STATE INTEROPERABLE & EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 8, 2016
DHSES - Building 7A - First Floor Training Room

 WISELY: Good morning, everyone. We're going to get started. I think we are set to go. We have some folks on the phone. We'll do roll call here shortly. I just wanted to say hello. Welcome, everyone, to our second of the Statewide Interoperable & Emergency Communications Board meetings for 2016. Back in February, I was unable to attend and I'm glad I was able to be here today.   Actually, it looks like I can stay for the entire meeting today. Again, welcome. My name is Kevin Wisely, Deputy Commissioner of Emergency Services for the Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services as well as serving as the Director of the Office of Emergency Management, OIEC, OFPC, OEM all part of my portfolio here. Welcome, and thank you for being here, taking the time to spend with us and be a part of this Board, a very important Board that we have in the State of New York. I appreciate your participation, your ongoing support and work that you do, not only for the State but also with the communities. Before I go on with some additional remarks, before we get started, I have some sad news to share from the OIEC family. We had the untimely passing of one of our radio engineers, Ed Gosch, late last week. So I'd like to just have a quick Moment of Silence to keep Ed and his family in our thoughts. (Moment of Silence)

 WISELY: Thank you. I appreciate that. As you all know, I think in February, we were in a transition mode. Brett Chellis is now currently serving as the Acting Director of the Office of Interoperable and Emergency Communications. Bob Barbato has moved on to our Division of Budget downtown. Bob is doing a great job down there. And as I think all of you would attest to, Bob did a great job for us in the State of New York over the last five or six years at OIEC as we developed. We are in the process of bringing on a new Director of OIEC. More will follow on that. But as you can imagine, that is a process and I'll leave it at that. So we're working forward with doing that in the near future. You know you folks and the OIEC have done some great work with this Board over the last five years and it's much appreciated. We've come a long way, and recognize that we do still have a lot of work to do. And over the next five years, there's going to be a lot of work and a lot of changes. I think, you know, having the five really key working groups that we have as a part of this Board are really essential to what we do and how we make our way forward. The Communications Interoperability Working Group, aiding with our statewide interoperability way forward, helping guide, you know, the tactical and operational and strategic decision-making and views of how we implement our strategic interoperability, I think, is huge and it's really important. So I appreciate all the work of that subgroup. The 911 Advisory Committee; we certainly have done a lot and we have a lot in the future to talk about and work on when we talk about NextGen911. Brett's going to talk a little bit about NextGen911 as we go through the agenda today. So that is something that's really important and getting to that point where we're connecting more consortiums and agencies. ESInet and interoperability and PSAP redundancy, all that work is very important and we appreciate the work that you folks have been doing. The Channel Naming and Use Working Group, identifying that consistent naming convention for our state interoperability channels is huge. Again, important work for what we all do in public safety. The State Agency Communications Working Group, again, another important working group for us internally bringing our state agencies together to talk about our

communications and the different and varied communications we have within state agencies and getting us to a consistent way forward in a positive posture so that we all can communicate. So that's very important. The Public Safety Broadband Working Group, certainly, as you all know, will have a lot of focus in the coming years as we talk about FirstNet and where we're going with public safety wireless broadband and working within that public safety band, how that builds out, how FirstNet develops that. I'm sure you've seen a lot of articles and discussions about some of the RFP process that's been out. Matt will be talking about FirstNet. So all of the work that you folks have been doing is very important and I do appreciate it at the state level. It's a pleasure to be able to be here with you today to listen to some of the report-outs, to have some dialogue and then after the meeting just kind of catching up with some of you. So without further ado, again, welcome, thank you. I think this is going to be a great meeting. I'm going to turn it over to Acting Director Brett Chellis to run us through roll call and start the meeting. Brett.

Board Members Present:
Kevin Wisely
William Bleyle
Steven Cumoletti
Stephen Campbell for Margaret Miller, NYS Chief Information Officer, NYS Office of Information Technology Services
Joseph Gerace (by phone)
Todd Murray for Michael C. Green, Commissioner, NYS Division of Criminal Justice Services (by phone)
William Hall (by phone)
Matthew Delaney for John P. Melville, Commissioner, Division of Homeland Security & Emergency Services
Brian LaFlure
Gary Maha
John Merklinger
James Freehart for Major General Anthony German, New York State Division of Military & Naval Affairs
Richard Tantalo (by phone)
Michael Primeau for Howard Zucker, MD, JD, Commissioner, New York State Department of Health
Michael Volk (by phone)
James Voutour

Board Members Absent:
Eric Day
Matthew Driscoll
Kevin Revere

Guests:

David Cook
Melissa Nussbaum
David Kislowski
Matt Campbell
Jason Baum

Lisa Madden
Leon Malinoski
Karen Geduldig
Mike Rowley
Eric Abramson
David Gottesman
Chris Tuttle
Toby Dusha
Joann Waidelich

CHELLIS: That gives us a total of 15. We have a quorum. The minutes were distributed. Do we have a motion to approve the minutes?

MAHA: Motion.

MERKLINGER: Second.

CHELLIS: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor?

ALL: Aye.

CHELLIS: Opposed? (No response.)

CHELLIS: Carried. And we do need a motion to adopt the agenda.

MERKLINGER: Motion.

CHELLIS: Motion by John.

BLEYLE: Second.

CHELLIS: Seconded by Commissioner Bleyle. All those in favor?

ALL: Aye.

CHELLIS: All those opposed? (No response.)

