STATE INTEROPERABLE & EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 3, 2016
DHSES - Building 7A - First Floor Training Room

BARBATO: This is the first meeting for 2016. So most of you have been here before and been involved with us in terms of the work of this group, which is to provide policy recommendations, prioritization, and a forum to discuss the needs and requirements for emergency communications within the State of New York, with an emphasis on the ability for first responders to communicate with each other and share voice and data.

The Board has been in existence statutorily since 2010, and I think we've been conducting business since 2011 regularly.

I'd like to express, again, our appreciation and welcome to Albany. Many of you have traveled to come here to meet at this function. I want to extend the greetings from Commissioner John Melville. The Commissioner will not be able to join us today, and also Deputy Commissioner Kevin Wisely also is unable to attend today. They send their regrets, but again want to re-emphasize our appreciation in working in partnership with you.

I want to move on to the rollcall first. And I do have a few announcements relative to board membership, so let me also get some housekeeping out of the way.

The meeting is recorded. This is subject to open meetings law per executive order and state statute. The meeting is recorded. The recording, as well as the transcript, will be available for review and distribution within a few days after the meeting. Today, a slight change. For efficiency's sake, which we think may allow us to have the meeting minutes posted quicker, we have retained the services of a stenographer, and we do have that resource here with us today.

One thing in terms of order of business, I would say while you're speaking, the Chair will recognize you, but please announce your name so that we make sure we understand who the speaker is. With that, let me proceed with the rollcall.

Board Members Present:
Robert Barbato
William Bleyle

Brett Chellis for John P. Melville, Commissioner of DHSES
Steven Cumoletti for Joseph D'Amico, Superintendent, New York State Police
Mark Fettinger for Michael C. Green, Commissioner, New York State DCJS
Eileen Fitzsimmons for Margaret Miller, New York State Chief Information Officer, New York State Office of ITS
Joseph Gerace (by phone)
William Hall
Brian LaFlure
Gary Maha
Robert Martz for Matthew Driscoll, Commissioner, New York State Department of Transportation
John Merklinger
Major Paul Mulligan for Major General Patrick A. Murphy, New York State DMNA
Michael Primeau for Howard Zucker, New York State Department of Health
Richard Tantalo (by phone)
Michael Volk
James Voutour

Board Members Absent:

Eric Day
Kevin Revere

Guests:

Eric Abramson
Michael Allen
Jason Baum
Matthew Campbell
David A. Cook
Steve DeChick
Matthew Delaney
Toby Dusha
Thomas Gallagher
David Gottesman
Steve Grochowski
Robert Grudberg
Larissa Guedko
PJ Higgitt
David Kislowski
Linda Messina
Michael Rowley

Bob Terry
Christopher Tuttle
Joann Waidelich
Peter Zwagerman

BARBATO: So as I mentioned, we do have two new appointments to the Board. They are Police Chief Richard Tantalo from Irondequoit Police Department, and also Chief William R. Hall from North Tonawanda Police Department. Gentlemen, welcome very much. I know it's relatively short notice. This meeting was happening very quickly. I am more than willing to have a conversation with you and provide some additional background, materials and context for you over the next few days, and we'll also share with you some of the printed materials and reports from the Board's reports over the course of the last few years. So welcome, gentlemen.

TANTALO: Thank you.

BARBATO: One other point of order. As you know, the members of the Board do have standing to speak here. Occasionally, depending on the topic area of presentation, we do have interested parties, stakeholders, or subject matter experts that also attend. In that case, if we do have a non-member that wishes to speak or perhaps comment, please allow the Chair to recognize you, and we'll point that out and get the permission from the Board.

So moving on to some old business. The end of calendar year 2015, the first time that this body has undertaken such an action, we issued certificates of appreciation to several individuals. I believe in our third quarterly meeting and fourth quarterly meeting last year, we did ask for ideas, nominations, recommendations of individuals who have contributed significantly to our work that were -- should be noted by this body with certificates of appreciation. So in all, we had eight certificates issued. We issued three certificates for continued leadership in advancing interoperable communications in New York State. And this is recognizing a career in a body of work spanning many years. And the certificates issued on behalf of the Board were for Sheriff Gerace, Chautauqua County, Sheriff Maha, Genesee County, and also retired Chief Tom Roach from City of Gates in Monroe County. In addition to that, we had certificates for work and professionalism in the field of programmatic and operational leadership in emergency communications. And three individuals received certificates on behalf of the

Board, Mark Kasprzak, senior dispatcher from Niagara County Sheriff's Office, Scott McInnis from Onondaga County Department of Emergency Communications, as well as Sean Sparks from Onondaga County Department of Emergency Communications. And finally receiving certificates for continued dedication as a public servant, who has been a strong proponent for public safety and emergency communications, and excelled in advancing the cause for communications and interoperability within New York State, and quite frankly beyond our borders, two certificates of appreciation were provided to John Merklinger, Monroe County, and Steven Sharp, Genesee County.

Next action on behalf of the Board in your packets today, you will find a hard copy of minutes of the last meeting from November 17, 2015. Any discussion on the minutes?

MAHA: Motion to approve.

BARBATO: Motion to approve. Second?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

BARBATO: All those in favor of approving the meeting minutes?

ALL: Aye.

BARBATO: The motion passes. Thank you very much. Next, I want to point out in your packets, at the request of the membership of the Board last year, you requested disbursement and expenditure information relative to the statewide interoperable grant programs, public safety answering point grant programs. That report is in your packet. It has been the intent of the Chair and our office that we want to provide that well in advance of the meeting so you have an opportunity to look at it and raise any questions or comments when we met. Unfortunately, this board meeting sort-of coincided with month-end reporting, so we were unable to get final numbers really pretty much until yesterday, but what I'd like to do is just point out that the report is available to you in your packet. I know that you won't have time to really look at it at this second, but we'll reserve some time at the end of the meeting to discuss it in the new business section if you have any thoughts or comments.

One highlight I might mention, and I want to extend our appreciation both to the leaders, as well as the grant

participants and advocates, is the public safety answering points operational grant, which is a relatively new grant. Obviously it's a formula-based grant. Through yesterday, I believe, the disbursements in the processing of claims has decreased dramatically in the last couple of weeks, and I think our spending or utilization of that 10 million dollars is approximately ninety-eight percent. I'll have to look at the list to find out if every county actually submitted a claim, but I think the overwhelming majority did. And utilization of that funding is much better than we expected, or certainly where we were in December. Thank you very much.

Next under old business, I just want to give a brief update. Last year, through a project team under the communications and interoperability working group, which is a subject matter expert ad hoc group in support of this board's business, under the leadership of Mike Allen in Oswego County; Mike is also here with us today. There was discussion of preparing for or developing feasibility for an emergency services internet IP-based resource on a pilot basis for the State of New York. This is a -- that type of functionality and architecture is a fundamental component for what is being called Next Generation 911 technology. Around New York, many states are ready to deploy this, upgrading their connectivity and their hardware, moving from copper to fiber, etcetera, but under that move and with the input of many participants, there was interest in perhaps developing a pilot, which could lead ultimately to a statewide network or architecture to be ready to transmit expanded data and broadband information over high-speed architecture. So the working group and that project team had recommended and developed a scope of work for what that would entail. Just to refresh your memory, the first step is really to engage consultant services to do some research, find out the state of the art around the country, what other jurisdictions, other states, have been doing in the past few years, also find out some best practices outside of the state, inside the state, and develop what would be some preliminary or business and technical requirements for what would constitute enhancing that pilot for the State of New York. The status of that initiative is the Board, I believe, had endorsed it and recommended to proceed with that. Where we are now from an operational perspective is the Office of Interoperable and Emergency Communications, Division of Homeland Security, my office, is going to serve as a project sponsor and funding source for that initial engagement. So we are just now in the process of requesting the allocation of appropriation for that. We may have to take a look at the scope of work a little bit as we proceed into procurement

for it, but we now are formally requesting the allocation and appropriation to be the project sponsor. Updates on that project will be provided to you and other interested parties as we move forward, and this afternoon's meeting with the project team and the communications interoperability working group I think might discuss it a little bit more. Are there any questions on the ESINET pilot?

(No response.)

BARBATO: So moving along on the agenda. We're going to hear an update from the 911 committee, which is one of the standing committees and working groups for the board, and also we're going to have an update on some of the work there. Sheriff Gerace, do you have any comments you'd like to report out?

GERACE: I do not, but I'd defer to Brett, whom I assume is there.

CHELLIS: Right now, the 911 standards were reviewed by the Colonel at the last meeting. The last policy meeting had a number of corrections or suggestions to clean it up. We went through it in detail and there were a number of things that we cleaned up in the document and then turned it over to legal, and they're reviewing it for the final edition and any amendments that they have to make before publishing.

BARBATO: Brett, what are some of the next steps with that?

CHELLIS: Well, the big thing is the whole posting process, which I'll defer to Linda. Basically after that, once legal is done with it and then it goes through a posting process, which I'll defer to Linda to explain.

MESSINA: I think everyone is pretty familiar with the process of the publication for the comments. I think before that happens, though, our plan is to get an absolute clean draft. There were a couple of further edits that we found after the last meeting, so I think what we'll probably do is get it back to you as a final draft for any last issues or comments, as well as maybe an overview of some of the edits that we made, make sure everyone is okay with it, and then we'll proceed from there, I think.

