STATE INTEROPERABLE & EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 31, 2018
DHSES - Building 7A - First Floor Training Room

SPRAGUE: Good morning, everybody. Welcome to the State Interoperable & Emergency Communications Board. We actually managed to pick a day that it wasn't snowing, so that's a positive all by itself. I'm your Chair. For those that are on the phone, Mike Sprague talking.
I'd like to go to roll call.

Board Members Present:
Michael Sprague
Charles White
Colin Brady
Michael Primeau
Bob Terry
Brett Chellis
Todd Murray (by phone)
William Bleyle
Joseph Gerace (by phone)
Brian LaFlure
Richard Tantalo (by phone)
Michael Volk
Marianne Buttenschon (by phone)
Richard Andersen

Board Members Absent:
Col. James Freehart
Eric Day
John Merklinger
Kevin Revere
James Voutour
Kimberly Beatty

Guests:
Matthew Delaney
Jay Kopstein
Joann Waidelich
Angelica Kang
David Kislowski
Larissa Guedko
Robert Gehrer, ITS-GIS
Eric Abramson
Christopher Tuttle

Michael Rowley
A. Wesley Jones
David Cook
Mark J. Balistreri
Michael Apollo
Trey Hill
Matthew J. Campbell
Joe Gruse
Kevin Hughes
Steven Sharpe
Stephen DeChick
Brian Maney
Kevin Pooley
Nicole Erickson
Adriana Celage
Ryan Lamothe
Lana Cawrse
Todd Danforth

WAIDELICH: We have 10 present, so we have quorum.

SPRAGUE: Thank you. Just for the record, Commissioner Parrino is actually in Plattsburgh this morning and I'm guessing that's where Eric Day is, because they're touring the flood damage up there with the Governor. That has preoccupied both of them. Deputy Commissioner Wisely is actually speaking at NYSAC this morning. They were both unable to make it.

Okay. A couple things before we get started. Etiquette and safety. That reminds me if your phones are not on stun, please put them on stun. Feel free to take calls; everybody always wants to be updated. Everybody's welcome to take the call. Please step out into the lobby, if you would, to take the call and we'll proceed from there.

The restrooms are across the hall. If there is an emergency for any reason, we'll file out into the hallway, go out the front entrance and go out past the cars and meet in a group out there so we can get accountability for everybody from the meeting.

A couple other things to hit before we move on. Basic ground rules for the meeting. Board members attending by video conference shall constitute presence at such meetings for all purposes, including quorum. Participants must make notice of their location pursuant to Open Meetings Law.

Guests or persons having relevant knowledge or information may attend and speak as part of the agenda upon acceptance of the meeting agenda by the Board. All other guests must be recognized by the Chair before addressing the Board and participating in discussion. If a Board member is unable to attend in person or by video conference, his or her designee may attend the meeting and vote on behalf of the member, unless they're an appointee not representing the state agency.

Just a reminder for those on the phone, please announce who you are before speaking.

Okay. Let's move on to approval of the minutes. Everybody received the minutes from the last meeting? Any comments or questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. Do I have a motion to accept?

LAFLURE: So moved.

SPRAGUE: Motion made. Second?

VOLK: (Indicating)

SPRAGUE: Okay. Second made. All in favor?

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Carried.

Adoption of the agenda. You should have an agenda in front of you. Any comments or questions about the agenda before we move on.

VOLK: Motion.

SPRAGUE: Motion made. Do we have a second?

LAFLURE: Second.

SPRAGUE: Motion made and seconded. Any discussion?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All those in favor?

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. Motion carried. Very good.

Let's see if we can liven the rest of this meeting up. Right off the bat, just to get everything wound up, we're going to turn it to legal. How's that for a lead-in? Angelica, you're on the spot.

KANG: I just wanted to talk briefly about the conversation that's been had about the two statutes 7-17 and 6A, not 7A. There's been some discussion about whether or not it needs to be redrafted in order for DHSES and OIEC in particular to tackle the issues of wireline and wireless 911.

After reviewing the statute, we concluded that there is no need to redraft either of the statutes. Under 7-17, OIEC is the principal state agency for all interoperable and emergency communications issues, which includes 911 support and operations will fall under OIEC responsibilities. That includes the state plan for the development, implementation and governance of NG911 in New York as well as the review and redrafting of wireless and wireline 911 PSAP. Now that we've reached a consensus at the executive level, we can move forward with tackling those issues. OIEC has moved forward with drafting a mission statement and objectives for OIEC to make this a little more clear-cut. Mike will be going over this.

Just please keep in mind that this is all still in draft form, it may still be subject to some editing and changes. I think any changes

that would be made would not be substantive, just more style, grammar and a consistent tone with the rest of the agency's mission statement.

SPRAGUE: Based on that, one of the tasks that we had to tackle was how do we codify this into something that becomes permanent that we can work off of?

I started looking around for a mission statement and, honestly, I didn't really find a mission statement for OIEC. We basically sat down and drafted a mission statement, what you see is the beginnings of the mission statement.

As Angelica said, it's still in draft form. It's been reviewed a number of times and it's at the point now where they're looking at the agency strategy, they're starting to write this into the strategy, I feel pretty confident that it's there. It's just timing as to which goes first, the chicken or the egg here, the strategy or the mission statement.

Essentially, a lot of this is not really different when you look at the very first part of it and when we were going through our strategy, the facilitator was very keen on trying to make sure that we came up with what they call an elevator statement for every one of the agencies or programs within DHSES.

That first paragraph, essentially, is our elevator statement. When somebody says "What is OIEC?", you're going to give it to them in one really long run-on statement, but at least it's all there to some extent. It's taken really right straight out of 7-17.

Where we adjusted it a little bit more as we kind of broadened things to move down into this directive, it's got some of the things in there we're used to seeing which is the grants, both public safety and the PSAP grants. We know that land mobile radio is part of our thing. We basically codified the fact that 911 support and operations and we're doing that, literally supporting that, through the PSAP grant, we're trying to state it right out.

Next Generation 911 development and implementation, we know, is a big one. FirstNet is something that wasn't even thought of when this agency was put together. The Internet of Things and other technologies as it goes to 911. I tried to split that out, because NG911 is the thing that's coming right now but we don't know what's coming after that. I really wanted to include other technologies as it pertains to 911 and interfaces with that.

Obviously, our Communications Unit training, credentialing, and then other communications is applicable to public safety; we don't know what's coming along. Over the next 25 years, as we know, FirstNet is going to be out there, what it's going to look like in 10 years, I have no idea. I don't think anybody, even in FirstNet knows what it's going to look like, it just gives us the ability to kind of work through that.

Then essentially, from there, it kind of delegated all of those things to me under 7-17 and 6A which really was there already to begin with.

Then we broke it into a number of objectives, but most of this is pretty much already there. The COMU program, really spells it out along with the SCIP. We've been doing that for years. That's nothing new.

Operating and maintaining a statewide communications network. This was one of the things that really kind of bothered me when I started looking into things. 7-17 when it was written was very concise, basically, five bullets.

One of the things that we do the most is push out our STR's, Command One, you know, some of that stuff, for supporting all these different incidents across the state and exercises. We're constantly running during the summer and that was literally covered under other activities. It wasn't even mentioned in that.

I think that was because when DHSES was being formed, a lot of those communications assets were under SEMO. When it changed, they rolled over to us, but they hadn't been really thought about or incorporated into the process.