CHELLIS: Carried. Okay. With that, I will present on NG911 Working Group. So as you recall, at the February 3rd meeting, the Board approved the formation of the Next Generation 911 Working Group to accomplish several objectives, which I'll go over. To start working on and get our arms around this whole NG911 effort and to move the state forward in that direction and determine exactly what the state's role is. So we got together, we decided the objective would be to provide a platform to develop a plan and a timeline for the implementation of NextGen911 technology and the capabilities for all the PSAPs statewide. We wanted to bring together the subject matter experts and stakeholders necessary in order to develop a roadmap first, which is exactly how that plan has developed and the timeline, et cetera, and utilize the methods and strategy to be sure that the 911 PSAP managers are the key stakeholders in the plan development, recognizing that the counties and the PSAPs themselves manage 911 statewide; however, they're looking to the state for, coordination and

oversight, so in terms of this process to make it successful the best way possible. So that's the purpose and objective that we set forth with the working group. Once we set it, had a little discussion initially, we decided the working group should report to the 911 Committee, which is already a formal committee under this Board. And in that way, you know, it's just proper that they report up to the 911 Committee and the 911 Committee to the Board. So far, we've put these agencies on the working group and I can just go down through the list from the counties. We have Director Dave Hopkins, from Steuben County on board. As you know, Dave has been a big pusher for NG911 statewide. He's been working with the 911 coordinators group on that effort for a couple years now. We have Mike Allen, Director, from Oswego County on board, Director Scott Roman from Cortland, Director Springler from Cayuga County, Chief Adam Feuer from Rockland County, Director Eric Day from Clinton County, Undersheriff Justin Kramer from Montgomery County, Marlaine from Erie County. And kind of as an ad hoc, being the president of the 911 coordinators, we just recently brought on John Merklinger as well from Monroe County on to the working group. So you can see statewide, we've got good county representation. We've also brought on from New York City folks and their team that are working aggressively towards NextGen911 for the City of New York, and that includes DOITT, which is their Office of Technology which is leading the cause down there, leading the efforts, and NYPD who is the operational arm of the 911 program in the City. So we have New York City represented. Then, we have a number of state agencies, from OIEC, New York State Police is very involved in the 911 business statewide, the Department of Public Service who shares with DHSES a lot of responsibility for 911services in terms of from the D-mark and the actual lines and so on and we'll get into that in a little bit, as well as our ITS group and especially Jason from GIS who's a very important part of this picture. They've been working aggressively for a couple, three years on now developing the actual mapping database, GIS database, that's needed to support such an effort. So they are a crucial, critical part of the working group as well. As far as New York City goes, a group of us met with them for a briefing from New York City DOITT on February 11th and we followed up with a follow-up meeting on April 6th to see the progress in New York City and how they were doing, what their needs were. We also met the day after our meeting with DOITT, went over to NYPD, and met with the Deputy Commissioner over there on their efforts to introduce what we are doing with the working group. He appointed a member of NYPD to the working group to work with us in representing the City, and that is Nicholas Puccio. The City's completed their RFI process that they had gone out for in the beginning of the year. They are now in the process of reviewing that and developing an RFP, which they are going to release this fall. The timeline for their total timeline right now is to implement NG911 in the City of New York between 2018 and 2021. Why such a broad range of years? They have an actual detailed plan in place month to month, but it's actually where they start cutting over different LECS and so on and so forth and carriers and offer the ability for them to move their IP-based technology on to the new servers, this is the timeline that they expect that all to happen in. So for it to begin in 2018, they hope to be ready with a total cutover by the beginning of 2021 is the current City timeline in place. Department of Public Service is working with DOITT to answer a number of questions. In the last weeks, they have been very busy with that. Mike and Karen are here. And they're answering questions on several implementation factors in regards to the obligations and requirements of the different LECS, whether it is ILECS, CLECS, and the VoIP service providers in order to facilitate the migration process. It's complicated. There's a number of things in place now that's all designed around the legacy switches, selective routers and so on that we've all been dealing with since the implementation of 911 in the state. And they're working with DOITT to see what needs to be done moving forward in terms of updates and management of these questions. So they're

basically facilitating discussions with New York City based on, you know, with the different OSPs, which are the service providers and LECS to facilitate discussions in order to move the ball forward. As we see the City moving forward, we also see the state moving forward. And our goal as a working group is to get this working together so that the City's plan falls well within the state plan and the state plan, you know, works with the City's plan. Also, the Board, as you know, has moved a feasibility study which was presented last year, a White Paper by Director Allen, to actually look at the ESInet statewide in a pilot, whether it be a pilot regional project or what, but to actually look at what the state ESInet needs to do. I will report that the Division of Budget since our last meeting has approved that expenditure. We're now ready to move forward with that study and start working on it. So we'll be contacting those folks in the Finger Lakes who proposed it, but at the same time, we want the study to include the entire state even though in a pilot project. Also, in terms of training, the working group has felt that they really need to -- we need to bring the whole working group up to speed and learn about NG911 and all the factors. This isn't just a simple project. So there are a number of steps we're taking in terms of that. Dave Hopkins, Director, also happens to be the State NENA Chapter President has proposed another workshop. As you know, we had one from the Office of Emergency Communications brought last November to the state. This one is one that NENA would provide. It's called "What Does That Box Do? Understanding NG911 Components." He feels that that builds on the previous workshop and will bring everybody up to a higher level of familiarity with NG911. So we're looking to do that in the July or August time frame. Dave's going to be getting back to the working group next week with some dates to schedule that. We want the working group to be the primary attendees, but it will be open to any of the board members or other 911coordinators as needed to build that out. I believe that the class is limited to 30 people. I don't think we'll have any problem filling that, hopefully. Toby Dusha, radio engineer, has been working with the feds, Chris Tuttle's group, to come up with a strategic plan development for NG911 series for New York to actually work with the working group in a series of meetings that would kick off -- now, we're looking at the August time frame. And this would help support our whole planning facilitation. We're hoping to come out of this process with a timeline and a plan. It would actually work us through these steps. These are consultants of the Office of Emergency Communications which they provide this support effort to states helping them work through their plan and implementation thereof. So we're excited about bringing this forward to actually help the working group through the process so we're not reinventing the wheel ourselves so to speak. In the short term, we're also, you know, fine-tuning the objectives and the governance of the working group and we're conducting either weekly or biweekly conference calls to continue the dialogue and move these items forward. We're developing a survey to send out to the state, we keep building on it, because Jason and his shop have a number of items they want to survey the counties on in terms of GIS. We've got a number of items in terms of the survey data and we also want to be able to answer some of the national data requests that have been presented to the state so we can be on that map of being able to just provide basic data to the feds in terms of number of calls, number of PSAPs, and get a snapshot of the state in terms of 911. So we want to make that all-inclusive in one survey to go out and capture this data from the counties so we're not battering them with two or three different surveys at once that are semi-related. We'll continue to facilitate training and working meetings for plan development. So what I would like to do now is, if it's okay with the Board, if there are no objections, I'd like to recognize Lisa Madden who is here today. She's with the Next Generation Now Coalition which is a federal coalition group of APCO, NENA and a bunch of other agencies on the federal level. They're working together and kind of looking at this nationwide, it was told timelines. And I would just like to, if the board doesn't object, recognize Lisa for about five