CUMOLETTI: Is that something we can do via e-mail? We discussed that at the last meeting, to review the edits by

e-mail so we all have it so that we can get it posted? So will that be expected to come out before the next meeting?

CHELLIS: It is okay with me, as long as legal says it doesn't need another editing. The Board already voted on the content of the document.

BARBATO: I would just say save the document early and often. Brett, has there been any discussion of other topic areas or work attended for the 911 committee for 2016, other things that we'd like the committee to engage in or consider?

CHELLIS: The big thing is the NextGen911 project. That's top on a lot of priority of a lot of PSAPs in the state. That's where we're going in that project so we can ready as PSAPs are preparing themselves and their own equipment and so on, a state-wide picture on that. So really whether the 911 committee as a whole and as it stands, with a few additions of maybe some subject matter personnel added to the committee, would be a good scope to work that in, or otherwise to setup a working group. These are kind-of my proposals that we could do a Next Generation 911 working group under that committee, or as part of that committee as a whole to move forward and develop a statewide plan with the input of the PSAPS and everybody that would be major players and stakeholders in that. We want to move forward.

     As many of you know, our partners in New York City are going out with an RFI in NextGen911 to collect information, and we want to work in coordination with them, but obviously the plan for the City of New York is not the statewide plan. We need to work in conjunction, but work the plan for the entire state, which is complex with multiple carriers and tandems and so on and so forth. So there's a lot of work to be done, but those would be the models that I would suggest as either a NextGen911 working group that's reporting to the committee, or if that seems too problematic or cumbersome, then the committee as a whole rework that.

BARBATO: So that sounds like a good idea. I think we can have some discussion about that perhaps under new business, but I'd just like to remind the Board that last year it was determined and recommended that the State develop a 911 strategy or plan with guidelines, not necessarily standards but guidelines on how we should proceed or prepare to build out NextGen911 technology in the State of New York. We feel that that subject area is certainly within the definition of the scope of this Board's responsibility, and I think this is an excellent forum for us to bring the practitioners and

the experts who actually perform 911 services on a daily basis to develop what those guidelines and standards should be. I think it will be a State plan, but it has to be collaborative and it needs contribution from the practitioners and the experts and the PSAP operators themselves. I think that's the model that's going on elsewhere in New York -- excuse me -- in the United States, not New York per se, but I think that would be some good work that this Board could recommend, and the 911 committee, whether it's a standalone working group or something under the direct responsibility of the committee there.

And as Brett mentioned and you folks probably have many colleagues and peers, we're looking for participants that could bring something to the table for that discussion in developing those guidelines, but also the ability and the time to provide the work. I think this body here is very good at setting the direction, but I know many of you are extremely busy people with a lot of expectations on your time, and I'm not sure that developing standards and technical discussions is something that we'd be able and is feasible to you.

Anyway, I think that's a good approach for the committee, and perhaps we can have a conference call meeting in the next few weeks to discuss maybe kicking that off.

CUMOLETTI: Bob, does anybody on the Board know the status of New York City's RFI for NextGen911? Have they put it out?

CHELLIS: They just put it out.

MERKLINGER: They just put it out.

BARBATO: The Colonel was mentioning that New York City Department of Information Technology has issued a request for information out on the streets and the market to explore certain aspects of NextGen-911 functionality, including back home and back haul relative to ESINET that we discussed. I think that's a joint venture, although do it as the lead on it. It also has participation from New York City police department, as well as the Fire Department of the City of New York. And we're going to be meeting and discussing with them and monitor what they're doing. I think it is a good idea, if they're able to get something to develop sort-of a baseline for that discussion. My understanding is, however, it's really just a scoping and a planning document. I don't know that there are any initiatives to actually construct or develop anything. And the City of New York's public safety answering point emergency services

dispatching capability is unique, and in many cases it's quite different, and in a different place relative to some of your counties, as well. So I think what we're looking for, we want to facilitate from the State's perspective here, is that the dialogue is there, and that we can establish some best practices and guidelines that make sense, regardless of your jurisdiction or the citizens that you serve. Any other questions on the 911 committee update?

MAHA: Has the federal government come out with any recognized standards or guidelines with respect to NextGen911 do you know?

BARBATO: Yeah, through NENA and other industry standard committees, there are engineering or technical standards developed. Those relate to technical functionality leaning toward some standardization. I don't think it's extensive or fully adopted as yet, but I think the Sheriff, yourself and some of your peers, that's a little bit frustrating to those of us closer to the operations, that if we're waiting for clear guidance and approval and reduction from the federal government, sometimes that's slow on the uptake.

MAHA: Thanks.

BARBATO: So I think it's in New York's interest, as well as on the county and local jurisdiction, that some of that early adopter or trial and error can go forward. I also mentioned that the State of New York's efforts to the GIS program and the SAM database, while not unique and so forth, it is the forefront of what's happening around the country, so that's a good example. Are there any other questions for 911 committee?

MERKLINGER: I don't know if this is a -- Chair, John Merklinger, Monroe County. I don't know if this is new business or really just an update for everybody. On Monday of this week, those national training standards that we had discussed in prior meetings were released for public comment by both NYC and NENA. So they're out there for public comment.

BARBATO: John, thank you for mentioning that. Just for consideration of the Board. Is there any interest in perhaps submitting comments collectively through this body; or if that would facilitate any discussion from New York; or do it on an individual basis?

MERKLINGER: Probably easier on an individual basis.

BARBATO: Okay. Do you remember how long the window is open?

MERKLINGER: A couple weeks.

BARBATO: Okay. Have any of you received that e-mail or that announcement? If not, we can search later.

MERKLINGER: Cheryl Benjamin also forwarded it around.

BARBATO: Right. The next item on the agenda is an update on the executive budget recommendations for fiscal year 2016/17. For fiscal year 2016/17, the Division of Homeland Security emergency services budget, I'm happy to say, is sustained. The good news is that we operate at consistent levels as the prior years, and that there were no reductions or eliminations in the areas relative to this Board's business in interoperable and emergency communications. What that means at a very high level is the operational appropriations, the state operations portion of the budget for the continuing operation of our office or this board was maintained at its prior levels, which is approximately 2 million dollars for personal service and non-personal service, and that's been relatively flat going forward.
     More importantly to the program, the statewide interoperable grant program, the appropriation for that, as specified in statute, is up to 75 million dollars a year. That funding is continued in 2016/17. The Governor values the program and the accomplishments to date. Slightly different this year is if you are to look at the appropriation bills themselves, there is some new language included in the appropriation bills that reference the formation or development of the grant pursuant to a plan submitted through the Commissioner and Division of Budget. Now, what that means is it gives us some flexibility. It gives us a little bit more capacity to perhaps restructure and reformat the interoperable grant program. And what led to the change in the language is some meetings and briefings we've had with the executive chamber in recent months, discussing where we need to get to, how the grant program as currently structured is working, how effective it is, and how to make it more effective.
     So getting back to the numbers for a bit, the 2016/17 appropriation for the SICG program totaling 75 million dollars would be scheduled as follows, according to the executive budget. 10 million dollars for the public safety

answering point operational grant is sustained. As you know, this will be the third year of that grant, which is a way for the State to help make an investment and reimburse the counties for expenses related to public safety answering and emergency services dispatching. In addition to that, the grant portion would -- the remaining 65 would be split roughly the 20 million dollars towards a targeted program to fill in some of those gaps and further the needs for infrastructure in interoperable communications base stations and equipment, and the roughly 45 million dollars would be available for a formula-based grant to counties for general purposes of maintenance and sustainment, as well as equipment purchasing and technology refresh going forward. And again, that would be formula-based. It would be non-competitive. Counties would have to meet certain eligibility requirements very similar to the grant program to date, participation in consortium, open standards and so forth. But what we're looking for is a very equitable distribution of funds to maintain, sustain and meet some county's needs and consortium needs, regional consortium needs that have been unable to be addressed in a competitive grant program that's set on infrastructure and capital.

       Relative to the targeted grant portion, approximately 20 million dollars, that is intended to fill in the gaps, make sure that connectivity is there among and between the regions, as well as insure that we are furthering the goal towards true interoperable communications on a statewide basis for first responders. That will focus primarily on capital equipment and infrastructure, and the participation in that will be available to where noted gaps in technology where interoperable equipment and communications infrastructure is lacking. So we can further that goal for statewide interoperability within the next year or two and make significant progress. I think from a programmatic perspective, this makes a lot of sense. The input, the dialogue with the Chamber and with the division of budget here in Albany, we took a lot of what you Board members, county officials and participants in this program have been telling us in the last two years to make this program more efficient and really achieve the objectives we're looking for.

       I think the -- it also underscores the need and the concept that unlike other grant programs from other levels of government that would give you funding or provide reimbursement to buy toys, gadgets, equipment and then walk away and they'll leave you with nothing for sustainment. This program's vision has always been not to do that and to commit to formulate the grant for an ongoing, recurring

source to help support operations and expansions. The Governor is committed to that, as well.

At this point, this is the executive budget recommendation. As you know, fiscal year does not begin until April 1, and the Legislature has to also enact the budget. At this point, we've had no direct inquiries from legislative fiscal committees or program staff relative to the change in language here. I do not anticipate any significant issues per se, but there might need to be an understanding of what we need and the discretion granted to the executive from this language.