I really wanted to capture that, because that's a huge chunk of what we do, is provide communications support to literally every agency that's out there. The interesting part of it is that a lot of agencies have communications capabilities, but they're assigned within their silo, shall we say - silo is probably not the best way to put it - within their agency.

Ours is really kind of available to support any agency from a state agency all the way down to a village, town, city, whatever it happens to be. We do that on a regular basis. It's kind of a little different operation for us.

The coordination planning of broadband is something that is new and really needs to be kind of culled out, because as we know, that's going to evolve over 25 years into God knows what. It could become primary, it could be supportive, it could be just a whole other operation altogether.

We got into fulfill the duties of State 911 coordinator and empower the 911 coordinator to coordinate all efforts in the development, implementation and governance of NG911 services. We really wanted to get that culled out. Brett has been doing that sort of unofficially and I wanted to be able to have the ability to designate that over to his job title, that he actually wears it instead of it sort of being understood.

We ran into that as we started doing our planning for NG911, that there was no one specifically designated and we wanted to make sure that that was done.

The last part really is support and operations of the SIEC Board. It's almost word for word exactly what's in the creation of the SIEC Board in the first place. There's very little change to the wording of that. I just kind of repeated it here so you can see it.

These are the things that have been part of the SIEC Board from day

one. We just codified that and put it into the same. All of it fits on one page when you get really creative with the margins. That was the goal we were trying to do is to be able to get that to the point where we had it.

From my perspective, this is a little bit of a game-changer for us with the Board here, because we've been kind of sitting on a point waiting to find out where we were going with 7-17. This clarifies it. It kind of pushes that back. I'm really happy to be able to put this out in the January meeting for this year, because that takes this kind of off the table and we can start to talk about other things. There's a few things that the 911 Committee has looked at and we're working on the NG911 program, this gets it to the point where we can move forward and get that behind us. That's kind of the long and the short of this whole legal report.

I really wanted it to come from Angelica, she's worked hard on this to get to this point, and roll it out right at the beginning of the meeting so that you all have it.

Any comments, questions, concerns?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I guess it's good to do at the beginning of the meeting when nobody's ready to go yet.

Okay. Well, that's where we are. As soon as we get the draft off, we will get copies of this out to everybody. It's going to be on our website. We're just waiting to get that draft piece off. I think it's soon to come.

In the interim, we can still work on what we're doing because the determination has been made that we don't have to change 7-17. That kind of puts that line in the sand.

If there's no other questions or comments, then I'll move forward. On to Larissa.

GUEDKO: Good morning. As always, this is an updated spending for all grants that OIEC implemented up to this point. We have stopped short of 2016 formula. At this point, all contracts have been developed. There is spending already that we see, 3.5 million, and all the project period contractual data is right here. The contract period for 2016 SICG formula grant is two years with possibility of extension.

Now, as you can see, 2017 PSAP and SICG are not here yet, however, all results have been analyzed and, right now, the announcement is being drafted with the Governor's office, so you should see it in the next few days.

As I mentioned before, the analysis is complete for both grants, 2017 SICG formula and 2017 PSAP Operations grant. 2017 SICG Targeted grant analysis has been completed as well.

We based our analysis on all the information we have received with the applications for the 2017 and '16 SICG Formula grants. Also, we had surveys completed a little over a year ago, which was also taken

into consideration when we made analysis for the Targeted grant program.

The targeted grant program will begin in February, next month, actually, 2018, not '17.

The total amount of grants received at this point is $340 million. With the 2017 for PSAP and SICG, it would take us to $395 million. As you all know, the program itself overall is striving to implement interoperability channels across New York State and improve and enhance the stability of existing LMR systems. Therefore, the program will be continuing this next year, well, this year, actually, and we're already drafting RFAs for both PSAP and SICG RFAs. The projected date for the formula grant for the SICG is May and projected RFA posting date for PSAP Operations grant is June. We do anticipate to put it on the schedule and this is going to be a schedule for every year.

The Targeted grant. There is no specific RFA or award period. It will be an ongoing floating basis as we analyze and sit down with the county to talk about the interoperability project, what kind of improvements we need to bring to a county or a region. The contract will be developed based on all those conversations, and all those conversations will begin next month.

I just wanted to bring up the map. This is the latest. This is a map of interoperability channels on the infrastructure level.

We combine 700 and 800 as a single band. We still see a few counties that do not have interoperability channels implemented on the system. So, those counties will be targeted with the Targeted grants.

The next map is planned. It's a little bit busier. They are counties that are planning or in the implementation stages of interoperability channels. We do hope that counties will continue to work and if there is any financial assistance needed to bring them up to the full interoperability in some cases, we will also look at those counties for financial assistance.

There are a few observations that we have made with this grant program that I wanted to share with you. Keep in mind the award amount for the SICG Formula program and for the PSAP Operations grant program will change every year.

Sometimes counties do not apply for the grant and that means that, for example, 45 million for the SICG formula grant will be distributed amongst all those applicants who submitted the application.

Also, we see that counties are building out; they put new towers, new microwave equipment, new infrastructure, and that also changes distribution of funding in the formula.

With the PSAP Operations grant, it's the same. We see changes in the call volume, in the CAD incident events from year to year. There's no certain number. If a county had 100,000 calls in 2016, they might have 200,000 next year, if they have a large event or an incident happening in that county. All this information is floating and also

reflected in the formula, therefore, the amounts of the awards will change.

Now, the SICG Targeted grant award amount. That will depend on the defined scope of work. We would go to the county. We'll sit down to discuss what kind of improvements, enhancements that particular county will need to bring them up and meet the goals that we have in mind, and that will vary from county to county.

We also see a great deal of collaboration and finalization of agreements and also SOPs, agreements between counties, agreements between regions, agreements between counties and State agencies. There is a great improvement in this particular area as well, and this is governance related.

Now, regional/consortium connectivity. There's a lot of impact at this point, especially in the few regions in New York State where regional connectivity has grown. There are systems with a single core, and now you have several counties operating on a single core. That means that this is one large system with floating interoperability between those counties.

We also see large input of database into CASM, Communications Assets Survey and Mapping tool. That's important. This is the tool that we use to actually come up with the plan for incidents. Because counties are utilizing this tool more and more, that will improve operational side during incidents as well.

With the PSAP grant and data that we have received, we see that there are more and more counties implementing text-to-911 services and every year the amount of counties that have this service increasing. We see more resiliency in LMR infrastructure. More and more counties are either putting new towers or they are enhancing the existing towers. There is a lot of system upgrades in LMR world and are also improvements in the PSAP. Counties are buying new CAD systems and they are implementing new VoIP services and moving away from analog. Any questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I'd just like to reiterate what Larissa said is that we had hoped to have the results out by this meeting, but it looks like it's probably going to be next week at this point in time. We're ready to move forward. It's just timing.

Moving to the Standing Committee reports. 911 Advisory Committee. Sheriff Gerace.

GERACE: Yes, sir. Well, with the discussion that we had at the opening of the meeting, it gives the committee a new set of things to do and we need to get back together as a standing committee and look over the current standards and then provide the Board with a new recommendation.

SPRAGUE: That sounds great. We look forward to doing that.

GERACE: I'll be contacting the current members and if there's other members of the Board that are interested in helping with that, I'd

encourage them to contact me.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Any comments from anybody that's on the committee here or wants to be on the committee?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: It's still a quiet group, Sheriff.

GERACE: Sounds like it.

SPRAGUE: Steve Sharpe just volunteered.

GERACE: Okay, great. Thanks, Steve.