minutes to talk about their effort. Are there any objections?
 (No response.)

 CHELLIS: Okay. With that, Lisa.

 MADDEN: Thank you, Brett. So the NG911 Now Coalition was formed at the end of last year and it's a group of very enthusiastic volunteers from NENA, NASNA, which is the National Association of State 911 Administrators, and ICERT, the Industry Council for Emergency Response Technology, all of the industry folks. I am the ICERT representative for this coalition. We are supported by the NG911 -- by the 911 program office, national office, by the NG911 Institute, Texas A&M, NARISSA, which is a group of GIS folks. We have lots of support within the industry. The goal of the NG911 Now Coalition is to accelerate the deployment of NG911 to every single PSAP in the country by the end of year 2020, which is really aggressive. We gather every week. We have put together five gap areas that we identify as having been very responsible for the delayed deployment of NG911: Governance, funding, technology, operations and education. Here, within New York State, you guys are really a microcosm, if you will, if New York is ever a microcosm of anything, of the federal perspective. Within governance, one of the issues that have been identified is the lack of state level true coordination and ability to really have direct influence within the state community, having one point of recipient for, perhaps federal grants. Within funding, the ability to control more how 911 funds are being spent and maybe identify new sources of, perhaps, either federal or other surcharge or resources. Within technology, Cheryl Benjamin has provided some input on GIS requirements, certainly, having a data standard that works for GIS technology and data across the region. Within the operations group, very important here in New York is the ability to be able to interoperate with regional and neighboring ESInet. So New York State, not only will you have a lot of regional ESInet, but you will also have, perhaps, seven other entities, including New York and Canada, that you will need to interoperate with. One of the gaps is right now that lack of true, almost testing or just the ability to assure that those ESInet will interoperate within the education group, also, possibly getting the word out to the legislative community as to the value of NG911. I don't know if many of you have seen the John Oliver piece on the HBO, what is it, Today, This Week, Today, This Week or whatever, it was sort of crazy but New York was called out in there. But there's the need to have more education across the entire country. So those are the five gap areas. We have a report that's coming out this coming week at NENA. We'll be presenting that on some of the findings on the City's proposed strategies for addressing that. And we continue to move forward and identify specific actions that can be taken and recommended, including a legislative package, which there is an agenda right now for a legislative package to be proposed in Congress possibly this year, if we can find somebody interested in doing it in political year but if not, then, perhaps, next year. So stay tuned. I appreciate the opportunity to talk about NG911 and we have lots of good things to come. Thank you.

 CHELLIS: Thank you, Lisa. As you can see, the working group is off and running and it's been just a few short months since the last meeting. I hope the Board is satisfied with our efforts thus far. Are there any questions regarding the efforts so far or where we're going? Sheriff.

 MAHA: Do you see the timeline for New York State pretty much the same as New York City's timeline as far as the implementation of Next Generation 911?

CHELLIS: I can't commit to that right now until we get into the weeds more, but I would love that to be the case. Then, we would fall in line with the City's timeline and the national effort. And I say that, until we get working with our partners at the Department of Public Service, you know, Kevin has the same thing working with the Chamber, until we actually get the into the weeds with the plan development, we see whether that's realistic. So I can't answer your question but I would say, yeah, we'd love to. Any other questions?

        (No response.)

CHELLIS: Okay. With that, we'll recognize Sheriff Gerace who's on the phone with us from Chautauqua County; he's the chair of the 911 Committee, to see if you have anything to bring forward to today's meeting.

GERACE: Nothing really new, Brett. I just want to congratulate you on the working group. I think that's an excellent direction we're headed in and you guys have done a lot of work. I am interested in being involved if that's a possibility. I'm really excited about the direction things look like they're going.

CHELLIS: Great.

GERACE: When it comes to the standards, I guess I'm going to ask it as a question: Where do we stand as far as the process? We made some changes and approved them. Are they ready to move forward and be officially adopted?

CHELLIS: Counsel said that, basically, she's been working with that and working with the fine-tuning of the language, but she says she would like to wait until the new Director's appointed to finalize that.

GERACE: Okay. And I assume that if the whole NG911 work group goes ahead and we adopt some -- we're going to be looking at different standards to adopt at some point in time in the near future, I hope.

CHELLIS: Well, I think that will probably fall in line. We know that the standards need updating and so does Article 6A and some of the other statutes. So once that's -- it probably can be an all-encompassing portfolio of updates. And once our partners at DPS, I know they've got stuff that they're working on that will probably have to be updated, so maybe that will all be looked at together.

GERACE: Yes. And if I can be involved in the NG work group, we could maybe be keeping that in mind as we move forward with the statewide effort.

CHELLIS: Okay, Sheriff. Very good.

GERACE: Thank you very much for your help.

CHELLIS: You're welcome. Next, we have Matt Delaney for OIEC and he's going to present on FirstNet and the public safety broadband update.