Status of this. Well obviously until the budget is enacted, we cannot go forth with another round or solicitation of the grant on either the target or the formula-based grant or the PSAP grant. However, it doesn't mean that we're sitting idly by. We are preparing to do the research to develop what the criteria and the requirements would be for both the targeted grant, as well as the formula-based grant relative to the targeted grant to fill-in those gaps within the consortiums and across the consortiums. Some of the efforts that my staff has been doing in the last few months have been to meet with each regional consortium. I think we have about two or three more to go. But that effort and that dialogue to gather information, verify information and gather what we don't have is directly leading to how we would restructure the grant program, both on the targeted side and the formula side. So we appreciate your cooperation there.

Before I turn it over to Larissa for an update on the grant program itself, I'll open it up to questions. Brian LaFlure?

LaFLURE: Brian LaFlure. Quick question, Bob. The targeted grant, is that competitive?

BARBATO: No, it will not be competitive in structure. However, not every county may be eligible for that, depending on the objective of the grant program and the eligibility criteria, but unlike the format of the SICG program through Round 4, this will not be a purely competitive, procurement-based program. It will be targeted based on needs and objectives and eligibility of participants. The formula based grant will function very similarly to the PSAP program grant. Of course, there will be different criteria and thresholds.

LaFLURE: Will consortiums be allowed to apply as a group as far as a targeted grant, as far as a solution that we're

trying to complete to bring things together?

BARBATO: Brian, that's a good point, and that's been discussed a lot in the last years, including revisiting the program. I think for the initial change or rollout of the program, a new structure for it, we will focus on county bases for now. That doesn't mean that we're closing the possibility for consortium-based proposals going forward. We felt, given the transition, it might be better to follow the existing paths, as well, but I think it's something that the Board should consider on how that could work mechanically. As you know, some of the difficulties with that were more relative to the capital nature of the grants in the past. Like there had to be someone who's the fiduciary agent or owning the assets, but in the future, the program is going to be moved more to maintenance and sustainment. Perhaps we can find a more amenable way to deal with consortiums as opposed to county by county, but it's envisioned at this point that both in the formula and the targeted proposals, or request for participation would be on a county basis.

LaFLURE: I think that's good. We've been asking for that all along, and I think this is a great step to eliminate the holes in the consortiums, and now we're going consortium to consortium. It's hard to have these guys build out, these guys build out, but the county in the middle doesn't make the connection. So if we can use the targeted grant towards that, I think that's great.

BARBATO: Thank you, Brian. Your input has been very instrumental in us being able to develop the recommendation going forward. Any other comments on the grant? John Merklinger, Monroe County.

MERKLINGER: Mr. Chair, I'd be remiss if I didn't -- first of all, I'd like to thank the staff for the work on this, because clearly a lot of things we discussed, hopefully this will try to address those as we move forward. I'd be remiss if I didn't comment that I see the $1.8 million of 911 money is not going to go into the revolving loan fund now. If we know where the Governor is targeting that, that would be a nice chunk of change to start building on NextGen911 network over the next couple years.

BARBATO: Well, actually I did see that reference in the budget. I do know what you're talking about. I think the language that Mr. Merklinger is referring to is that for the

coming fiscal year, the transfer of monies from the revenue source to the emergency services revolving loan fund will not take place. I do not know what plans will be for that funding amount. I think it's more mechanically -- it really spoke to the fact that the emergency services revolving loan fund hasn't really been utilized very much, and so there's a balance in that program of over 2 million. Dave, do you know?

KISLOWSKI: Last I heard it's over 10 million.

MERKLINGER: It's way up there.

BARBATO: That program that is being referred to is essentially a loan program, largely to fire services and local emergency services programs. It was intended and created, oh gosh; it's got to be twenty years ago, to be a funding source for apparatus and equipment replacement and purchasing. And if there are any questions about that, I could refer members or any of your colleagues to the Office of Fire Prevention and Control, who administers that grant program. That was one they didn't give to us. That's a good point, John. Thank you.

MERKLINGER: Can't blame me for trying.

BARBATO: Any other discussion on the executive budget?

BARBATO: Just a programmatic -- if I could mention also. As we continue these meetings with the regional consortiums -- and thank you all for hosting and participating in those. I know Mike helped us a lot in the lower Hudson. We're going to be discussing the program and what we should consider, what criteria should be factored into formula and the target grant, as well. And we have not selected a date yet, but we do want to meet with all consortiums, similar to what we did last September in Oriskany. We want to hold another one of those meetings this spring, as soon as possible. And that would be an area where we can make, I think, significant progress and establish some best practices and affect some of the policy things a little bit more. So stay tuned.
       Okay. Moving along on the agenda, Larissa Guedko will give us an update on the Statewide Interoperable Communications grant program. Larissa?

GUEDKO: Good morning everyone. We'll start with the spending statistics, which is for Round 2. At this time $69.3

million has been reimbursed, which is not a big change from the previous meeting when I reported the last time. $6.3 million for the 2012 PSAP and $5 million for 2013 PSAP. The 2013 PSAP has significantly increased in spending from the last time I have updated. So to date, we have over $285 million in awards since 2010. However, the spending at this time is just slightly over 50 percent overall between all grants.

For the Round 3, $27 million has been reimbursed to counties, and for 2014 PSAP 9.2 million have been reimbursed. This is a grant that Bob mentioned before, and we would like to see all 10 million reimbursed; however, there is one county that has not submitted vouchers. And you can take a look at the report, which is on the left side of your folders.

There's one slight change to the 2014 PSAP grant report in your folders, counties submitted vouchers right after I printed everything. We have over 90 percent in reimbursements. But as you can see, there's one county requesting only 2 percent of their amount, and one county, which is Dutchess, did not request reimbursement at all. There are a couple counties that spent only 40 percent of their awards and three counties somewhere between 70 and 80 percent. And one county had requested only 44 percent of their award amount. So there's slight under spending.

And I would like to mention again counties that do not spend a hundred percent of their award amount will be affected next year. The way the formula works in the PSAP operations grant, they might lose a certain amount depending on the amount that they have not spent in the previous year. So from this point on, the spending will be reflected in the formula.

And for the last two, Round 4 and the 2015 PSAP operations grant, the contracts are still in process for most counties. Practically all of them except one. We are still waiting on a signature from one county. Those are timelines for your reference.

For Rounds 2 and 3 grants, the deadline has been extended by one year for counties to make sure that they complete their projects.

One highlight and I always, when I have a chance, try to mention this. The PSAP operations grant is a one year only, and there are no extensions here. So we have only one year, one calendar year for counties to spend money. This year we will try to go out with the RFA a little bit earlier to make sure that counties can submit the applications and receive awards in time for their budgets. So you will see an RFA somewhere in the middle of the year,

maybe July timeframe plus/minus.

So where are we going from here? We still are not at hundred percent in the implementation of national interoperability channels. Bob mentioned how we are going to structure the targeted grant and the formula, the sustainment grants. Those two grants will address several goals that we have in this program. The targeted grant is for implementation of national interoperability channels statewide. However, we do understand, there are back haul enhancements that are necessary for counties to complete, and a portion of that money will go for that purpose, as well.

The documentation of the governance is still ongoing process. About 60 percent of counties at this point have documented their governance, but still there is work to be done. The standard operating procedure is the same. There is still work that needs to be done, and our grant program will support the governance and implementation of SOPs.

Training and exercise. This is going to be ongoing. You'll see it again and again in all of our programs. Our technology is moving ahead very fast. There are technological upgrades. There are changes in the systems. And training and exercises are a necessary component, especially for public safety. You want to make sure that all your personnel are trained to operate on the new systems and the updated systems.

More radio system usage. This covers the propagation characteristics of the system and utilization of channels, as well. Next, the non-propriety open standards in LMR, land mobile radio system, is a major component of our grant program, because we feel very strongly about this and we don't want any instances where county buys a system and implements proprietary component. That will immediately hinder the interoperability for that entity. For example, if you're building 700 MHz systems, it has to be P25. If you are implementing encryption, it will have to be AES encryption. There are no other encryptions at this point in time that has been standardized and utilized by all manufacturers. Please utilize the grant money, your awards, to make sure that you implement the open standards technologies.

Regional inter-connectivity. We still need to work in this area. We know that there are counties that have one core and they operate as a single system. There are counties that have operations in different frequency bands, and those counties will need to be connected. There are different methods and ways from a technological perspective, and also from a governance perspective. And we will work with counties to make sure that they develop a way that works for

them.

And of course we understand that sustainment of LMR systems is a major component of public safety. And we are making sure that from now on, the grant program will be structured to ensure that sustainment to the LMR is there. Any questions?

BARBATO: Any questions on the Statewide Interoperable Communications grant program?

(No response.)

BARBATO: One thing I failed to mention on the budget update, but everything again is subject to an act under the budget and developing the program parameters, but in terms of timing of the grant program, Larissa mentioned some of the components. The PSAP grant, our objective is to have a PSAP operations formula grant out and released, available for response sometime after July, certainly no later than October. This year, things got postponed inadvertently and it's a little difficult for some of the county operators to know what their allocations were going to be. So we're going to try to address that this year. So July to late September that that notice should go out with a quick turnaround.

As far as the interop grant program, the formula in the targeted, we're planning to have a release or announcement of the formula grant in the first quarter of state fiscal year 16/17, so that's April to June. And then the targeted, probably second quarter, or sometime thereafter, so exact dates haven't been developed. As I said, it's premature pending enactment of the budget, as well as development and vetting and analysis of the formula and the objective of the target grant. So I just wanted to let the board members know the rough timeframes. Thank you, Larissa.