SHARPE: Any time, Sheriff.

SPRAGUE: Okay. Very good. Any other comments or questions for the Sheriff?

SPRAGUE: Thank you, Sheriff, for being able to get in. Hopefully, it didn't interrupt you with your testimony you were supposed to be doing.

GERACE: They got me in yesterday, it worked out well.

SPRAGUE: Excellent. Thank you, sir.

Okay. With that, we'll move on to NG911 Working Group. Brett.

CHELLIS: Good morning. The NG911 Working Group has continued to meet. We've been having regular conference call meetings on a regular basis. Currently, the Working Group consists of sixteen county representatives from 911 PSAPs, four state agencies, which are Department of Public Service, New York State Police, ITS and DHSES as well as New York City, including NYPD and New York City DoITT, all active in the group and we've had a good working relationship with all the stakeholders through that committee work.

We've done a lot of -- while the legal review's been going on and the discussion along that, in the meantime, we've been doing a lot of watching activity at the federal level and some activity at the state level, but mostly at the federal level, different things, like the Next Generation 911 Act that was introduced in the Senate and on the House side now, and is in committee, which will update the original Act of 2012 that established the National 911 Office and all this and really sets them up to be trying to move the ball forward faster in the country for Next Generation 911 deployment, help states that are falling behind with suggested programs, formats, roadmaps, anything they can do, as well as manage a grant program authorizing the legislation which would renew the 911 grant programming to states and PSAPs to work on upgrading 911. That was a close one we've been watching.

Through NASNA, there were comments made and their solicitation for comments and some of that stuff was done and activity was reported on the committee.

The FCC's Location Accuracy Requirements are actually this month. The first wave of that kicks in in February of 2018 where 40 percent of wireless calls have to have an X and Y accuracy within 15 meters based on real calls. They have a graduated scale, which I reported a few meetings back, that the FCC ordered February 3rd of 2016. The

first benchmark takes effect in February of this year.
Next February will be 50 percent, plus they also have to start
providing some z-axis data, which is your height. By six years, they
have to have 80 percent accuracy of calls and a much more accurate
Z axis. It's interesting. I'll talk a little bit more about the
technology that's moving very fast to actually accomplish that.
It's kind of exciting. I think it's going to move ahead of the law
requirements.
The MLTS seems to be becoming a bigger and bigger factor, the
multiline telephone systems. Our partner here from the Department
of Public Service, Mike Rowley, is here today. We talked a lot with
Mike about this, because there has been -- a number of the states
have had what was call Kari's Law introduced. Very few states have
actually had it pass in their legislatures. That's what requires
multiline telephone systems mostly like in commercial buildings,
institutions, those type of places, to be able to call 911 direct
to a PSAP without any additional dialing 9 or other access codes and
this type of thing because of a tragedy involving a young child trying
to call 911.
Out of the legislation when it's introduced, it's requiring asking
for location services as well with those calls. It's nice to get a
911 call, but those of you that run 911 PSAPs know the issues with
the old PBX's who only have one address for an entire university with
a hundred buildings and you have no idea where the call's coming from
if the caller can't provide it. That is still a big issue nationwide.
The FCC is taking another look at it because the states have not passed
the legislation as they thought they would. Back five years ago, they
said let's let the states do it. The states haven't been able to do
it; only a few states have. New York City actually passed a law.
Suffolk County has a law. Statewide, there's no law in New York.
Now, the FCC has put out a request for comment for this. Again, through
NASNA, there's a lot of comments made in support of legislation at
the federal level -- or action by the FCC, I should say, an order,
not legislation, although legislation wouldn't be bad either.
Nationwide Number Portability is another one we're watching.
There's proposals on that to make total portability of numbers
nationwide. Area codes won't mean much anymore, I guess. With that,
what does that mean? What does that mean for call routing and 911
services and these type things?
Net Neutrality. Watching that. Mainly a lot of controversy on that,
obviously, but what is the aspect in the end in terms of writing
oversight regulation or what's needed as we visit this in an NG911
plan with the FCC kind of changing the scope of authority over
wireless providers and other what we call OPS service providers,
OSPs, you know, for changing the scope of who has the authority over
these type of providers and to regulate them and what the states can
do. We just have to watch this whole thing, because it's going to

affect the end oversight enabled to govern an NG911 system in the end. The NG911 Working Group also is looking a little bit into the grant program and the rulemaking around that. We did also put in a request to OEC, Department of Homeland Security at the federal level. Chris is here today, a representative.

Mike and I, in our regular technical assistance request, talked to Chris about a revamping technical assistance through the Working Group, which basically the federal government would provide us some consultants to help the Working Group in writing the state plan and a roadmap. Chris is processing that through their office.

TUTTLE: If we get a federal budget.

CHELLIS: Yeah, if you get a budget, okay.

I attended the NENA Next Generation 911 Standards and Best Practices Conference. It's a learning opportunity to help us with the planning. Also represented, we had -- we were very happy that both our GIS subcommittee, co-chairs were there, Chris from New York City and Alex from Monroe County. Bob Gehrer will report on that group shortly, but I was very pleased they went as well. We were able to learn a lot about this.

We also had Dave Hopkins from Steuben County in attendance. So it was a good group and it was a productive five days.

We started out with a Change Management 911 course. There's a lot of change coming to 911. This is especially operationally once NG gets really in full gear when you talk about the type of calls you're going to get and what has to be processed and the workflow requirements and the impact on the employees and possibly different titles needed or skill sets, analysis type people or whatever.

When you look at all that, there's a lot of change coming to 911. How do you manage change in this environment and promote change in the right way without upsetting the apple cart too much? That was the first day.

After, that, there were a lot of sessions provided by the different NENA working groups on the standards and the different things they've been working on and mainly opportunities to provide input. They included topics such as gathering, moving and sharing data in NG911, a lot of talk about cyber security, that's a big issue in any VOIP environment today. So there's a lot of -- there's sessions on that. The National Emergency Address Database and how it's going to work. They have given the contract basically to West to put that together and that is going to be how they feel they're going to have addresses, your Wi-Fi's and things like that in buildings to help get the address, location height and internal building locations for 911 wireless. Somewhere, you've got to record all those locations and this database is where they plan to do it. How is that going to be managed, updated? Where is it -- how is the work, the flow going to be? Of course, that taps right into GIS, of course, the location. Call routing, proper PSAP routing, this type of thing. Location

validation and accuracy I talked about a little bit, the FCC requirements.

Both Google through their Android devices and now, just this week, Apple announced an upgrade coming out which basically gives emergency location services availability within Smart Phones using what they call a hybrid approach where they combine factors, not only your GPS and the standard triangulation and cell towers you're hitting as the way it's done now, but a hybrid approach using the technology in the phone. I reported on this a couple meetings ago, but basically, your phones measure barometric pressure, you can get Wi-Fi points in a building, Blue tooth, these different things, even step counters. There's all kinds of technology in these phones that can be put together to actually figure out pretty well where that phone is. And that's why Uber knows where you are but 911 doesn't, as the headline in the Daily News a couple weeks ago was talking about.

Big discussions, as I mentioned, on the operational impacts on the PSAP, what it's going to mean. Improving accessibility. Most of that session was represented with the hearing impaired community and what NG is going to mean for improving access for people with disabilities. Role of NG911 in disasters. This year, there's a lot of talk about that, especially in Houston. Inability to route calls to other PSAPs to help with work, call load and those types of issues, and what does NG bring to the table for that? It brings a lot. It brings challenges, but it brings a lot of capability.