DELANEY: Good morning, everyone. I'll just give a brief update on FirstNet. FirstNet's RFP proposals were due May 31st. This is a huge milestone in the public safety broadband

development. It's been several years sort of in the making to get to that point. It's unknown how many were submitted, though. That's not made public under the federal acquisition rules. One vendor did, sort of indirectly, make it very clear that they were one of the ones who submitted, but the other vendors and how many of them are unknown. I'm not sure if that will ever be made public. I don't know if after the award that's made public or not, but we don't know today. FirstNet review process is now underway. It's a very locked down process. They've essentially sequestered groups of employees from FirstNet and a technical team. They actually leased a separate, like a proposal review office, to have them separate from the rest of the FirstNet employees. FirstNet is still indicating, though, they are on track for a November award. As time goes on, we'll see if they alter that, but they're very adamant that that's the intent. Looking through the rest of 2016 here in New York, 2016 consultation task teams, FirstNet has requested states provide a group of up to five sorts of subject matter experts who are interested in participating in consultation task teams. This would be a group that would review materials from FirstNet and make recommendations. It's separate from the proposal process and proposal review. I think this is more sort of a network operation, you know, network operations down the road versus how it goes into the review of the proposal. The first one is quality of service, priority and preemption. FirstNet just recently released the information to us and asked us to engage and find people for that. We are preparing for state plan review. Sometime in 2017, if all goes according to schedule, FirstNet will be delivering a draft state plan and then a formal state plan to each state with 90 days for the Governor to opt in, opt out or do nothing. We're just preparing what's going to be a rather large document, a lot of review process and 90 days is really going to be a short amount of time for what's going to be a very detailed and very technical and financial document. We're just sort of getting ready for that now. One of the things we're doing to get ready for that is the subject matter expert survey. We have a survey online. Thank you to those who have taken it. If you've not and you don't have a link, feel free to go on the website or we'll get it to you. It's just a quick survey. We're just trying to determine people who are available who may be a resource or have some areas of special expertise and certain things that we can then use as we review the state plan. If there's some specific section or paragraph that needs a detailed review and we don't have expertise, we can reach out and sort of do a pre-build database of those who have expertise in that area to help us and review that. And continued outreach to attend meetings and talk about the FirstNet process. So as I mentioned, 2017, the state plan draft first and then the state plan formal deliverable and that will lead to the 90-day opt in/opt out/no action. Then, potentially, depending on the FirstNet timeline, there may be a deployment of, for example, sort of non-band 14 FirstNet broadband. This would be a FirstNet service over an existing commercial cellular service, a similar sort of way that prepaid carriers are branded but they're actually using one of the four major carrier networks. This could potentially be an early FirstNet deployment, which is essentially just a service and a solution and not so much hardware. Then, of course, there will be the actual construction of Band 14, which is where FirstNet is going to actually operate on. And this may start in 2017, probably more likely into 2018, just simply the amount of time it takes. Then, of course, it may take several years plus to actually build up the network, a five-year schedule on the FirstNet RFP but that -- you know, they could start in late 2017, but 2018 is probably when it will really kick off. And that would be FirstNet's successful bidder's responsibility to do that construction. So I mentioned the SME survey. It's just a simple set of questions. You have this logic so depending on what areas you identify yourself; you may or may not see the questions. But, for example, like "mobile data application use"; you don't have experience, you're familiar, you oversaw a project or you're an expert in it. So this is just good to help us develop that list of expertise that we can use as we get through either consultation task teams or the state plan.

Reminder, we have a website, psbb.ny.gov. This is where we have news information, we have some of the latest documents, we have our quarterly newsletter posted there as well, just a page, flip sheet on broadband and topics. So if you need to brief somebody with information, there's a collection of those, the archives are there, makes good briefing material as well. Any other questions?   (No response.)

 DELANEY: Hopefully, I don't think we will have a lot of new material for the September meeting, but for our last meeting of the year, potentially, if FirstNet has announced the winning bidder that may be a huge milestone in the next step.

 MAHA: Matt, one thing I've expressed in the past, and we met with the CEO of FirstNet about a month or so ago with one of the state reps, is the rural areas which we patrol, we won't know what the plan is going to be until we see the state plan but we hope it looks at the rural areas, doesn't just go down the Thruway and down to New York and so on and so forth. That's something that we expressed from the beginning, hopefully, it's looking at the rural areas also for this type of service.

 DELANEY: Yes. So FirstNet has in their proposal, and it actually goes back to their original congressional mandate, what are rural milestones for build-out and they have to meet a minimum and at each tier build-out, they have to meet a minimum amount of rural. It depends how exactly rural is defined; but actually, much of New York can be defined as rural depending on the definition and the way they define it is. We, in our data submission last year, did specify a rather significant amount of New York State to have coverage, operational areas, for example, entire counties. We don't want to see a network that gets built where it's just a couple roads. That really doesn't help from an operational standpoint if you have coverage on one road, you drive off the road and you no longer have coverage. We certainly described that to FirstNet. We, in our coverage requirements, said it has to be built at the same time more populated areas are built. We don't want to see more populated areas built and then at the end, you come back and build less populated areas. You have to do everything from the start to show you can do both halves and not just populated areas. But we won't know that for certain until FirstNet's plan is delivered to the State as well as what the ability will be to do roaming as existing commercial cellular coverage is today, whether that will be included in the rate structure of FirstNet, whether you have that roaming in the area you have it built. And that's something we said in the past; it will be a great benefit to adoption if you can drive through FirstNet coverage and you can roam to existing cellular coverage. You might not necessarily get the priority and preemption and so forth and get the quality of service that you have on Band 14, but you would at least have coverage, especially in areas that might be longer and harder for FirstNet to build, take a commercial carrier years to construct but, again, that's something they said will be a part of, you know, the bidder's proposal and part of the state plan deliverable.

 MAHA: Thanks.

 CUMOLETTI: I was going to ask, really, the combination of the RFP submission or what gets awarded and the state plan, the state plan's going to give detail but maybe not -- I'm assuming not enough detail until we really also hear from the vendors.