GUEDKO: Thank you.

BARBATO: Next agenda time is an update by Matthew Delaney. Matthew will discover -- discuss updates on public safety broadband, the FirstNet initiative, as well as New York State's initiative to deploy Mutualink technology among the counties and state agencies. Matt?

DELANEY: Good morning everyone. My name is Matthew Delaney. We're going to talk a little bit about FirstNet and a little bit about Mutualink.

So FirstNet current status. FirstNet released their

RFP January 13th, so this date they have been saying for
several months that they would release in January or
throughout the new year and they did. They released January
13th. It's printed out double-sided, and it's about that
thick. And it certainly -- it's a little different than the
original draft RFP. They really have focused in on having
bidders present an overall solution and propose sort-of
unique or innovative ways to obtain or achieve the goals that
FirstNet wants to achieve, versus a traditional RFP is long
lines, technical specifications and requirements and so
forth. This is more about these are the objectives that
FirstNet wants to achieve and propose the best solution to
meet those objectives. So there's a lot of sort-of
qualitative type analysis that will have to occur and
decision making in their review process. So the proposals
are due April 29, and just as a reminder, this is a federal
procurement. The state is not procuring. This is federal
government procurement. And then FirstNet states that
their awards could be announced as early as November. This
kind-of varies -- will vary depending on how many submissions
they get and the quality of them and so forth. They are
predicting right now possibly around the beginning of
November.

        So throughout 2016, the consultation process with the
states will continue. FirstNet will be holding a series of
meetings with each state in 2016. Some of these are just
more sort-of planning, small groups. There's technical
sort-of task teams, and they're also looking for more of a
larger scale meeting with governance, so with our working
group and/or with this board, as well, and also with
executive policymakers in the state. And we have a planning
meeting later this month with FirstNet to talk about some
of those meetings throughout the year, so maybe by the next
meeting we'll have more of a detailed schedule and plan.

        We did have our public safety broadband working group
meeting yesterday. That's a working group of this board.
We held it yesterday. We had maybe fifteen people or so in
attendance in person, another ten or so on the webinar. And
the agenda included a detailed overview of the RFP and
preparation for the 2016 consultation process. We actually
were fortunate. We had Dave Cook, who is FirstNet Region
2 outreach coordinator. He was here for our meeting, and
he gave a presentation on the RFP, as well as we had a more
detailed -- and we can send out those slides. If anyone is
interested in seeing them, we can certainly distribute those
slides, as well. The notes in the slides detail a lot of
the sections of the RFP and so forth, and some of the things
a person is looking for.

We did also talked a little bit in that about the State's data submission. There were some back and forth that occurred throughout the fall with FirstNet. Originally we created a very detailed, if you'll recall, the states were asked to submit data on coverage requirements, public safety user distribution, amounts of bandwidth use and so forth, and so FirstNet and their bidders could better frame their coverage models and their overall network design. We did submit a rather extensive amount of information, GIS information. The state's GIS program office helped us with that. Then there was some back and forth discussion where FirstNet decided to make all the data submitted public in a reading room. So we actually did submit -- we sort of withdrew some of the information we submitted and submitted a more redacted version. It kept the spirit and the overall pilot information, but took out some of the detailed information that we felt was not appropriate for public distribution and public safety information and some of the more critical infrastructure type items. So the public process that was posted in the FirstNet reading room, which anyone can sign up for to review, was the redacted version.

Mutualink. This is just a quick status update. We're up to 51 signed MOAs out of 58 total sent out. New York City counts as one, so 57 counties plus New York City are 58. So we had 51 signed to date and several more we know that's in process, whether it still has to go through legal approval or change in administrations and so forth, but we would expect that very soon we will be very close to 58 total returned. So once it's returned it goes through a little process here. It has to get approved by the Office of Attorney General and Office of the State Comptroller. So 48 have been approved to date. The other ones are just still in the approval process. I think a couple of them are missing a copy of the resolution authorizing the county to execute it and so forth. So then after approval, Mutualink contacts the county to begin installation and the county installation is brought online. There's quite a few online already. Once your MOA is approved, that portion can come online within a matter of days. That's just software that's installed on a computer or an iPad or so forth. And following is also the installation of the hardware components, which include the radio interfaces and the county's video interfaces. So that schedule takes time. The radio vendor has to come in and do some technical work. That's coming along.

And procurement is still in process for the New York Responds additional licenses. If you recall, we're going

to provide up to ten more additional EDGE client licenses to every county as part of the Governor's New York Responds initiative. So that will be a total of up to fifteen per county that we're providing. And then of course, if the county wishes, they can procure additional licenses directly. And regardless of where you purchased the licenses, it's all the same. So there's no inoperability.

Just as a reminder on broadband. We have a how-to broadband website for New York specifically, psbb.ny.gov, as well as FirstNet's website. Any questions about either FirstNet or Mutualink?

BARBATO: Matt, on the Mutualink deployment, as I think the members are aware, state agencies, response agencies, are also utilizing it. Can you let the Board know how many of the EDGE licenses are distributed among the state response agencies so far?

DELANEY: Currently, there are, if you don't include DHSES, about 20 that were distributed. If you include DHSES, it's considerably more. It's over 150 or so, but the plan is as part of the New York Responds initiative to distribute quite a few more to state agencies to create sort-of a large pool that would be part of that procurement for state agencies.

BARBATO: Right. And we do believe that the Office of Fire Prevention and Control, which is part of the Division of Homeland Security, is interested in deploying the Mutualink capability to an increased number of their personnel across the state, operating on regions and state police, expanding their use of Mutualink, as well.

DELANEY: Currently 70 within -- they do use it for response and for field awareness.

GERACE: Matt, Sheriff Gerace. A question. Is there any chance that a county could get more than fifteen if other counties aren't utilizing theirs?

DELANEY: I mean, from a technical standpoint, that's certainly possible. I guess it would be a programmatic decision we can look at.

GERACE: Okay. We're very interested, and it's going to be part of our rollout here. If there are other licenses available, we'd appreciate getting them.

BARBATO: Sheriff, I would also remind you that you'd be able

to purchase additional licenses directly.

GERACE: Yeah. Well, that's what I'm trying to avoid, Bob.

BARBATO: We'll make sure that's an eligible expense under the grant program. Anyway, that's a good question, though. We'll take it back to Deputy Commissioner Wisely.

LaFLURE: Remind me, the licenses are the number of simultaneous users or --

DELANEY: Correct.

LaFLURE: In other words, you don't need a license for every user. The license tells you how many can be on the system at the same time?

DELANEY: Correct.

LaFLURE: So if you have 40 patrol cars, you don't necessarily have to have 40 licenses?

DELANEY: Right, as long as how many sign-in -- when they're actually signed in, it would bump off the previous sign-in, so you have to manage it.

BARBATO: And Matt, is it accurate to Brian's point, the utilization of that, when an incident is open, it's kind of role based, as well, not necessarily individual. So at fixed locations, like say a dispatch center or emergency management office, operations center, that's just one role that's online.

DELANEY: There's actually two ways you can set them up. You can set them up to be a particular user that's assigned by a type of location. You can also have them set-up in a role-based. So you can have a pool of available sign-ins for a particular role, so you can make individual accounts and have them sign in and get from the pool of roles.

BARBATO: Thank you, Matt. Moving on to Toby Dusha's presentation on Consortium Interoperability Update. I would just like to pause and I think Matt did -- I would just like to introduce David Cook, who is the Region 2 coordinator for FirstNet entity. As you know, that's the federal corporation that's responsible for the design and implementation of the public safety broadband network. Many of you probably know David. He's a New Yorker from the

capital district, and he's been instrumental in emergency communications. In fact, correct me if I'm wrong, John. I think David was the founder of the 911 committee in the State of New York.

COOK: Don't hold that against me.

BARBATO: So welcome, David.

COOK: Thank you, Bob.

MERKLINGER: It's his fault that I know you.

COOK: You're my hero, John.

DUSHA: Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. Toby Dusha from OIEC. A brief project update on the interoperability data collection survey project that we've been working on for a while.

An overview of the project purpose. We need to determine a state of interoperability in New York, what really exists, what doesn't exist, identify capabilities and gaps. Those are the two key items. What exists today, what do we need in the future, and what is missing, a gap? Identify the shortfalls and obstacles in achieving interoperability. Obviously money always comes up as the number one, but what are the real solutions that need to be developed to make this thing work. Identify the priority tasks. It kind-of goes back to the obstacles in achieving interoperability. Do we need more widgets, do we need more planning, do we need what? And identifying priority channels is one of those "what" items that we need to identify.

In the process, we were also capturing the operable communications capabilities of each county, what bands, what spectrum, frequencies, are they digital, are they analog, what are their capacity, and the general demographics of public safety communications. This gives us a good background in the future for dealing with future plans, use of spectrum, and allocation of frequencies and channels.

Project status. The surveys that were submitted or issued were submitted and returned by 52 of the 58 counties. That's 57 counties plus New York City. Six of the counties have not submitted their initial data. We were trying to obtain that from the folks. We will be working on that in the future. Deputy Director Chellis is the project lead on this and is working on setting up follow-up meetings to capture this information.