Building a roadmap, how to do it, and nationwide; and of course, a session with FirstNet. AT&T and Bill Hinkle from FirstNet were in the house and it was a good session. It was challenging. Bill certainly got a lot of questions thrown at him which he answered in Bill's way, but I think we're still waiting for some answers from FirstNet.

A lot of the concern was that it has to be on connections to plans connecting FirstNet into the PSAP and the costs associated and those type of connections.

If you have an ESINet, you go to the ESINet and then the ESINet connects to all the PSAPs, or direct connections to every PSAP. Different alternatives were presented, different models, and it led to a lot of discussion with FirstNet.

Our goals for this year are to develop programmatic responsibility for NG911 that Mike discussed through the mission statement; continue the development of a statewide 911 plan; define our roles with the other state agencies, which I went over in the plan, actually, formally define them; and establish a timeline and roadmap for NG911, like the Director said, to move this ball forward and get moving. We've been keeping a lot of track with New York City because their program RFPs are out, they're in the review process for a system in New York City. With New York City moving ahead, it is imperative that the state moves ahead with a plan. It's imperative anyway. That's

our goals and objectives for this year.

Do you have any questions for me? Next, I'm going to turn the floor over. I'd like if the Chair would recognize Bob Gehrer from the GIS program office at ITS.

SPRAGUE: Will do.

CHELLIS: Any questions first for me before I turn it over to Bob? (No response.)

CHELLIS: Okay, Bob, you're up.

GEHRER: Thank you, Brett. Thanks, Mike.

The committee was set up late last year. In the GIS community, we think this is a great opportunity to bring some awareness to the role that GIS plays in NG911, so this is a really good opportunity.

We've got representation from the eight counties listed there, New York City and our office. We are interested in having one or two more counties if there are counties that have someone that would -- a GIS person that would like to be on the committee. We have room for one or two more and would appreciate their contributions.

Our office has -- we're technical support to the committee. It's a county-based committee and members of our office have experience, technical experience, with all the GIS data sets, development and maintenance that you see listed there.

The most notable initial goal that the committee has is to conduct a survey to find out where each county and New York City is with regard to the development of those four data sets listed here, which are going to be required to operate NG911. Call routing, as Brett pointed out in his previous slide, it's going to take GIS data to route calls to NG911.

These data sets take time, years, to develop. You can't just throw money at it or super capable consultants. It just takes time. I have personal experience with the last one, the fire/police/EMS boundaries. Back in the '90s when enhanced 911 was the new technology and you have to get neighboring fire districts -- they're the most difficult ones -- to agree on disputed boundaries. I'm going to go way out on a limb and say, nowadays, that's still going to be hard. It takes a long time. By putting this survey together, it will give us an opportunity to educate counties on who might be behind the curve.

Our current activities that we have going on are listed there. We're putting the questions together. We're gathering contacts.

In counties, each one of those data sets might have a different person and sometimes in a different department in the county that's responsible for that. We need to figure out everyone we need to get the survey to and then we need to ride herd on it so that we get good results coming back and contact folks that haven't submitted the information yet, including who the person that knows about the CAD system in the county is. That's important, and I'll mention in a moment.

We hope to have the survey conducted and the results in by April-May of this year.

Once we have it, what good is it? Well, through this Board and through the membership on the Next Gen Workgroup and through the 911 Coordinators Association, if we have these survey results, and we can publicize that, we need to get -- for those counties that are behind the curve on developing these data sets, we need the people at those counties who can put resources on that to understand that their county is behind. By having survey results, we can use that to kind of beat the drum and educate these counties.

Additional goals that we have is educating counties about standards. Standards are important for interoperable, for both communications, well, they're important for GIS data, too, and that's the best way to make them work smoothly when they're put into a NG911 system. And Brett mentioned that our two chairpersons were at the NENA Standards Workgroup. We're encouraging other members of our committee to get on standards workgroups, these are national workgroups, and help develop the standards for the benefit of New York State and the users in New York State.

Also, we're collecting information about CAD vendors. In fact, we just last week synchronized our list with OIEC's list that they assembled through the recent grant submissions. We keep that list for New York State Police purposes and, now, we synchronized it. Going forward, we'll be able to know who the players are, the major players CAD system-wise in New York State, and educate them and push them to make sure their new versions of their software will ingest this GIS data without having to stand on your head and do all kinds of data conversion.

We hope with just educating about where counties are with the data sets and putting pressure on CAD vendors to update their software appropriately, if we accomplish those two things, the committee will have done some good work. And that's it.

Any questions?

KOPSTEIN: Are the GIS data sets going to include other markers such as mile markers or railroad control points on them? I know in New York City, over time, those had to be added, because sometimes people don't know where they are. "I'm by exit whatever on 87." What does that point to? That has to equate to something that goes into the system.

GEHRER: They can be on that address for the second bullet there in the list, the address point data set. I know counties, through work we've done with counties, have address things like mile markers and put them in their address, you know, road mile markers, put them in their address database. Along like the rail trails converted for recreation, they put signs up and address those and put them in. You can put anything that's a discrete location, including the landmark names like Wal-Mart, you know, things where you get a lot

of calls from and people don't know what the address is, but they sure do know where that store is, that can go in there as well.

KOPSTEIN: The other item, the railroads don't go by addresses; they go by control points. They become important, especially with the amount of material being transported today. If there's an accident or a derailment, they're going to radio that in by their closest control point.

GEHRER: The experience I've had with some of the current CAD software packages, they allow for other data sets, like control points, to be added in and it kind of works seamlessly like the address points. I think most, if not all, CAD software packages will allow you to put that in there, similar to an address.

SHARPE: May I? It all depends on your vendor. One of the things that I'm trying to push at from the operational side of things is it's all good to have this data; in fact, NG911 data, GIS data, element forms is huge. You can have buildings, you can have floors, you can have suites, all that stuff.

The problem is the data is so dense and so detailed that now CAD vendors don't have locators that can easily handle that data.

It takes that floor, building, room, suite and makes it into one small field. Depending on your CAD vendor, it limits it to five characters with no spaces. That's the challenge that we're facing is that NG911 GIS data is being built and it's actually being effectively managed at the state. Now, we've got to get the CAD vendors on board and say, okay, now, how are we going to do this so that way Joe Blow dispatcher who has a high school education can type that address in as the caller's giving it to him or receive a 911 call with all those data elements in it and still get it to verify on a map on the screen?

Most CAD vendors right now, I can put any X-Y coordinate in the world on there, assign it a common name and it'll work and that's what we did with our mile markers.

NG911 is going to have more data, more elements that our CAD members are going to have to figure out.

If we don't start setting the standard here in New York State as to how those CAD vendors are going to treat this data, then what we're going to have is 25 to 26 different solutions and people like us at the front lines are going to have to figure out 24 or 25 different ways of doing it.

The purpose of this subcommittee is to help us give guidelines so, that way, our CAD vendors know where New York State stands on these issues. We're going to need your support.

GEHRER: It's important that when counties go out with RFPs for new systems that they put those standards, those requirements, in there and that they hold the vendors to it and don't let them say, "Well, this is what we thought was complying."

CHELLIS: Or "We're developing it; it'll be there in a few years."

GEHRER: Yeah, yeah.