DELANEY: The state plan would have the vendor's deployment detail. The vendor will propose, actually, sort of like a draft framework for the state plan as part of their proposal to

FirstNet when FirstNet awards it, in that period of time between when they make that award and that draft deliverable in 2017 where they fine-tune that, how it will occur in New York. So that state plan will actually have a lot of detail as to how that will actually occur in New York. David Cook is here from FirstNet.

COOK: I think I know most people here, Matt, thank you. Sheriff, you got a very good point about the rural and the rural build-out is a very critical ingredient of the RFP objectives. It's a requirement that was built in for the responders to address. What I want to let this body know is that New York and the team, and Matt in particular, have been very strong on pointing out the requirements of not only the rural but also the waterways. I know Sheriff Gerace's on the phone and Matt pointed out that New York needs coverage in Long Island Sound, Great Lakes, the rivers and things of that nature. So it's not just the Metropolitan areas but FirstNet is taking very seriously the remote responses that the emergency responders are called to. And New York has some really remote geography. We're well aware of that. But you got a good team that is really watching out for you here.

DELANEY: Chris Tuttle, DHS OEC, I want to recognize him.

TUTTLE: This is a question for Mr. Cook. What's the rule once the RFP is awarded if there's a challenge from another vendor and that's delaying the rollout process and the award process and the build-out process?

COOK: I can't tell you, Chris, that there are rules. Everybody understands that with the size of an award as big as this one's going to be, there will likely be protests and things of that nature and that's being brought into consideration. But I cannot sit here and predict how that's going to affect anything.

TUTTLE: Obviously, I'm not familiar with the federal rules, so I wasn't sure if you guys can move forward with the build-out while it's deferred or if it has to be delayed or not.

COOK: I can't answer that. I would suppose it's based on the protest.

DELANEY: I do know that that was brought up a couple of times and FirstNet is looking at the best way to address that without delaying the project. Any other questions? (No response.)

CHELLIS: Thank you, Matt. Moving right along, we move on to new business. Is there any new business to bring forward? We do have one item under new business and that is Matt Delaney is going to present on a base station interoperability channel guidelines resolution.

DELANEY: We have obviously throughout some of our board meetings had discussions about guidelines, we've reviewed, and we've had discussions. Some of those are modified. The one that was an issue, we've resolved. But one we've been working on for a while, probably well overdue in New York, is interoperability base stations. We've had guidelines in the past issued on mobile programming, on channel naming, but we had not published one on interoperability base stations. There was some confusion, you know, in the past, counties have been deploying base stations with grant funds and other funding sources and there has been some inconsistency with some of the new grant programs talked about in the past. We really need to sort of solidify some of these questions and have a guideline that really

describes what we want to do and what we need to do in New York. We need to address both the calling and the TAC channels. We drafted a guideline. We held a series of conference calls with the Channel Naming and Usage Working Group, which is the working group of this body, to make modifications.   I think we had some very good discussions at those calls and we came up with draft guidelines, I believe, which were distributed a week, week and a half ago, and it's in the packet, too. So a couple of key items that came out of that. Repeaters must be disabled when not in use. Maybe some folks aren't aware but everybody is sharing the same set of frequencies. These are the same set of channels. If you have repeaters there, everyone just builds out infrastructure and leaves repeaters on the air, it essentially becomes useless. Because if you go to use a repeater and all your neighboring counties have the same uncoordinated, they're not simulcast, they're not connected repeaters, you key up several and intertwine, and it just basically becomes unusable. That's not to say that you can't have coordinated repeaters and have a system built, but if it's not coordinated, it leads to chaos. So there is a repeater activation process. The State of Connecticut hosted an e-mail reflector for Regions 1 and 2 interoperability channel activations. It's worked very well. We've been using it. In fact, probably many in the room may get the e-mails. Early this morning, for Americade, there was an activation notification up in Warren County. So, if a county is not a member of it and wants to sign up, and we want you to sign up, we can provide you with the details. We don't put them in the guideline, because we don't want them to be publicly available but, certainly, our office can provide details on that. One of the discussions in this guideline was what side to listen to. The direct or the repeater input. So, for example, if you have UCALL40, there's UCALL40, which is the repeater channel, and UCALL40D, which is the direct channel. We did have a lot of discussion about that and we ended up with the direct version will be the state standard. If you were a mobile unit and you were calling in to an incident, there was no other existing communication plan in place, it wasn't a predefined use and so forth, you would call in on the direct channel, UCALL40D, UCALL90D. But we also strongly recommend that anyone building this infrastructure also monitors repeater input, because there's a chance that units who are not familiar with this standard in New York, or what will be the standard in New York, or maybe, for example, some other parts of the country are coming into the area may call in on the input because it may be the standard in other parts of the country. So the standard in New York will be the direct channel. There are a couple reasons for this. It's a simpler design of a base station and it allows you to hear other units who are on the channel. So if other counties are talking, you're able to hear them. If you only monitor repeater input, you would never hear -- you wouldn't know the channel's in use, you might key up on a channel that's already in use or somebody may be getting assistance, may have called for assistance and be getting assistance from somebody and you wouldn't know it if you were only listening to the input and the other county was talking on the direct or on the repeater output. Another item in the guideline is repeater enable/disable process, how to enable and disable the repeaters when they're needed for an incident. And the repeater ID, or Morse code, CWID. So repeaters that are left on will be easy to identify. It's not just that it meets the FCC requirements, we do need to identify them, but it also makes it clear if someone does have repeaters on and it's interfering, it's a simple matter of decoding them with the Morse code, you see the call sign, you see who the licensee is and you can address that. One of the issues that we addressed as best as we could in the document is Line A issues. Unfortunately, with our proximity to Canada, these channels are not recognized as interoperability channels in Canada. We've had these discussions with the FCC and the State Department for some time about this. I think Canada is slowly recognizing that in the U.S., they are designated national interoperability channels. Vermont had a significant