We conducted review meetings with 7 and 3 are remaining to capture and validate this information. Twelve counties or 20 percent still need to either submit, verify, validate or update their data. Some information has come back. We've reviewed this at meetings and discovered there were errors in submission or they had forgotten something, so we're trying to confirm what exactly exists through a validation process.

One thing we've determined here is the capabilities are proportional to the length of time that the channels have been in use. You'll see that upcoming, but keep that in mind. The longer you use it, the more user capability.

The disclaimer at the bottom. Just keep in mind, this is preliminary information. This is not final. The big number is there's 20 percent data that's missing. The maps you're about to see are for general representation and discussion only, since data submission is incomplete.

In a table we have identified nine radio frequencies or channels that are primary channels for use in achieving interoperability in the state. This is a comparison of the capabilities, current capabilities of those channels versus those channels that folks have determined that they want to implement at some point in the future. And starting on the left to the right, the two oldest channels that have been in use for interoperability in the state, the LFIRE4D, a low band fire frequency and NYLAW1, a common law enforcement channel, have been around since the late '60s, and early '70s. Very high percentage of use in the PSAP 911 dispatch center arena.

As you travel across the table, those frequencies have been designated as national interop channels and are relatively new in the world of public safety over the past ten, fifteen years. Implementation of these in the PSAP operational area has been slow, and as you can see, the VCALL10, which is a common VHF channel, only has 38 percent of the counties actually utilizing that frequency in their centers.

And you continue down through to -- the low would be 7CALL50, which would be a 700 megahertz channel. And there are only five counties that would either have the capability, and only fifteen are planning to implement that.

There's a lot of factors in the selection of this, and that's another project we're working on, is to establish minimum channels, probably based around the nine that you see on this table.

A quick representative map of these. I've selected four specific channels. LFIRE4D 45.88 was a low band fire frequency. It's been around forever. It exists in almost

all of the counties. I believe the number is 79 percent.
Take into consideration the counties that did not
submit information. The counties that did not indicate if
they have the capability or indicated they actually did not
have, but there's very good coverage, very good capability
in the use of that channel at the base station environment.
Again, it's been around for intercounty coordination for
fire mutual aid purposes since the '60s.
The second most popular channel in use is NYLAW1. It
was known by six or eight different names over the past few
decades. The same thing holds true. It's been around
forever. A number of counties did not submit their
capabilities, a number of counties indicated they did not
have the capability, and the remaining counties in green
indicate they do have that capability, the PSAP environment,
the PSAP setting.

VOUTOUR: Toby, can you explain? I see my county is white
up there. I know that we have that channel and we use it.
Can you --

DUSHA: Somebody didn't submit some accurate information.
This information is based on survey data that was given, and
the other issue is that your county and the other three
counties in western New York have not met with us yet, and
that's part of that validation process. It is not green
because they didn't indicate that on the survey form, but
if the status changes we would pick that up during the
meetings. You would have a chance to update that
information.

VOUTOUR: I mean that's just a name change of the old interop
channel we've used for twenty years. We've obviously used
it. To be listed as no capability doesn't make any sense.

CHELLIS: That's not complete yet, Sheriff. The western
consortium meeting got postponed due to the weather, the
whole lake effect thing that's been going on. So when we
meet with western that will probably go green once we have
all your data.

VOUTOUR: Okay. Thank you.

BARBATO: Sheriff, I'd just like to add, not as a Chair but
as OIEC director, that clearly we're mistaken.

VOUTOUR: There goes your raise, right?

DUSHA: One thing we've determined or have seen on a regular basis during these meetings is folks have updated their initial data submission. They've either forgotten channels, increase in percentage of use, decrease in percentages of use. There's a lot of moving parts. We initially surveyed over forty radio frequencies. And so capturing all that information can be somewhat tedious.

CHELLIS: Toby, one mention, especially for the law enforcement people in the room. One thing we're finding out through these meetings with the consortiums is different counties are making different decisions on future of NYLAW1 as they migrate to say a trunk UHF system or 800, whatever. They may be making discussions to abandon that capability. So the question is, if a corrections or other sheriff's office is transporting prisoners across the state and runs into trouble or has an issue and wants to get on NYLAW1, if that county has decided not to proceed with monitoring that channel and continuing the capability, then there is a gap there. So these are the things, once we collect and see the whole picture statewide, we're looking at if it's the wish of the body and everybody, if that should continue statewide, that's something we should look at in terms of total interoperability.

DUSHA: That's just one of those variables in this big puzzle of achieving interoperability that we face.

The next common channel, VCALL10, a VHF interop channel. Again, relatively new. Checkerboard pattern of use all over the state. Some counties have been capable of implementing it. Most of it was funded under the grant program. They were able to install base stations in the three bands. In some counties it's three bands of call channels, but it is a hopscotch pattern across the state. The yellow indicates counties that are planning to implement. Again, it all comes back to funding, and in some cases they were not successful in grant applications to achieve that goal. Relatively good percentages of use there.

In the last one, just for representative purposes, is a relatively new channel in the 700 MHz spectrum, 7CALL50, the primary call channel. Only three counties in the state that were funded under grant projects were able to implement and install these frequencies. There are some alternatives to using this channel, but this just indicates another one of those variables. We've got nine to pick from. Which one do you fund first? What's the priority? Those are the kind of decisions the end users need to make.

As has been indicated, and it was discussed earlier, all of this information is going to be brought back and dissected, and it's going to help determine and really identify the gaps that exist today. And as the grant project is modified and amended in the future, the decision and the direction to go, what to fund. If 7CALL50 is determined to be a priority, then that could be funded. If not, is there another channel that needs to be determined as a priority. So this will all go into implementation of that process in determining the priority channels and priority usage to achieve interoperability.

And that is the last slide that I had, just as an overview. Again, please keep in mind this. Twenty percent of the data is missing. Hopefully at the next board meeting, we will have 100 percent of the returns and have a very good report, solid report on capabilities.

BARBATO: Thank you, Toby.

DUSHA: Any questions?

BARBATO: Brian LaFlure.

LaFLURE: Toby, as you look across the top of the State, the 800 megahertz interop channels, as you know, a lot of people are having trouble with the A-line and getting those licenses next to Canada. Do you see that in your surveys that people are, in theory, having trouble getting that, or are you really not seeing that?

DUSHA: We do hear that when we talk about the obstacles, the impediments to achieving interoperability. The A-line is an invisible line that runs -- dissects New York State, and it's impacted by Canadian radio users. A folk above that A-line have a very hard time licensing channels, and unfortunately, it's really hampered achieving interoperability across all spectrums of New York State. So we do see that, and that would be a good map at some point to produce is the A-line. Impose the A-line on the map as opposed to the counties that do or do not have some of these interop channels. That's a longstanding battle. I don't know if we'll ever achieve that in our lifetime.

BARBATO: Any other questions for Toby on the data gathering and consortium?

(No response given.)

BARBATO: Okay. Thank you, Toby. The next agenda item, we have a presentation by Christopher Tuttle, who is the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Emergency Communications Coordinator for Region 2, FEMA Region 2, which includes the State of New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. So Chris, thank you for coming to Albany today instead of being in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands. In addition, Chris is joined by Dan Currie also to discuss priority telecommunication services, which are sponsored as a service to the federal government.

TUTTLE: Good morning. Chris Tuttle from the Office of Emergency Communications, Department of Homeland Security. I'm going to turn this over very quickly to Dan to talk to you about priority telecommunications services, but I very quickly want to highlight an issue that's been ongoing in New York, but we very rarely talk about it in this forum, interference, both malicious and just occurring naturally. We've had two instances just in the last two months, Nassau County and Orange County that have been probably in the press; you've seen them or heard about them. People who are going on, playing taped messages or audio transmissions from radio stations over live activity on public safety channels. The Orange County one, for example, the interference was only occurring when there was fire calls ongoing. It wasn't just sporadically.

Where I'm going with this is the FCC, as most of you know, has recently consolidated their operations between the Philly and New York offices, which results in a delayed response, if you will, to your interference issues in the field. The regional manager has asked me to pass along some information to all of you to bring back to your counties and your consortiums. The FCC is looking for you to be as self-sufficient as possible. So to understand from your stakeholder community, both in your counties and your partner counties, your consortiums, who has spectrum analyzers, possible tracking software, tracking equipment, things of that nature. It also asks that you develop an increased relationship with your vendors to understand what capabilities they have. Once you start to figure that out, you understand from a regional perspective who has what and can be called upon during incidents.

Further, if you do have any harmful interference that continues and is repetitive, to contact the FCC public safety operations center. I will pass along this information to the Chair to disseminate to the Board so you all have it, rather than me give it to you verbally now. They have a 24/7 operation. They'll register it, and then based on what

actions you are taking or you cannot take, they will then escalate it within the FCC and send somebody out or have somebody contact you.

For the PSAP community, this also occurs for any sort-of large scale phone outages you may have, any adverse effects on the PSAPs themselves that have nothing to do with radio communications. They are very curious and they like to keep track of PSAP outages, as well, because as you all know, it could spread rapidly or it could be a bigger issue going on. There could be one PSAP out in New York, but ten in Pennsylvania. It could be some sort of cascading software event. It helps them get the bigger picture on things.

The last thing is there's a statement to be read over the air when interference occurs. It's a canned statement the FCC has. It's pretty much a warning statement, if you will, and it may or may not have the person stop doing what they're doing, but at the very least, when the FCC asks you what steps have you done, you can also check that box that it's been completed.