SPRAGUE: Any other comments or questions for Bob or Brett?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: Okay. With that, we'll move on to Jay and the CIWG.
KOPSTEIN: Good morning. I'm going to cover a whole slew of issues that's going to be SAFECOM and the like. First, and without stepping on Chris Tuttle's toes, the federal government is still on a continuing resolution; therefore, no new federal grants. They're all in abeyance until a budget is approved.
Information came out on the NIMS refresh. They're looking for comments within the next week or so. The Communications Unit Working Group is working on the IT positions to be within communications and they're also working on the positions cast for the various tasks that will be the network managers, et cetera.
SAFECOM is also looking to come out with a procurement guide on their RFIs and RFPs talking about evaluation teams, compliance with rules, sole source procedures. New York State is usually pretty good with procurement procedures. Not everybody is as in-depth as we are here in New York State. New York State law really governs and the Comptroller's Office audits. They're looking to put a national guide out of what the minimum should be on procurement guidelines.
On COM-L, COM-T's and IT positions when they're established, once credentialed, what's going to be the recertification period? Is it going to be three years or five years? That's being discussed right now. Then density and credentialing is still being discussed.
On December 13th, there was a T-band meeting at New York City OEM to decide next steps. There's going to be a meeting in Washington, D.C. where representatives that have T-band issues will be meeting with congressional and senatorial staffs. That's on February 13th. I don't know if the state is sending anybody or not.
SPRAGUE: Just on the status of that, we have finalized our White Paper. We've shared it with New York City. We are not attending that. It's a lobby function. However, what we have done is provided our White Paper up to the Governor's relations folks for Washington and they both have that and they're aware of the date. They're going to be coordinating with the folks that are going to be coming from New York.
KOPSTEIN: Right now, I know of NYPD, FDNY, New York City OEM and Yonkers will be sending personnel. I will not be attending. No funding.
Funding and sustainment is looking at again in the new grant having a set-aside for sustainment.
New association is in the process of moving the all hazard incident management team association forward for membership within SAFECOM. And there are openings within SAFECOM. If you go online, there's an application if somebody's interested. We are still looking for tribal representatives. If we have anybody that knows of anybody in any of the tribes, please get them to submit an application. They can be

sponsored by SAFECOM when NCSWIC members, if need be.
Moving along, new guest cards are out. If you haven't gotten them, talk to your points of contact.
The next SAFECOM NCSWIC meeting will be in Portland on May 14th to May 18th and the PSCR conference will be in San Diego. Those conference dates are June 5 through June 8.
The next New York City ICC meeting is on the 7th of February, and it's being hosted at Westchester County DES.
And on NYMAC, there's nothing to report at this time.
SPRAGUE: Okay.
KOPSTEIN: Questions? Comments?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: I'd just like to add the pitch that if you haven't done the SAFECOM survey, you still have time. February 23rd. Get it in there.
Any questions or comments for Jay?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: Very good. Let's move right along. Matt Delaney. Public Safety Broadband Working Group.
DELANEY: Good morning, everyone. Before I get into the details of FirstNet and where we are in the State, and things that will be changing going forward, I just want to take a moment and just sort of recognize and thank a lot of people -- and I'm not going to name them by name to save time -- that helped us over the past several years because now we're really seeing the exercise going to the next phase. I want to thank our Public Safety Broadband Working Group members for their participation over the past three years in providing all of the input that went into our state consultation, the information we provided to FirstNet, and to our state plan evaluators who helped us go through the FirstNet draft state plan and the final state plan over the summer and the fall, generated like 400 comments and questions on the state plan. They spent a lot of time on that, I want to thank them as well.
The Governor's opt decision. We passed the mandatory opt decision date for all the states in the United States, and New York has opted in. Governor Cuomo opted in on December 26th and accepted FirstNet's state plan for New York.
The implementation operation of the FirstNet plan is a 25-year obligation, but it's FirstNet and AT&T's obligation, not New York's to implement, and we have not assumed any financial obligation. Our rationale behind the recommendation? The opt-out path presented substantial financial risk with uncertainty over a better outcome; service is available immediately. We're still waiting for it to be with the OGS contract, but once that occurs, it would be available for purchase. It's actually available now if you have another purchasing avenue to take, because it is based on AT&T's existing LTE network, it is available essentially immediately and not a

multiyear build-out for that.

We can leverage all the federal program benefits, everything from R&D and buying power for devices, application testing, the public safety communications research, all the work they're doing.

In an opt-out state, you would not be able to really take advantage of all of those things, whereas, opt-in is a national network and all those features are beneficial to the network.

So what did other states and territories do? Everyone opted in. Fifty-six. Fifty states, DC and five territories. There were no opt-outs. There was only one state that seriously had announced the intent to opt out, New Hampshire.

However, in the days leading up to the deadline, they had not actually delivered notice and they, in the end, decided to opt in. They decided it was too much risk to opt out, they made the decision they were going to opt in. It is a nationwide network with no opt-out states. There's no networks to integrate in that regard.

What opt-in means for New York. Public safety stakeholders retain their choice of providers. There's no mandate to use FirstNet. Just because we've opted in does not mean a commitment. There was no commitment from the State to switch or sign up a certain number of subscribers.

AT&T has adoption goals and penalties as to how many public safety subscribers. That's on the federal contract, they have those adoption and penalties. They would be looking to sign up and make incentives to sign up public safety, but that's between FirstNet and AT&T.

Then agencies may be able to influence the RAN, radio access network, build-out. Because you have a choice, you can ask your AT&T/FirstNet representative to provide coverage in an area you need in order to transition. Make sure when you speak to them or they speak to you that you express your needs for coverage and that may influence the build-out of additional sites.

FirstNet and AT&T have committed to building out a number of additional sites in New York for added coverage, which is both public safety coverage and commercial coverage, can provide both. They're also going to harden the network and provide other resources that are public safety grade.

If they come to you and look to you to subscribe, express your needs, what you need in terms of coverage, in terms of hardening, in terms of additional sites. Coverage may be in your EOC, your dispatch center that you might not have, you need building coverage. Express that.

FirstNet is expected to drive innovation. PSCR is doing a lot of work in the development of grant programs for apps and devices. They just released information on a grant for developing models of interiors of structures for geo location inside a building for first responders. Some of these will be compatible with other providers. Depending on what the app is, depending on what the device is, it may be compatible with other providers, depending on whether it

requires something specific to FirstNet or is more generally based on open standards.

AT&T and FirstNet have committed to work to try to make apps available whenever possible to the larger public safety community.

Interoperability, as I mentioned, all the bordering states have opted in, so it's a seamless network controlled by one core, one set of RAN controls across the state border. There isn't a mix of networks as you cross state lines.

As I mentioned, AT&T has expressed the intention to have interoperability with other carriers. The details on that, what exactly that means, I think we'll have to see over time.

Interoperability in the cellular world can mean a lot of things. It can mean everything from just being able to pass data to roaming to core services. There's a whole variety of things.

What these details mean, I think, is something that will develop over time. There's certainly a lot of interest in this from a lot of people. It's come up in congressional letters as well as general discussion. So DHSES and the Public Safety Broadband Working Group, and I'll talk about that change in a moment, will help provide resources. We're still going to be available, we'll still have discussions, and we'll help as a conduit to FirstNet and AT&T.

The benefits of FirstNet. It creates a large market, especially since it is nationwide, there were no opt-out states. It encourages product development. Instead of multiple small buys, now, we're looking at being able to have one large buy from public safety as a whole. AT&T is certainly a very large company and has to be able to influence the user equipment manufacturing, adding Band 14 public safety features onto maybe commercial devices or having purpose built or semi-purpose built devices. There are a few that exist today. Some of you may be familiar with Sonim and a couple other semi-rugged devices. They're relatively small-scale compared to a Samsung and an Apple. Here, now, it adds sort of the buying power of millions of potential public safety users. It will probably attract more device manufacturer attention.