amount of time spent in doing on-air testing to prove noninterference. They weren't a hundred percent successful. There were areas where certain channels can be used and can't be used. But it definitely was better than their initial denials from Canada. We work through the FCC. We don't work directly with Canada. But, clearly, any time anyone gets a rejection for especially a national interoperability channel, let our office know, our federal partners, we let them know. Clearly, in the U.S., it's an important issue that these channels are built out. One issue that we sort of worked around and suggested in the guideline was the treaty agreement with Canada allows you to build 5 watts without notification to Canada. So that's at least an option to get on the air. I mean, 5 watts at a high site, it doesn't sound like a lot, but if you're not terrain limited, that can actually help. And if you are terrain limited, 5 watts or 50 watts may not make a difference anyway. It's certainly not an ideal solution but it's better than not having the channel at all. It also addresses base stations for some of the New York State common channels, such as NYLAW1 and NYMED715. We did have a discussion about which EMS channel to implement and I think there wasn't 100 percent consensus but the general feeling was NYMED715 to prevent interference with VMED28 which is 155.340, which deals with hospital communication. So part of the rationale is to develop the national interoperability calling channels for hailing and staging purposes and available to responders both on an incident basis, big and small, but also for non-incident basis, lifeline throughout, out of area, they have a lifeline, the ability to talk to somebody. On scene traffic moves to the TAC channels. We do have some wording in the guideline about building out the TAC channels. Repeaters on the TAC channels would be permitted. Again, they would be subject to the activation process and not having them active when you're not using them. But that's almost -- the TAC channel's like a working channel to move off the calling channel. Base station guidelines need to reflect the proposed approach and regardless of the funding source. So including, for example, our upcoming grant programs that we talked about at the last meeting, we would want to ensure that they work the same regardless. Then, dispatch center monitoring. So if no one's listening to the calling channel if someone calls for help or assistance, I mean, that doesn't really help. So encourage required monitoring of the calling channels if you are going to build a base station. The next step is to request the Board recommend that OIEC publish the guidelines that have been developed by the working committee. Questions?

 MERKLINGER: Matt, or Mr. Chair, was anybody on there from the State Health Department, because the Health Department guidelines also want me to monitor 280, 175 and 340 on top of the six that we already have listed there. So, now, I have to listen to nine channels. That's like a full-time person.

 DELANEY: DOH, EMS was on the call.

 MERKLINGER: And they're okay if we stop listening to those?

 DELANEY: They actually didn't mention that. Do you have a copy of that?

 MERKLINGER: I'd have to go back. It's in their guidelines. I don't know it off the top of my head.

 DELANEY: It wasn't brought up on the call.

 MERKLINGER: Honestly, we've been listening for years. They're pretty dead. Nothing

really comes across them. So it's probably not the end of the world, but it's something we may have to make an adaptation later or maybe they need to make an adaptation in their guidelines, one of the two.

DELANEY: Yes.

BLEYLE: I've looked at the reflector and I think it's more -- you know, there's not a lot of activity coming out of New York on it and it seems to be a much wider scale. I think a lot of the users here in the state, especially some of the smaller agencies; you're probably not going to be attuned to that. It might be the larger centers and things that watch on a regular basis. As you know, in Central New York, we've been experiencing some VCALL interference and it would be nice, and I'm thinking possibly a good vehicle, Homeland Security does the daily bulletin that they send out and a lot of people get it. It would be nice to include in that like when there's operations, I know you send your trucks out and there's operations like when the break in Dannemora, the prison break. It would be nice to include in there that when you guys know that channels are in use, you know, that they're going to be in use from such and such a time, until further notice, we're using VTAC, whatever, and also to get information out like if there's interference, somebody's got a repeater that's keying up and we can't find the source of it, it's in the western region, have everybody check their systems, it would be a nice way to communicate that. Something that's more applicable to the state.

DELANEY: With the Deputy Commissioner's permission, we'll work to include information like that.

WISELY: We are working on -- first off, those that are on the board, do you all get the daily brief from OEM? (Affirmative and non-affirmative responses)

WISELY: So we'll make sure that we -- so we do a daily brief. It's got weather stuff and a lot of other information from the State, mass gathering events, where we're mobilizing. But that is certainly something we're looking at enhancing, changing that daily brief up a little bit, making it more of a quick, easy read document. So we'll certainly look at that. It's certainly something we could add and things we do categorize some of the larger mass gathering events that we are monitoring or that we are slowly deploying around the State of New York, so we can put that in as part of that.

MERKLINGER: Do you need a motion for adoption?

WISELY: We'll make the change out unless there's somebody that thought negative against that. We're constantly looking at ways to upgrade that daily brief and provide –

MERKLINGER: I mean a motion for the base station guideline.

WISELY: On that part, yes.

CHELLIS: Matt, you're looking for a motion.

DELANEY: Yes. There's a resolution, I believe, in the folder. A motion to adopt the resolution.

CHELLIS: Okay. Further discussion before we move on to the resolution?
(No response.)

CHELLIS: All right. Before you is a resolution; Resolution Number 2016-0608-01 which adopts the guidelines as Matt has presented. Has the Board had a chance to review this and is there a motion to adopt?

MAHA: I'll move it.

MERKLINGER: Second.

CHELLIS: Sheriff Maha, seconded by Director Merklinger. Is there any discussion on the motion? (No response.)

CHELLIS: Okay. All those in favor?

ALL: Aye.

CHELLIS: All those opposed? (No response.)

DELANEY: I'll abstain.

CHELLIS: Okay. Matt abstains. And with that, the motion is adopted.

MERKLINGER: Matt, I know -- and Brett, I know you have to do this anyway, but as wide a circulation as possible that we can get this out to all the radio shops, both public and private, you know, so the counties but the individual private shops that work for the counties, the big manufacturers, the Motorola's, the Ericcson's.

CHELLIS: Yes. Maybe you can help us through your e-mail tree.