So I will send the Board Chair the FCC statement to be read, the public safety operations software center contact information for the FCC to be disseminated. And as always, if there's anything I can do to assist you, just reach out to me directly.

Seeing no questions on the interference issue, I will then turn over to Dan Currie right now. He's my colleague. He is focusing on priority telecommunication services for OEC within Regions 1 and 2. And Dan, your show.

CURRIE: I appreciate Chris letting -- I appreciate Chris getting up on this panel. We just started this up recently. If you'll see what I have here is personal information, because we don't have any business cards or e-mail addresses. But what we did is we are area representatives for GETS and WPS, primarily priority telecommunication services. I handle Region 1 with Rick Andreano and Region 2 with Chris Tuttle.

I don't have much to say. I'm really just doing this as a way to introduce myself to you and get in front of enough people that I can expand the leverage I might have with getting the information out.

What's at risk? Well, mass calling events that jam up landline and cellular networks. And one of the solutions is GETS and WPS. And the action and this is where I'm coming to you. I'm asking for you to be -- the easiest way would probably be to give me the sign-in sheet for today, as well as everybody drop a business card off where Chris and I are

sitting and I'll get back to you. I'd like to work with the people in your organization who have GETS and WPS accounts, work with them to come up with a list, add regions to the list. I see an awful lot of groups that have minus cards and things like that. A lot of times that's because people read, and these cards are just -- well, nobody has them because that's why we're getting rid of them, but there's people that replace people. And I just want to make sure everybody has the capability. These capabilities work. Obviously the Boston marathon, I guess, was the most recent example of that, the nine plus percent completion rate of those calls.

That's what I'm here for. That's what I do in this region, and I'm trying to offer my services to you folks and take something off your people. I know this is not necessarily the most important thing that they do, but when these events occur -- so again, I appreciate the time, but if you can give me some information, I will get back to you and work with you.

BARBATO: Dan, if you could very briefly just explain to the Board the difference between GETS and WPS, and also how they're related.

CURRIE: Okay. Well, they're both -- these are for voice calls, for lack of a better definition. GETS is a card. It looks like a credit card, but it has information for you with this capability to dial in and be able to route a call through a congested network. Now, if you're trying to route a call through a congested cellular network with this GETS card, you're still going to be waiting with everybody else for a channel, because this won't get you through there. That's what WPS does. WPS is a feature that's put onto your cellphone. It allows you, upon dialing a code, to put that call through to wherever it's going to go to.

And I don't know if you recall the earthquake in California, what was it, back in 2008, 2009? Well, as a result of that, they put an enhanced routing capability on it. Now these calls go through. Like I said, I guess the most recent is the Boston bombing incident, but they do work.

So they can work independently and they can work collectively. For example, if you had a GETS card and you had a WPS capable phone, but you're calling from someplace in West Virginia, the problem might be in western Pennsylvania or western New York, that GETS card, making a GETS call will get your radio channel, the first radio channel, the tower that's closest to you, but the call will be routed over a landline number. So they work in

conjunction.

And there's -- I see an awful lot of groups, not yours but nationally. They have a lot of GETS cards, and a lot of times they're bundled up in drawers, which really don't do any good. If somebody has a GETS card, they can take the card home with them. They can call from wherever they use the app and that's what they should be doing. There's no charge for this. Again, WPS, there's a little cost involved. It's pretty nominal. But these things -- these things do work, and to have these capabilities, particularly if you're doing voice communications and that's part of what you do, that's -- well, there's pretty much no other way to get these calls through.

TUTTLE: One thing I would add to that, too, is from my past days in the Port Authority when we had the blackout in 2004, one of the biggest issues were the GETS worked, the WPS worked, it was great. The police chief could talk to his training officers in the different facilities, but when the executive officer for the entire agency couldn't talk to the police chief about what was going on, it was an issue. So you have to think about your chain, the succession within your counties and in your agencies as to who really are the most important people that have to be able to talk during a major emergency. If there's an outage in LMR world, or they don't have LMR, they'd be able to get a dial tone with one another. So think about county executives, they have the capability of having something like that. They are eligible for GETS and WPS. So it doesn't just apply to the typical first responder, but think about how a response would go in a major emergency.

CURRIE: And I guess the final thing to say about these, this is your mobility. This is your Port Authority. This is your way to be more hooked in. You could be on vacation. You could be anywhere. You could be out of the country and you could still get these calls.

BARBATO: Thank you, Dan.

CURRIE: Thank you.

BARBATO: Questions or comments? Brett.

CHELLIS: If I could, just as an example. I think along with anything, like the technology of new handheld subscriber units, same with the GETS and the WPS is familiarity with

first responders on how to use them. I had an example in
my former life in Broome County with an active shooter
incident on April 5, 2009. And, you know, the command post
people -- some of the leaders had GETS cards and WPS
capability, but in the fight of the storm or whatever you
want to say, the knowledge on how to use them -- it's not
a good time to get out the card and read it and try to get
familiar with it and try to figure out how to do it. So I
think training, and I think there is an ability to actually
do test calls on that system?

CURRIE: Absolutely.

CHELLIS: You can do a learning process?

CURRIE: Absolutely.

CHELLIS: So this is something that's got to be implemented
so the people actually know how to use it and do it when the
time comes in the incident. So just an example.

BARBATO: Thank you very much, Dan.

CURRIE: Thank you.

BARBATO: So we're going to move to new business before the
Board on the agenda. The first item is channel guidelines,
proposed channel guidelines and resolutions. Matthew
Delaney.

DELANEY: Thank you. So we have several proposed
guidelines that were distributed. They should be in your
packet, as well, along with some resolutions. So these
build on work that OIEC has been doing over the past couple
of years to get some communication guidelines to enhance
common naming, use of interoperability channels and so
forth. The data included the NYLAW1, a common channel name
for 135370, the LFIRE4D, and specifically the CTCSS tone
issues for that. We have one for common EMS channels to try
to eliminate some confusion. So these build on that.

    And starting with the first one is fire, VHF fire
channels. So we did one for EMS, common EMS channels were
named. They were also some common fire channels, 46.22,
46.30, 153.830, and obviously there are many more fire
channels in use in departments throughout the state. These
are sort of common ones that are likely to be in apparatus
and in radios when responding to another jurisdiction. So
if you need mutual aid, you may very well have common -- you

know, your neighbor's channel programmed in. And that's sort of a common, and you know what that is, but if you have more of sort-of a statewide type response, you travel a longer distance, some channels that might be in common in addition to the regular interoperability channels. So that's just to put some names behind these to make sure that people identify and recognize that this is the same channel. So this is consistent with the same idea that was done with EMS channels, as well.

The second one is guideline for minimum set of interoperability channels for all public safety radios in New York. So the NIFOG, National Interoperability Field Operations Guide, addresses the inherent channels available and a rather detailed guide book. It's pretty thick. It's got a lot of good resources in it, but it doesn't necessarily tell you what the program or what service categories or clearly distinguish things that are available in New York versus not available in New York. For example, VTAC17 is available in the western U.S., but it's not available essentially anywhere on the eastern side of the country.

So this is to sort-of try to set aside by bands and by service, police, fire and EMS, a minimum set of channels that should be programmed in when you program your radios to have that common platform. Then a similar one for a more limited set is for public service radios. So there are many channels in the EMS and the fire and the law enforcement world that are specifically disciplined, and then of course there are also common national operability channels that are multi-disciplined. So this is sort of a more limited set of the common national operability channels in public service radios. And that varies of course by jurisdiction a little bit, and what is part of a common radio station or not and so forth, but these are just minimums. So these are the recommended minimum. Obviously if you program more in a radio, if local plans dictate that, if there are other channels available, depending on the rules, the licenses and so forth. This is just a recommended minimum. So people were looking -- we had quite a few requests, "Well, what channels should I put in my radio?" This is sort of like the minimum recommended set, just to make sure that everybody has that common platform in every radio that might respond to an incident.

And then the fourth one to talk about today is guidelines for P25 unit numbering. So this guideline was actually an appendix to the 2010 SCIP, the Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan that New York had issued. The SCIP format was changed about eighteen months or so ago and it turns out the appendices were dropped from

it and we didn't realize it. Just as a result, this guideline was no longer on the OIEC website. It was when it was part of the SCIP. So this just moves the file into the current guideline format. The actual content of the guideline is unchanged from the original one published in 2010. So if anyone has adhered to a date, there are no changes in that regard. This suggests a structure for P25 unit identifiers. The idea being in Project 25, you can have an identifier. Every unit has an identifier, similar to like MDC1200 or GSTAR, where you can have a unique identifier for each unit. It also exists in P25, the actual month's range of identifiers for larger -- there's like 16 million, so it's easy to create a scheme that doesn't have overlap throughout the state. And the idea here is that if everyone adhered to it, there is no chance that you could have a P25 identifier that would be the same as another county or another state agency. And also, there's some built-in ways laid out to identify service categories, as well. So even if you don't alias every single ID, many people alias their local radio system identifiers so it appears on their console as Engine 12, but if you have a mutual aid response or a large incident, you might not necessarily have identifiers for people from a great distance away. This allows you to do that. And it can apply to either conventional P25, for example on the 700 megahertz interoperability channel on Project 25, or on a trunk system if you so programmed into the trunk system.