The same thing with applications. Now, there will be a market, one network for applications, public safety grade applications.

By public safety grade, I mean both reliable, because they're dependent on FirstNet network, but also building in public safety features that you need in terms of making sure they work in the field, during a shift, that they don't require an update halfway through a shift and you're down for an hour. That doesn't work in the public safety world. Authentication and identity management. All those things can be built into the fact that this is a public safety network. As I mentioned, PSCR and test lab and certification of apps. Actual public safety testing through grant programs, through trials, through field tests. They've had a lot of experience in Project 25 with the vocoders. Some of you may be familiar with the early days

of Project 25 voice. It didn't work very well in noisy situations, your fire trucks and chainsaws and those kinds of things. A lot of work was done by a lot of these same people on really improving the vocoder to improve its use in noisy situations.

You see the same kind of influence in public safety apps, you know, trying out apps that are available commercially, what needs to change to make them public safety grade, apps designed for public safety. Are there issues? Going back and really working through those things and making them work better.

Then, as I mentioned, a single shared nationwide system. It is, from one coast to the other, the same system.

In New York State, AT&T and FirstNet will provide the priority and preemption services for public safety. I say priority and preemption services for public safety, because that's what exists on the network right now.

The FirstNet core comes online in the spring, we expect a lot more services related to single sign-on, the ability to see what issues are on the network, if there are outages, identity management. You know, signing on, you sign on once and you can be on multiple different applications. All those things we'll see on FirstNet as time goes on.

Today is priority and preemption, that's the first sort of major public safety type feature to launch on FirstNet.

Verizon has advertised that they will provide priority services for public safety. The details on the exact integration are still uncertain. If you are an existing Verizon user, how does that integrate with those who are or become FirstNet users with AT&T. As I mentioned earlier, there is a lot of interest in having interconnection or interoperability of applications. What exactly that means is something that will develop over time. Some of that may be driven by the forces of public safety saying, "Hey, look, we need better interconnection between them, we can't have one network or the other."

FirstNet/AT&T may offer some exclusive solutions. There may be some things that are unique to that network that other carriers may or may not offer. They may offer and it may not be compatible. I think in the end, this is something that we're going to have to see over time.

As I've said many times in the past, competition will provide a benefit to public safety price, equipment and applications, but there's no mandate to switch and it's still a very much developing solution.

You know, take the time, consider what your options are and what you do now, you might want to reconsider in a year or two years or three years as more features become available, coverage is improved by a particular carrier where you need it and then you make a decision to switch. The devices in this realm change much quicker than devices

in the LMR world. You know, a modem replacement in a vehicle probably isn't the same modem that's going to be in the vehicle in five to ten years. Look at your options for multiple carrier support, especially things like command vehicles or communications vehicles that might be in the field.

If you really want to look at diversity, take advantage of all options to use, multiple carriers, and take advantage of each and be able to switch and choose the best one that's in that location or the best one that's available in a situation where one might be down and you have the other one to choose from. It's probably not an option from the cost perspective in every vehicle, but it's something to look at for certain people.

SLIGP 2.0, State and Local Implementation Grant Program. We've been using that for several years now. It's a federal grant for states to conduct planning and consultation with FirstNet. Much of the work that we've done collecting information. Some of you may remember from several years ago we did a survey collecting information on public safety uses of broadband and device prices and subscription prices and rates.

That SLIGP 1.0 grant is wrapping up the end of February. About a year ago, NTIA looked at the ability -- NTIA is the federal agency that administers the SLIGP -- looked at the ability to take unspent funds that the state did not spend on SLIGP 1.0 and basically come up with a new grant program, extend it for another two years, through spring of 2020, and allow the states now that we've opted in and FirstNet is a known entity, be able to look at what it will take to transition, you know, applications and other things that will happen, what agencies need in terms of coverage to be able to use FirstNet. They've released a SLIGP 2.0. We have an application in. It's pending award. Everybody's pending award right now. It would start about March 1st. Allowable activities include identify coverage needs/gaps within the state. Development tool that would allow agencies to -- it's uncertain exactly how it will work still, but collect information on where they need coverage and where they have gaps in coverage from FirstNet and be able to provide that information to AT&T/FirstNet to help improve that. Plan for the transition of public safety applications, software and databases. That's very generally what -- is there public safety applications or data out there today? Does anything need to be done to make it available on FirstNet? Do you want to integrate it with the identity and credentialing management that will exist through FirstNet? What will it take to have that happen? What policies need to occur? Are there differences in everything from procedures to state law? Do any of those things need to be updated or modernized to reflect this sort of new development of a single broadband network and public safety.

I know many agencies operate networks that use commercial or private networks, applications. Some of them may have sort of been shoehorned

into fitting into a mobile data environment that went from slow mobile data systems up to now commercial LTE broadband and now public safety broadband and what needs to change, if anything, to have that work. Stakeholder outreach events and data collection as requested by FirstNet. FirstNet can request the states to hold sort of sessions to have AT&T/FirstNet and public safety come together and talk about specific topics. These are an allowable expense under SLIGP as well. The period of performance is March of 2018 through February of 2020. Hopefully, by the next meeting, we'll have details on awards. What's next? As I mentioned, the Public Safety Broadband Working Group has been in existence now for at least three years. Now that we're transitioning from consultation and development into an actual implementation, we'd like to change the structure of it a little bit and migrate it to a Public Safety Broadband User Group, New York's user stakeholder focal point for all things Public Safety Broadband. Instead of consultation and sort of the notion of what's happening in FirstNet and what's happening in their procurement and going through and evaluating the responses, now, we're really into, "Okay, the network is alive. What kinds of changes or improvements do the users need to make it work better for them?"

We see that potentially, you know, a natural migration of the working group into a user group to do that. Provide stakeholder input to DHSES to support both FirstNet and non-provider specific public safety broadband items of importance.

Some things will be unique to FirstNet and AT&T solutions; other things will be much more general, broadband for public safety in general. Then provide a non-biased resource for public safety broadband information to public safety in New York.

This would require a minor change to the Board Bylaws Article 5 to update the name and then a new revised charter for the user group. This charter was distributed by Joann in an e-mail about a week ago, and I'll just read it here real quick. It's not in your packet, so I'll just read it here real quick.

Public Safety Broadband User Group. I just want to say first before I read it, this is essentially just a modified version of the original working group charter. It's not completely new, but it is updated to reflect sort of the next phase in public safety broadband.