MERKLINGER: We can certainly put it out to you.

CHELLIS: Push that out. You know, we can post it on our website, but that alone is not going to get a lot of attention to it.

MERKLINGER: We can sort of send it out electronically to the different -- you know OEM blast, 911 coordinator blasts, and all those different places.

CHELLIS: It's going to have to go to everybody.

MERKLINGER: The more people we can send it to, the better.

CHELLIS: Sheriffs Association has -- I'm sure you have –

MAHA: Yes, we'll get it blasted out.

DELANEY: When we format, you know, the announcement of it, we will include the link to the other guideline. It's certainly on the website. I know in the past -- Toby, 200-something

people received the last blast of the guidelines?

 DUSHA: There are about 250 on our distro list.

 DELANEY: We'll have that in there. It will help to reinforce it anyway. We know people who received it and then don't remember receiving it.

 WISELY: We should put it out through the OEM and OFPC distribution lists that we have, too.

 MERKLINGER: If people get it twice, oh, well.

 LAFLURE: And some kind of connection so that they know -- like your home phone number, Matt. No. Seriously, somebody they can reach out to here at OIEC with questions so they're not -- they ask their county guy that they work for and then, you know, it goes round and round. If there's somebody they can talk to directly, to explain that stuff, that would be great.

 VOLK: Brett, its Mike Volk from Westchester. You there?

 CHELLIS: Go ahead, Mike.

 VOLK: Just a quick comment. You may want to go back and check some of the other governance for their mobile and portable programming, because it differs from the base station. Just before we send it out, we may want to re-take a look at that.

 DELANEY: Mike, I'll call you later. If you can let me know what the differences are, we'll go back and verify.

 VOLK: Okay. We can talk about it offline. Thanks.

 CHELLIS: All right. Matt will take that offline with Mike. Toby.

 DUSHA: Regarding that, it's basically making sure the PL is consistent between transmit and receive.

 DELANEY: And there are some differences, right. In some cases, the base station has encode and decode where the mobile would only have encode and that's certainly consistent, too, as a general practice, if there's a high site and you want to eliminate any chance of hearing interference; whereas, if you're mobile, you might want more flexibility and also consistent with high spots to hear that information. Of course, you can transmit this and encode it on a base station even if you're carrier squelch on mobile, you start getting transmissions.

 DUSHA: Also, as a follow-up, we're starting to do a rebroadcast of these -- reissuing of these guidelines or re-notification every three and six months after the initial notification goes out, which is a good reminder to folks that may have missed it and been delinquent in implementing these changes. So it takes time to implement. We understand that.

 DELANEY: Thank you.

CHELLIS: Thank you. Any other questions?

TUTTLE: Just as a follow-up to the work that's being done. I know we talked about this on the working group side and also on this level about guidance going out regarding the proper use of these channels and when to use them and who should or shouldn't be using them, like they should not be used as fire ground frequency, should not be used to call in coffee orders for patrol, things like that. Has there been any progress on that? Can we draft something so when these do go out it's an addendum to it or a reminder as to what the proper use is?

DELANEY: We can put it in that e-mail announcement; we can put a reminder and then an actual guideline, too. We can definitely put that language in the announcement.

TUTTLE: One thing we've heard consistent throughout the state is when there are interference issues, they hear them, there's nothing to fall back on and say, well, there's this document that says you cannot use it for that.

CHELLIS: Wasn't the interference coming from out of state?

TUTTLE: No. A lot of times, it's in state.

CHELLIS: Okay. I know the Rockland and Hudson Valley folks had issues with one of them. Connecticut.

TUTTLE: That was Connecticut, right. And once again –

CHELLIS: And we figured you would take care of that. You got your –

TUTTLE: That was resolved. But for that example, even though it's out of state, they were using it for fire ground frequency. There are departments throughout the State that will use various TAC channels for fire ground frequencies which is not allowed. So every time it's discussed at those departments and they're very amenable, they understand, they always say, "Well, we didn't know we couldn't. Where does it say we can't use it?" So even though there's federal documentation that says these are what the channels are for, there's nothing on the state level that says what you should and shouldn't do. And ultimately, the State has the authority over the local departments.

CHELLIS: Okay.

DELANEY: In the guideline itself, there is some phrase, prohibited. But, yes, definitely in the announcement, we can definitely put that in very clear text. That might be a very clear place to put it, because on page 3, people might not see it as much if it's in bold with the announcement.

CHELLIS: They are guidelines. It's not really a regulation. So that's something we have to look at, too, if there needs to be something harder to stick down the road.

VOUTOUR: It might not be a bad place to include plain language as well, a reminder.

DELANEY: I think we do have that in the guideline itself. We can put it in the announcement as well.

CHELLIS: Any other comments or questions for Matt? (No response.)

CHELLIS: Moving on to new business.

BLEYLE: I know this is, I think, the first meeting that we ever had where we didn't get a grant update. And I know at the 911 coordinators conference recently, it was a hot topic, particularly the PSAP payment grant, because we're now halfway through the year and it's supposed to be spent in this year. And, yes, some of us are using it on personnel and other things, but some of us are also using it on projects that will take time. For example, our county's building on a microwave link for the phone system and we can't go ahead and spend the money until we know we have a contract signed. I'm just wondering what the status of that is.

CHELLIS: We have -- Larissa, as we speak, she's in San Diego for the National Broadband Conference for our office and, you know, discussing it, there really was no new information since the 911 coordinators meeting. So we didn't put it on the agenda and I wasn't going to attempt to replace Larissa as far as presenting on that. But we could entertain your question. That was brought back from the 911 coordinators as a strong concern. I brought that back to Kevin. They've been working that through the budget office downtown, getting that resolved and then we'll make a determination on what we're going to do about it in terms of timelines and so on.

WISELY: It's twofold. It's the fact that we don't have a contract yet, it's halfway through the year, and then we're asking -- last year, when I was here in November, at the November meeting, we talked about being adamant, you folks helping get people to spend the money down and, now, here we are in June and we don't have a contract.