So that's all I have on the slides. The guidelines and the resolutions, both resolutions, are in the packets. They were distributed about a week ago, I think, by Joann. Are there any comments on the drafts or any questions?

BLEYLE: Bill Bleyle, Onondaga County. Matt, is there a plan to bring this, at least the P-25 identifier issue, to the CIWG group for this purpose of study, because I know I showed it to my radio guys, and when they looked at it, they said, "Well, first of all, starting with a zero isn't going to work, because most vendors will not accept a zero as a first digit."

DELANEY: Right. You can actually drop that, the zero, so it's insignificant. It becomes a six digit identifier instead of a seven digit.

BLEYLE: Well, then if it starts off with a 3, what does that do?

DELANEY: Right. So if it becomes a six or a seven, it's

still -- a two-digit county code still is valid because the six is identifier instead of the seven, but 36 or 42 or whatever is still there.

BLEYLE: Have we talked to any of the vendors to make sure that the plan is consistent with what they're going to be doing with their schemes and things, because --

DELANEY: You know, it's funny, because we've had questions for this, because several county and city systems were deploying and looking for schemes, and others had been already clearly understood what the scheme was going to be. And there was no -- we had asked a few questions around and there was no clear answer on how they were being picked. So back actually -- the original question came in about the time we were developing the 2010 SCIP. So that's when the guidelines for the number scheme were put into the 2010 SCIP, but we've had very little feedback since then. And actually, your specific question, I know actually has been asked before and I thought addressed in 2010. If that's still an issue, I wasn't aware it was still an issue.

BLEYLE: My suggestion, I don't know what the plan is from here at least with that. I think we ought to make sure that it's good, because I know -- and it's going to work in all cases, because the reprogram. I have 8,500 radios I'll have to reprogram, and that will be a very costly venture, and I hate to do it twice.

DELANEY: Right. And I think this one -- I understand that this is sort of a situation where, you know, it's a very involved process. I mean, your number is almost as unique as your serial number in some regard, and we know that not everyone adhered to it, and we understand that, but we wanted to have some basic guidelines so that there was -- for 2010, actually the request came in, "Well, Is there some guideline?" There was confusion at the time that there was a federal requirement to have one and there wasn't. We did create again and it's been unchanged since then, so if someone didn't adhere to it, they had something to go by. So I do understand your point, and we can -- this -- there's no actual change from the 2010 one that was issued here, but if you'd like to defer it --

BLEYLE: I don't think a lot of places did not adopt. That was a thought at the time. I don't think it was a guideline. Now you're talking about issuing a guideline. I think we want to make sure that it's technically where we need to be,

and that there's enough unit IDs for agencies, maybe large agencies that need them, but definitely, like I said, I would not want to do this twice, and it's going to be a very costly venture for everybody to go out, that already have radios out there, and reprogram them, because it's inconsistent with the scheme that can cause problems, too.

BARBATO: Bill, would there be a motion to the Board to defer Resolution Number 4, the P25 unit numbering to CIWG for further analysis before adopting the guidelines?

BLEYLE: I would make that motion.

BARBATO: Second?

MERKLINGER: Second.

BARBATO: All those in favor of deferring --

VOUTOUR: I have a question.

BARBATO: Go ahead.

VOUTOUR: Just a question I had is this a permanent number for a particular unit, or a number that would be used in an interop situation?

BLEYLE: Permanent number.

DELANEY: It would be the unit identifier programmed into the radio. Now, in many situations, your radio can have different identifiers for different systems or different channels, so the idea is that the scheme would be common across any system that's programmed into the radio so that it was unique. Again, it's so you have a unique identifier so it's not duplicated in another radio or another portion of the state, but it could be programmed, for example, only on interoperability channels, and then a different identifier programmed for your county's use.

VOUTOUR: They're duplicating my county, let alone the state.

DELANEY: And I'll just clarify. This is only for the Project 25 identifier transferred from the radio. It has nothing to do with the voice identification or unit ID that's given to like Car 17 to Dispatch. This is specifically sort

of a digital identifier transferred by the radio.

BARBATO: Further discussions on deferring the P25 unit numbering guidelines?

(No response.)

BARBATO: Hearing none. All those in favor of deferring this for further analysis through the Communications Interoperability Working Group?

ALL: Aye.

BARBATO: Any opposed?

(No response.)

BARBATO: Motion passes. So guideline 2016-0203-04 will be referred to the CIWG for analysis to make sure that there aren't any technical conflicts. And we'll refer to that body for the next Board meeting, assuming that there aren't any difficulties, for the Board to take that up again in their next meeting.

Any discussion on the other proposed resolutions before the Board or questions for Matt?

(No response.)

BARBATO: Okay. Hearing none, we'll proceed before the board with Resolution Number 2016-0203-01 relating to New York State minimum channel programming of interoperability in common channels for public safety mobile and portable radios. Is there a motion to adopt the resolution?

MERKLINGER: Motion, John Merklinger.

BARBATO: Second?

MAHA: Second, Gary Maha.

BARBATO: Sheriff Maha. All those in favor of adopting the guidelines pursuant to Resolution Number 2016-0203-01?

TERRY: I have a comment. Where would you predict that New York State DOT falls under either one of these? Would it be public safety or would it be put under public service?

DELANEY: I would, in terms of the three categories and the guidelines, say the public service guideline. However, these are again minimums, so certainly you're free within the realm of the FCC rules and so forth, free to program additional channels that are appropriate beyond the minimum.

TERRY: Sometimes we are public service and sometimes we are public safety, and all our channels are issued out of the public safety FCC pool.

BARBATO: Matt, could there be a distinct code for transportation purposes?

DELANEY: Well, of course a category could be added to the guideline, and then those specific channels added down. Just looking at it, I'm not sure which ones that are not in the other guideline would be included in that unit category in the public safety. Do you have any specific thought on that?

TERRY: No. Primarily, what we do have is some limited VHF and UHF radios. Obviously, we're not going to program NYLAW or anything like that in there. I just wanted -- the same situation comes up when you start talking about the FirstNet system, whether or not transportation agencies are considered public safety agencies as opposed to public service agencies. So I just wanted it more defined as to where we would fit under the umbrella of public service or public safety.

BARBATO: Would you like further discussion on this, maybe to the working group, about adding another category?

DELANEY: We can if the Board feels that is appropriate. We can add a category for public safety guideline, although I was just looking at two of them. I think they're pretty much covered in the public service one. It would be the same ones. We would check on the category under public safety.

BARBATO: Bill Bleyle?

BLEYLE: Bill Bleyle from Onondaga County. Looking at the two of them, the only difference is the things like VLAW and medical frequencies that they wouldn't be eligible to operate on anyway. I think that -- you know, our practice in our county has been we consider the highways public service, and we have them do all the national interop

channels for interoperability with our public safety agencies. So I think the only difference between the two documents is the frequencies that they wouldn't be eligible to install in their vehicles anyway.

TERRY: The one issue we have sometimes is a lot of times a lot of the local fire departments like us to have either their channels on our radios, or our channels in their radios. I haven't seen too much other than that, whether or not we would be eligible to put the fire channels in our radio for interoperability on that.

DELANEY: Well, that would be sort of at a more local, a drop rating, for example, authorization under their license. That would be a situation that would be outside of the realm of sort-of a global statewide. And again, these are minimums. In a specific situation, if there's authorization, there's authorization that goes above the minimum guideline.

TERRY: Right. I just wouldn't want us to get in trouble if we did, in fact, put the fire in our operability channel in there or not.

BARBATO: Would a notation in the guideline be helpful?

DELANEY: We can certainly look. I think there's information about how you must have agreement with licensees.

BARBATO: I think perhaps we should defer this, make the notation and bring it back to the Board. I don't know what language we would include at this point, unless you have a suggestion, Matt?

DELANEY: I will just say that we've been trying -- there have been a lot of requests for these types of minimums, so as people reprogram radios, they like to see what is the minimum, what should I reprogram? So we are trying to create a template for a minimum, and it certainly doesn't prevent anybody from going above and beyond that to add in additional channels that they work with on a regular basis. Certainly we can add a little note in the guidelines just saying this should be in no way considered to be a restriction on programming additional channels if they're so authorized.

MERKLINGER: Even if we approve it today -- Mr. Chair, John Merklinger. Even if we approve it today, there's nothing

that says we can't change it later with a future resolution.

BARBATO: Is there a motion to approve the resolution as written. Any thoughts on adding an amended language for allowance for exceptions or allocation to public service entities?

MAHA: I'd say just to make it clear, we amend that resolution to add that language.

BARBATO: Is there a motion to approve the resolution as amended for the public service notation?

(Unidentified member made motion non-verbally.)

BARBATO: Second?

MERKLINGER: Second.

BARBATO: All those in favor of adopting Resolution 0203-01?

ALL: Aye.

BARBATO: Any opposed?

(No response.)

BARBATO: Any abstentions?

(No response.)

BARBATO: Thank you. The motion passes. The office will circulate the amended language with the guideline to the Board members. Thank you.

LaFLURE: Mr. Chairman?

BARBATO: Yes.

LaFLURE: A comment. One of the things that we're finding out in the field is that the radio vendors, installers, whatever, don't seem to be getting this type of information. And I believe a lot of customers, whoever you want to call it, fire department responders, whatever, they rely on their vendor to tell them what to put in the radio. Do you have a way to reach out to the vendors? I know it would be ideal that the customer does that, but it doesn't happen. If the vendors know that this is what's been put out there, then

they could point their customer in the right direction. I don't know if there's a way once you distribute it, just putting it on the website, the vendors aren't going to go look for it.