Mission: The Public Safety Broadband User Group is charged with advising the State Interoperable and Emergency Communication Board and collaborating with the New York State public safety community on matters such as FirstNet deployment involving standards development, public safety broadband grant status, including the state and local implementation grant program, promoting public safety broadband in the New York State public safety responder and secondary user community and collecting the needs, requirements and expectations of the public safety and emergency management communities for broadband and communicating those through the state

point of contact team to FirstNet and AT&T.
I'd first ask are there any questions on the change from the working group to a user group or on the proposed mission statement charter?
(No response.)
DELANEY: Okay. As is indicated here in the slide, it does not require a resolution, but it does require a simple Board vote to vote the minor change to update the naming in the bylaws and also to accept the revised charter distributed by e-mail. I'd ask the Chair to call for a vote.
SPRAGUE: Okay. First off, I'll ask if there's any objection to considering it at this meeting.
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: If there is none, we'll proceed with it. Okay, very good. Joann, would you call the roll?
WAIDELICH: Michael Sprague.
SPRAGUE: Yes.
WAIDELICH: Charles White.
WHITE: Yes.
WAIDELICH: Colin Brady.
BRADY: Yes.
WAIDELICH: Michael Primeau.
PRIMEAU: Yes.
WAIDELICH: Bob Terry.
TERRY: I have a question first. Are you going to require members of the group to actually be a user at the time?
DELANEY: I would say no. Certainly, not a user of FirstNet. Because that is -- you know, the user group will be more than just FirstNet. It will be Public Safety Broadband in general. I would say that part of it will be what would be needed to transition. It may certainly have input on what they would need to make public safety broadband work that doesn't exist today or to learn more.
I mean, we see the membership as being relatively, you know, open in that it would be open to the public -- similar to what the broadband working group was. We had a membership of about 40 groups of people on those working groups. We see that similar approach on the user group and those who are interested and have information to either provide or learn from in order to enable or benefit from the transition.
TERRY: Just with the name user group and if you're not quite a user, I think you should still be able to be part of that group if you have plans to. Just as long as that doesn't preclude, I say yes.
WAIDELICH: Brett Chellis.
CHELLIS: Yes.
WAIDELICH: Todd Murray.
MURRAY: I'm here.
WAIDELICH: Are you voting yes or no?
MURRAY: That's correct, yes.

WAIDELICH: Thank you. Bill Bleyle.

BLEYLE: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Sheriff Gerace.

GERACE: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Brian LaFlure.

LAFLURE: I have a question also, Matt. As we're going through this scenario, are we painting ourselves into a corner where everything that we do, we use the terminology AT&T/FirstNet when there is Verizon and another possibility if we do -- let's say we allow something to do with public safety broadband and the SICG grants, are we painting ourselves in a corner by listing a specific brand of this broadband project?

DELANEY: Well, I think that -- you know, as I mentioned, I think that the working group will be non-biased. While there is the National Public Safety Broadband Network, which is FirstNet and they're contracted with AT&T, we do certainly recognize that there are other options which can be commercial and both private.

I mean, it's entirely possible that agencies have or wish to build their own private broadband network. You can do that on 4.9 gigahertz. Some communities have mesh networks of a 4.9 gigahertz for public safety. That is public safety broadband.

I think that while one of the main focuses will be the National Public Safety Broadband Network, we don't see that as exclusive to FirstNet simply because there are other options available.

I think that's important in those considering their options for a public safety broadband if they are not using it today is what do they need from, say, the National Public Safety Broadband if they wish to transition and expressing that.

If they can't meet the needs of an agency, and there are other options that do, that can be an entirely valid path to proceed down with the understanding that there may be differences between what is offered as the national network and what may be offered as a different choice.

LAFLURE: I'll vote yes. It has nothing to do with my question. I just think down the road as we go through this and we get more and more involved that we don't want to appear that we are only allowing the AT&T/FirstNet system.

WAIDELICH: I'll continue. Chief Tantalo.

TANTALO: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Michael Volk.

VOLK: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Marianne Buttenschon.

BUTTENSCHON: Yes.

WAIDELICH: And Richard Andersen.

ANDERSEN: Yes.

WAIDELICH: It's unanimous.

SPRAGUE: Thank you. Any other questions or discussions for Matt?

KOPSTEIN: Just two comments, sir. First, you mentioned AT&T talking

about public safety grade. There is no hard definition of public safety grade or mission critical. When they use the term, nobody knows what they're talking about unless we impose a definition upon them, how we want to harden and what type of redundancy we're insisting upon. That's first.

Secondly, as to do with applications, they have to be backward-compatible until everybody has gotten a chance to upgrade their devices. You can't have somebody on patrol or wherever who goes to use an application and, all of a sudden, it doesn't work, because the application has been upgraded and he or she is still working and the phone hasn't had the opportunity to download.

DELANEY: The second point is definitely what is different about a public safety use of application that don't exist in the commercial world. I think that's something that bodes from the user group, from general community nationwide in the public safety world. PSCR is making sure app developers understand that.

There's already been programs underway to help app developers understand what is involved in developing a public safety application. That is just one of many types of differences in a public safety application different than what you might find in the commercial world where you get a little pop-up that says, "This application no longer works, it must be redesigned", I mean, iPhone gets that occasionally, and it's like, well, that doesn't work. You have to make sure every last one has been updated, transitions occur, however your process will be for rolling out any type of new application, you can't -- I think that same commercial model, "we'll just do it", it's like "no, it's not", public safety is very different. You know, it has to be much more thought out and planned.

KOPSTEIN: It's more in-depth than that, because major agencies may have a dozen or two dozen or five dozen phones sitting somewhere in the event of a major incident or in the event somebody's gets broken and has to be vouchered as evidence, whatever the case may be. That phone will come out and be turned on and has to be ready to be worked, not to spend two or three hours downloading and upgrading. That's first.

Secondly, whoever the vendor is, that vendor can no longer say, well, the system will be down for 15 minutes for a software upgrade. Public safety can't tolerate it. The system has got to be up and running all the time, which means they may have to have a second system called a development system up and running doing all upgrades and doing all testing on the upgrades and then have it cut over almost instantaneously rather than what you see now where you may go down for 10 or 15 minutes and then pray that it boots up at the end.

DELANEY: Back to your first point about the public safety grade, and that's something that we are currently in discussions with FirstNet and AT&T, as I know many other agencies are as well, and I think that's something that over time will have to be proven. You

know, nobody expected P-25, for example, you know, when it first came out many years ago was immediately accepted by everybody. No. It took time, it took changes to really make it more acceptable for public safety.

I think the same thing will happen in this world in that it will have to be proven. There will be outages or disasters and how does the network withstand that, how does it hold up over time and, you know, all those things.

If it does not work well, then I think that's something that public safety will have a much harder time adopting or using, because they can't trust it. I think that's important. It's different -- you know, there are some things that will be the same as an LMR, you know, power and backhaul are two things that affect LMR networks, too.

But there are other things that are more prevalent on a broadband network that are primarily a data network than a traditional voice LMR network. You've got things like cyber security, server availability and authentication, app updates and device updates, all these things that will have to make sure that they don't affect and that they work seamlessly and flawlessly over time so that they can be trustworthy.

KOPSTEIN: My last comment, and it's something that we always have to take into consideration, public safety practitioners don't have a bottom line. The bottom line for public safety practitioners when they push the button, it has to work. The bottom line for the vendor is dollar signs. There's different bottom lines and we have to make sure that their bottom line is at least congruent to what our bottom line is.

DELANEY: Any other questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Anything else for Matt?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay, thank you. State Agency Working Group. There really wasn't a whole lot of time during the holidays to try to put anything together. We have established a meeting date of February 21st and we'll be able to give a report at the next meeting on that.

The Channel Naming and Use Working Group. Matt, anything?

DELANEY: Oh, I have no updates on that.

SPRAGUE: Okay. The Citizen Alerting Committee. As we reported at the last meeting, there's an internal planning subcommittee that's working through the rewrite of the state plan. They are still working on that. They've come back with some drafts and still editing that. That is slowly working its way through the process.

I would think by the next meeting, we'll have something more to report on and maybe even draft for some people to look at.

