: I'd like to comment from the floor with the possibility that the point of having the working group meeting and the Board meeting on the same day, as you mentioned earlier, and at the same time noting that ½ the Board members are on the CIWG as well and encouraging participation in both, is it possible to maybe start the CIWG at 9am and the Board 11am. Instead of separate days?

Chellis: There's an idea. We could try that. Any other new business? No other closing remarks. Thank you all for coming and have a safe trip back.

Gerace: Motion to adjourn.

Maha: Second.

Chellis: Meeting Adjourned.