DELANEY: Two things on that. One is, we are working with State ITS to develop a listserve that basically would be a way to distribute any changes or updates or notifications to a very large distribution of e-mail addresses, but I do know there was an outreach effort made when the first set of guidelines were introduced and included the vendor contracts that we had from the state contracts and so forth of all the various authorized retailers.

LaFLURE: Something for your future survey, Toby. When you're asking people for information about their system, ask them who their vendor is and a POC for them so that they make sure everyone -- some guys have Joe the consultant that helps him out. And if everybody gets the same information, it would work better.

BARBATO: Thank you, Brian. The next item is Resolution Number 2016-0203-02 pertaining to implementing guidelines for channel name and use of common fire VHF radio frequencies in New York State. Any discussion on the resolution?

LaFLURE: I'll move it.

BLEYLE: Second.

BARBATO: All those in favor of adopting the resolution, Guideline 0203-02?

ALL: Aye.

BARBATO: Any opposed?

(No response.)

BARBATO: Thank you. The motion passes. The final resolution is 2016-0203-03 pertaining to the implementation of New York State minimum channel programming of interoperability channels for mobile and portable radios in the public services. Any discussion on the resolution?

(No response.)

BARBATO: Is there a motion to adopt the resolution?

VOUTOUR: (Indicated.)

BARBATO: Second?

MERKLINGER: (Indicated.)

BARBATO: All those in favor of adopting Resolution Number 0203-03?

ALL: Aye.

BARBATO: Any opposed?

(No response.)

BARBATO: Thank you. The resolution passes. Thank you, Matt. Thank you for the dialogue.

The next new business item, we have a brief update from Toby Dusha relative to the interoperable communication technical assistance program, which is a federal program to states for technical assistance. Toby?

DUSHA: I have bad news and I have good news. Just a quick update. New York State, for the past six years, has been the recipient of federal DHS OEC, Office of Emergency Communication program known as the technical assistance program. It provides training, exercise, support, workshops, information, general communications related type programs. The State has submitted a request each year for -- it's been up to five of these TA projects. There's a catalog of over 50 or 60 different projects that are eligible to be funded by the feds. We did submit for the 2016 year and initially we received a letter of denial from OEC. A little bit concerning, and it turns out that we're not the only ones around the country that were denied for these program. So the director submitted a letter of concern back to the feds, and fortunately on Monday of this week, we received a call from their program director who indicated they have reconsidered and they would be providing funding and support for two of the technical interoperable communication plan development projects, which has been an ongoing project program around the state for the consortiums, and that they would also support the governance request for the governance development for the MTA, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority. They had put a request in with the MTA's build out of their radio systems through quite a few counties in the Hudson Valley and into

Connecticut and Jersey, the need for governance and better organization, coordination and planning. So it was determined that the TA program would be ideal to provide that type of service.   So the good news is that we were given three of the five TAs for 2016.   The last two that were requested, the AUXCOMM and the NextGen-911 strategic plan development are still on the denied list, but that's open for further discussion in the future.

So Chris Tuttle is here. I don't know if Chris has any additional comments he wants to provide, but we're better off today than we were on Monday morning.

BARBATO: Chris, do you have any comments?

TUTTLE: Yeah.   There are overall issues currently ongoing due to budget cuts within DHS. I don't want to give the amount that's been cut, but it was substantial this year, which is affecting technical assistance nationwide. What I will tell you, whether it be good or bad, the State of New York, Bob Barbato, sent a very detailed and animated letter to D.C. expressing his concerns on the deferral process and being denied TA, and within 24 to 36 hours, New York was awarded three TA's. So it really pays to have someone that really knows what is going on, but also is willing to fight for their stakeholders. So it's a direct relationship with what Bob did in order to get that TA.

BARBATO: Thank you, Chris. The program itself is very valuable to New York, and we certainly understand that our partners on other levels of government that may be dealing with retrenchment or budget restrictions or constraints. That's certainly understandable. I think the issue and the message back to that program office was that if the changes were forthcoming, advance notice would have been preferred and we could have adjusted accordingly.

Toby did mention, and I just want to highlight something that one of our top priority requests this year is a technical assistance workshop for the benefit of the Metropolitan Transit Authority. And it's not just for the MTA, but they're in a very unique situation. They've expanded deployed emergency -- public safety emergency communications radio network, which has benefit to jurisdictions throughout their corridor. And they present a unique challenge both to local governments, state-level governments on a tristate basis naturally. So it would be a good test case for development of governments and procedures and protocols on the utilization and

accessibility of that system. So we thought that the expertise and the subject matter expert services from technical assistance programs would be wonderful, and it's almost sort-of like a case study for inter-governmental partnerships. So that's kind of a unique thing. Metropolitan Transit Authority came to us looking for that type of assistance, and we thought it was a good fit. So we'll keep the members of the Board posted on that. I also think it's a good example on a case study for inter-governmental cooperation, both from our federal partners providing the service and expertise to us and the utilization of the network in an orderly and organized fashion in a tristate area. So it's something we'll report out on as it proceeds through the course of the year.

With that, I will open it up for new business. Bob Terry, DOT?

TERRY: I don't know if this is the forum to bring this up, but I'm sure most of you are aware that the statewide communication OGS contract expired as of December 31st of this year, which leaves a lot of us in a place right now where we can't purchase any radios or equipment, auxiliary antennas like that to keep our fleets going. And I wonder if there's any type of, concern to be brought to OGS in a group effort to help push this along so we can keep going?

BARBATO: Quick question. Linda, is that contact also available to local governments, the OGS state contracts? I believe it would be.

MESSINA: It depends. You have to look at the terms. Most of them, I think, are, though.

BARBATO: So the impact -- and Bob, I'm glad you're raising this -- would be beyond, at least in theory, beyond state agencies that purchase from the state contract administered by the Office of General Services. It is noteworthy, and is something that caught many agencies by surprise. I know among the radio users in state government, DOT is a big user and procures regularly, as well as the Department of Correctional Services. They have a three-year replacement cycle for their equipment. The State Police obviously are affected, as well. It is good to call that attention to the Board, and any potential local users that would allow -- would be interested in availing themselves to the State contract. The lapse of the contract, again there was no notice of that, but puts us in a bind. My boss asked me last week, if I had to buy a radio, how am I going to do it

or can I do it, and there are ways around it.

At any rate, I can assure you that the message to the Executive Chamber and Office of General Services have already been transmitted through the Division of Homeland Security, and I'll mention that the Board is aware of it and it could impact state agency members of the Board, as well as local governments. Any discussion on it?

(No response.)

BARBATO: We're running short on time, but I do want to come back to the possibility for discussion perhaps, or at least consider for thought as potential action between now and the next Board meeting, the proposal to establish a working group or task force relative for the development of a NextGen911 strategy for the State of New York. I just want to say a comment I forgot to mention earlier when the topic came up, that when the Board recommended that the State develop a plan and guidelines for implementation of NextGen911 in the State of New York, I believe it was clear that it was recommended that it be separate and distinct from the SCIP, or the Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan. It's not related to it, but it's a separate and distinct strategy document. So Brett, what would you propose for consideration and discussion?

CHELLIS: Well, I think if we look at the total public safety broadband working group, it seems to be -- I think that's a good model. And I don't know if Sheriff is still on the phone, but would he be opposed as a chair of the 911 committee if we set up a NextGen911 working group to actually pick the players for this topic?

GERACE: I think that's an excellent idea.

CHELLIS: Pardon?

GERACE: That's an excellent idea. I would -- I don't know if you heard me, but I said I would support a working group concept.

BARBATO: So the Chair would like to suggest that a meeting among the 911 committee shortly after this meeting to discuss the possibility and canvassing participation on that. This topic will also be brought up at the CIWG, Communications Interoperable Working Group meeting later today.

MERKLINGER: Do you need a formal motion from us to create that subgroup?

BARBATO: I think maybe we should define it or flush it out more and motion it at the next meeting.

MESSINA: Yes.

BARBATO: The Board has an interest in establishing that working group for NextGen911 strategy, but perhaps it should be an action item at the next Board meeting. Any other new business?

(No response.)

BARBATO: Thank you. I'm going to adjourn this meeting today. I want to thank all of you again, on behalf of the Governor, Commissioner Melville, and Deputy Commissioner Wisely, for your continued participation and contribution.
        Just as a reminder, the next board meeting is June 8, 2016. It will be held here again in campus building 7A. And materials and information relative to today's actions and other references will be forthcoming.
        Another order of business. We will begin preparing the annual report for 2015 from this body, which is due to be delivered to the Legislature in March of this year, and we'll get copies of that in draft form for any thoughts and comments.
        Lastly, I'd like to thank Chief Tantalo and Chief Hall again as newest members of this body. We welcome you and we look forward to your contributions and your information and input into the actions of this board.

HALL: Thank you very much.

TANTALO: Thank you very much.

BARBATO: Thank you, Sheriff. And motion to adjourn?

MAHA: So moved.

MERKLINGER: Second.

BARBATO: All in favor?

ALL: Aye.

BARBATO: We're adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the Meeting adjourned at
12:02 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, **NORA B. LAMICA,** 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.

_____

NORA B. LAMICA

Dated: February 5, 2016