There is one other thing, though, that's kind of arisen. There was legislation passed this year that basically directed the Department of Public Service in coordination with DHSES to look at the ability

to break into streaming providers. We're supposed to be able to come up with some sort of a study.

Mike, I don't know if you want to touch on that, Mike Rowley. I threw you under the bus there. We're looking at trying to work together on that. I don't know if you want to talk about what the legislation was a little bit.

ROWLEY: Not in detail. Just that we're still putting together a work plan. We have until October. It's kind of a shortened timeline now, but we are working with DHS. We know that there are some revisions to the overall EAS plan, so we're trying to coordinate that and just get the proper stakeholders together to get the study done. That's still a work in progress, but I think we can get it done by October.

SPRAGUE: Literally, we're trying to figure out exactly who the stakeholders need to be in all of this. It touches a lot of different areas, a lot of different things and, you know, obviously, the federal IPAWS folks are really going to have some sort of a role in this because of the mechanisms that they're using to be able to put the data out.

One of the big questions is going to be, okay, where does the streaming start so you can actually get it injected in there? That's going to be an interesting discussion, I think, as we go forward. I just wanted to make you aware of that and we'll have more of that as we go on. We literally just talked about it here yesterday more than anything else.

LAFLURE: How does the state switching from NYAlert to Everbridge fall into any of this? Because that's coming very shortly.

SPRAGUE: Yeah, I know that there's a switchover. Colin, I don't know if you want to address that directly.

BRADY: Time frame?

LAFLURE: Well, the time frame and to make sure that these groups are talking.

BRADY: Just in terms of the time frame, I think for folks that just aren't aware, NYAlert really has two user bases. One is private notification, it's an organization that essentially goes and loads individuals into the system for notification, and then the public. That's the citizens really going in, opting in, saying I'd like to be notified about these types of activities as they occur.

The hope really is moving the private notifiers in starting in March, moving them as the training is completed for those organizations so that they have the ability to take advantage of that new platform. And the public will be shortly behind that in the May time frame. Does that help at all?

LAFLURE: Yeah. I mean, I basically understood that. We've been on the conference calls, whatever, the webinars. I just want to -- you know, when you're talking IPAWS and all this other stuff, I just want to make sure these are all -- we don't run into a whole bunch of multiple systems trying to contact our constituents at the same time.

I assume these systems will be the same put together?

SPRAGUE: Yeah, the operations of them are considered to be the same. Yeah, the transition really from what we had for NYAlert to where we're going with NYAlert is really supposed to be a seamless transition. The use is the same.

BRADY: The use should be the same. The hope is that with the new platform, we have additional capabilities than we have today, back to these other points around better redundancy, better recoverability. The usage should be the same. It should just be a different look and feel, different platform with better capabilities as well.

SHARPE: Are PSAPs going to be included as a part of this training? Because a lot of times, what's happening is you have an emergency manager or prior police chief in the field that says, "Okay, I need you to send out a NYAlert" and what we're finding is first-line supervisors or a PSAP director's sometimes crafting this on a mobile phone or from home.

When do you plan on doing the training so, that way, we can inform our brother and sister counties that, hey, you need to be on top of this because things are changing and --

BRADY: The training should happen between the February and the May time frame. I think the question you're asking, though, around who does the notification, I don't think we're necessarily dictating that. I think that's more of a local decision. I think to your point, that education piece and that awareness piece is probably just the key component to make sure that people do know that's an option that's available for them.

SHARPE: Can you at least outreach to the PSAPs leadership across the state, please?

BRADY: We can do that.

SHARPE: Thank you.

CHELLIS: Colin, we can provide you a list.

SPRAGUE: I'd suggest that as we move forward, maybe at the next meeting, depending on where you are in the transition, we might bring that up as a topic.

BRADY: Sure. Okay.

SPRAGUE: Any other questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All right. Moving along to new business. I'd like to take a minute to introduce one of our newest team members. Mark Balistreri has come over to us from Rensselaer County. He's filling the position Toby Dusha held and he's got 23 years of 911 communications experience over there. We're very pleased to have him on board. Phil, if you would introduce our new interns.

PHIL: Over in the back here are two young gentlemen. The one closest to the window is Trey Hill and the other is Michael Apollo. They will be our interns for the spring semester. They may be reaching out and

contacting you for different things, just to give you a head's up.

SPRAGUE: Welcome. One other thing I wanted to hit. The 2018 Communications Consortium Symposium is the 19th through the 21st. Hopefully, everybody's been notified and signed up for it by now. If you still haven't and you want to go, get a hold of Joann and she'll take care of you there.

We are putting a tour of West Point together in the morning. There's some real specific details on that. It's not something you can sign up for that morning. Please reach out to Phil to make sure if you want to go, your name is on that list.

There is a weapons registration. For some reason, the military academy doesn't like a lot of extra weapons floating around. Make sure you touch base with Phil on that as well.

We're working on the agenda. We're literally wanting to get through this meeting, then we'll start really diving into a lot of the finalization of the agenda. We've got some really good stuff on there that we'll be pulling up from some of the hurricanes that happened this year and some of the other events that have been going on, those things we've been working on.

We do have a keynote speaker for our banquet. It is our commissioner. I think it's going to be very appropriate that he's going to be our keynote being at the West Point Military Academy. He's got a pretty good military background and he is a student of military history, so that should be pretty interesting, I think, all by itself.

The Communications Consortium Chair's dinner, or C3 for short, is going to be held on that Tuesday night. We have started holding -- I brought it up at the last meeting, it went very well. We're going to try to do this at least three times a year. We thought this would be a good opportunity while everybody's together for them to do that. They're also going to be doing some reports during the day on Tuesday, so we look forward to bringing that up as well. It kind of seems to be kind of an energy piece that's really kind of picked up between all of the consortiums so we're really looking forward to what kind of comes out of that.

Any questions on the symposium coming up? We are looking at one thing that's not on there, the agenda for the last day. We're going to do similar as we did last year with a workshop. The workshop is going to be a four state communications consortium workshop and depending on whether there's a budget for OEC or not, we're going to get some support for trying to put together something all four of us SWICs have signed on to do, to do some sort of a work plan, for lack of a better term right now, because I don't want to label it until it develops, but basically between New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Connecticut. Being down in that region, it's a good opportunity for those folks to come in.

We are going to invite some additional folks from those other states to come in and be part of the discussion. They're more than welcome

to travel in that day and stay. We're looking to have some really good discussion. If we get half as much traction as we did out of the CAN-US discussion last year, I think it will be a home run. Along those same lines, while I mention it, there is another CAN-US webinar that's coming up in another two weeks. That will be the third meeting since we've had the meeting last year, which normally they only have two a year. It is quarterly based on our input. I think we really kind of forced the issue when we were there back in Buffalo and it seems to be working well. Those are some of the things that are going on kind of surrounding the whole symposium thing.

Comments? Questions? Okay. We look forward to seeing everybody there. With that, I have no other things. Anything for the good of the order that anybody would like to bring up?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Other than that, just in summary, I'm really pleased with the fact that at this meeting, we were able to really put out our mission statement that we've made this turn, I think, from not only as an agency but also from the Board itself and the direction we're going to head in. You can see we've got some pretty aggressive goals and objectives for this year and I really look forward to where we are next year at this time based on all this discussion we've had today.

So with that, I have nothing else. Anybody else?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Thank you very much for coming and we're done with 15 minutes to spare. Thank you.

* * * * *

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

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

<u>Theresa L. Ardia</u>

THERESA L. ARDIA, CSR, RMR

Dated: February 4, 2018.