LAFLURE: Budget time is coming up and –

WISELY: So we're working the issue to make sure we get contracts back and we're having a conversation on what we can do with that PSAP, the statement year to year and give the extra time on 2016. So we're having that conversation.

MERKLINGER: The other problem, Kevin, I thought last year, we finally had it addressed, because the information came out, but you know, so we've got now this new 45 million dollar pool but nobody knows how much they're getting, and I'm doing my budget already. So I don't know how much money I'm going to get this year, it's still a mystery for my current fiscal year and I have no idea what I'm going to get for my next fiscal year so, now, I'm guessing. If I guess too high, I get in a lot of trouble. If I guess too low, they're like, "Why did you estimate this so low? Playing games?" So the sooner we can get that information out, the better.

WISELY: Yeah, and we're working that, Larissa's been working that. We've been meeting on all three of the grant programs that we're doing to get those out sooner rather than later. So I think you'll be seeing guidance and information in very short order on that.

MERKLINGER: Thank you.

BLEYLE: Any estimate on when the PSAP contracts may come out or would we be guessing?

CHELLIS: It's at the Comptroller's office.

WISELY: Today, we would be guessing. We'll follow on today and see if we can get information out.

CHELLIS: Any other new business? (No response.)

CHELLIS: Hearing none. Any closing remarks?

WISELY: Yes. So, again, thank you for your time today. I'd like to just quickly -- I notice the Executive Deputy Commissioner O'Leary has stopped in to visit with us. Terry O'Leary is our Executive Deputy for the Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services and has come on board to help coordinate some of the operations of the division. So thank you, Terry, for stopping in. So we've talked a lot in short order today about some very hot topics that we have a lot of work to do on. NextGen911, working formation, I think, is a critical aspect of our way forward in developing what we're doing as we model and watch what New York City is doing, staying in contact with them. As Sheriff Maha was articulating our time frame, I think that's a great goal to look at as New York City's doing it, but I think what we need to do is get that working group moving forward and making sure that they are -- we are all comfortable with the working group and start to establish and develop that timeline for our way forward, because that is so important, and recognize that there has to be a goal where we can put that stake in the ground. As I joke with the OIEC team, I kept talking about that stake in the ground for interoperability and I think that's why Bob actually left, because he thought I was going to put that stake in him. So it is an important thing, so I appreciate the recognition of that. The standards that we clearly recognize and we have some standards work to do, I think it's prudent to get our new Director on board as we move forward and then work with all of you folks to identify what we need to do and what's the appropriate way forward. And back to the Next-Gen, Brett had talked about the Next-Gen/GIS survey that Jason and his team are working on. Please, please, please, when we get that out and put that out on the street, help us out, get on that, fill out that survey. I think that's going to be important for all of us as our way forward with all the work we're doing with communications. The FirstNet stuff, as you all have been – are well versed on where we are with FirstNet. I appreciate Dave coming today and being a part of this to be able to share some of the insights and what's going on with FirstNet. The RFP's on the street, we're starting to see some articles out in some of the trade journals. Some of the folks and vendors that are out there that have submitted RFPs back into the process, so it will be interesting to see how this all comes out and we look forward to getting our state plan as we move forward and then review it with all of you, because I think that conversation also is very important. And Dave is right, the work that Matt and the team has done here with the assessment of the state, we certainly are a very diverse state as it comes to size and complexity and topography from the rural areas to the large Metropolitan areas, which also pose their own issues in those Metropolitan areas. But certainly, we want to keep focused in understanding those rules, impacts and what we need to do in that build-out. I think this OIEC team has done a great job in the pre-identification of that stuff. So I think that it will be a good document once we get it in to really evaluate from FirstNet. The base station interoperability work, I think that's huge work. I think it's very important that we

have that naming convention; we know what we're dealing with. I think that's a great point, Director Merklinger, about the EMS channels and we will follow up with the EMS Bureau. And Mike Primeau' s here and will also help us with that with DOH to make sure that we don't have a whole bunch of other channels that we're expecting the County 911 Center to be monitoring, you know, going down this path with the naming convention. So that's all good stuff. And Director Bleyle' s idea of adding to our daily report as we move forward and make some adjustments to that daily report, I'll get the list of everybody that's on the board. I think its good information for all of you to get that distribution that we send out on a daily basis. 9:00 o'clock every day, a report comes out of the New York State Watch Center just talking about some key activities in the state, a quick weather synopsis around the state so you have an idea what's going on, could have some other information that may or may not pertain to some of you. We have a report on the status of nuclear installations and any key electric outage issues that are going on in the state at that point in time. We also have things like fire weather map and we have what's going on with active wildfires or what's going on for the downstate folks. We monitor the reservoirs and New York City DEP levels of that. So there's some different information in there that's valuable. But Bill's sort of thought of we do have forward deployment of OIEC as we are setting up communications networks around the state for different types of events, I think that's prudent information to share with you folks. Again, thank you for your time. I appreciate you being part of this organization. I know many of you are very active in all those subgroups that we talked about in my opening remarks. So thank you again, and please continue to help us with that. And with that, I'll turn it over to Brett and it's the conclusion.

 CHELLIS: Thank you. We are adjourned. Counsel says we need a motion to adjourn. So can we have a motion to adjourn?

 MAHA: Motion.

 CUMOLETTI: Second.

 CHELLIS: Thanks, everybody. Thanks to those on the phone. (Whereupon, the Meeting was adjourned at 11:14 a.m.)

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

I, THERESA L. KLOS, Shorthand Reporter and Notary
Public within and for the State of New York, do hereby
CERTIFY that the foregoing record taken by me at the time
and place noted in the heading hereof is a true and
accurate transcript of same, to the best of my ability
and belief.

_____
THERESA L. KLOS, CSR, RMR

Dated: June 10, 2016.