

STATE INTEROPERABLE & EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION**BOARD MEETING MINUTES****SEPTEMBER 12, 2018****DHSES - Building 7A - First Floor Training Room**

SPRAGUE: Good morning, everyone. I'd like to thank everybody for coming in for our SIEC Board meeting this morning. We have a pretty full agenda and there's a lot of things going on. Deputy Commissioner Wisely won't be here this morning, because he's tied up with emergency management stuff as everybody would expect and the Commissioner's actually in New York City with a meeting today, so you have me.

I'd just like to say a couple things as far as opening remarks. Yesterday, obviously, was September 11th. It's something that we'll never forget and we, as part of this Interoperability Board, should keep in mind as we move forward, because it was one of the keystones of pushing interoperability forward. So it's something to keep in mind. And we all lost people we know and people we worked with.

And, you know, the other side of this with the activity going

on in the Caribbean and what happened last year, we all know what role communications played in all of that last year so we were all very busy with some of that. Hopefully, we don't end up to that level, but some of these storms look pretty interesting.

So I want to thank you all for coming here, because you're all part of trying to figure out the solution to all of these issues that we run into.

With that, let's start off with the roll call. Joann.

Board Members Present:

Michael Sprague

Charles White

Colin Brady (by phone)

Joe Gerace (by phone)

Marianne Buttenschon (by phone)

Richard Anderson

John McBride

Bob Terry

Todd Murray (by phone)

William Bleyle

James Voutour

Michael Volk

Allen Turner

Dominic Dagostino

A. Wesley Jones

Ryan Greenburg

Anthony Tripp (by phone)

Board Members Absent:

Brian LaFlure

Kimberly Beatty

Richard Tantalo

Guests:

Matthew Delaney

Jay Kopstein

Joann Waidelich

James Callahan

David Kislowski

Larissa Guedko

Robert Gehrler, ITS-GIS

Brett Chellis

Nicole Erickson

Phillip McGeough, Jr.

Michael Rowley

Steven Sharpe

David Cook

Cindy Christman

Ryan Lamothe

James Clark

WAIDELICH: Okay. Now, back to Mike. We do have quorum.

SPRAGUE: Thank you. One of the things I'd like to do as part of this meeting, we have some new members, some new people attending, so I want to take a chance to recognize them. The first is Anthony Tripp. I believe Anthony is on the phone. He brings 20-plus years of fire and EMS service, including a portion of the time served as volunteer fire chief of Glen Cove.

Anthony, I give you an opportunity to introduce yourself any further, if you like.

WAIDELICH: He did not reply.

SPRAGUE: He did not reply. Very good.

Sheriff Dagostino, welcome aboard. And you're from Rotterdam. You come to us with over 25 years of experience in public safety. And I'd like to recognize you, give you a chance to introduce yourself further, if you like.

DAGOSTINO: No; just a pleasure to be here and thanks for your time.

SPRAGUE: Okay. We have Wes Jones with us. Wes has over

20 years of public safety and emergency management experience and he's a new addition to the Board. Welcome.

JONES: Good morning.

SPRAGUE: And do you want to give any welcome speech?

JONES: Chief, Director, Chenango County Sheriff's Office 9-1-1 Center, and also serve in an emergency management role for the City of Norwich, active New York State Emergency Management and president of the 10- County Eastern District, New York Emergency Management Association.

SPRAGUE: Welcome aboard.

JONES: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Ryan Greenburg is now representing Department of EMS -- Bureau of EMS, Department of Health, and he's been appointed as the representative for Commissioner Zucker. Anything you'd like to say to the Board? Welcome aboard.

GREENBURG: Thank you so much. It's a pleasure to be here on behalf of the Department of Health.

SPRAGUE: Thank you very much. We look forward to having you folks here for a while.

All right. So, with that, a couple of things. Etiquette and safety. As usual, if an alarm sounds in the building for fire or otherwise, we will all orderly go out and meet out in the parking lot up into the rows of cars to keep the space open, and we'll take accountability there. Please put

your phones on stun. Everybody in this room is important, that's why you're here, but we realize if you need to take a call, please step outside and feel free to take the call. The restrooms are out in the hallway directly across from the elevator, so if you need any of that, feel free. And with that, we just had one of our new people actually arrive, so Allen, welcome.

Allen is from Albion, New York, so you had a little bit of a drive, too. He comes to us with over 20 years of public safety service as a communications coordinator for Orleans County Sheriff's Department. Welcome. And is there anything you'd like to say to the Board?

TURNER: Sorry I'm late.

SPRAGUE: No problem. It is a challenge to get here and you'll get the flow down after a while. Welcome aboard. Okay. Let's do adoption of the minutes. Hopefully, everybody got their minutes from the last meeting. Any comments or corrections to the minutes?

WHITE: Yes, Mike, just a couple. Page 59, line 1, if we can just replace "MTLS" with "MPLS".

Then, on line 14, if we could replace "inaudible" with "multiband end user equipment". And the same for line 15, if we can make that "multiband end user equipment" as well. It might make the paragraph make more sense.

SPRAGUE: Thank you very much. Any additional changes or corrections to the minutes?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Do I have a motion to accept them as edited, as indicated?

VOUTOUR: I make a motion to accept the April 11th minutes.

SPRAGUE: Okay. Motion by Sheriff Voutour. Do I have a second?

TERRY: Seconded.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Thank you. Motion made and seconded. Any further discussion?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All those in favor?

VOUTOUR: Does that motion have to be as amended? I apologize.

SPRAGUE: Yes.

VOUTOUR: My original motion will be as amended. Sorry.

SPRAGUE: And I assume your second includes that; correct?

TERRY: Yes, sir.

SPRAGUE: Okay. Any further discussion?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All those in favor?

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. Carried. Thank you.

Also, along with that, you have the agenda in front of you. I'd like to entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

BLEYLE: Motion.

SPRAGUE: Bill, thank you. Motion made. Do I have a second?

VOLK: Second.

SPRAGUE: Mike. Very good, sir.

Any further discussion?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All those in favor?

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay, thank you very much. Approved -- or carried, I should say.

Just some quick ground rules I'll read through just to update everybody. 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 or participating in discussions.

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 are an appointee not representing a state agency.

And a reminder for those on the phone: Please announce who you are before speaking so that we can capture that in the minutes. Thank you very much.

Moving right along. Legal introduction. We have a new legal counsel. Angelica Kang has moved on to the City of Albany and we now have James Callahan -- welcome, James.

CALLAHAN: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: -- as our new legal counsel. He's going to hopefully get a baptism by fire today of what he needs to do. It's good to have counsel here and he'll basically keep me honest as I go through the meeting. He just has to sharpen his elbows, has to poke me once in a while. Very good. Anything you want to say, sir?

CALLAHAN: Nothing to add. Just looking forward to working with you all.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Okay. Larissa is up with PSAP, SICG and Targeted Grant updates. Things are very busy in the

grants world these days.

GUEDKO: Thank you, Mike. I wanted to give you an update on current grants, Statewide Interoperability Communications Grant, PSAP grant and we'll get a little deeper into discussion on the Targeted Grant program. This is a program overview of spending and vouchers that have been submitted to our office. This is just SICG, Statewide Interoperability Communications Grant, and right now, we just received the submissions, at the end of August, for 2018 SICG-formula applications. Right now, we are still analyzing and it's in the process with our administration. The anticipated project period for this grant is from beginning of January of 2019 until the end of 2020, so a two-year period, the same as the previous grant program. There is potential for extension, depending on project submission and review why the project hasn't moved forward. I'd like to point out two grants right here, Round 3 and Round 4. They've stayed open for quite a while. We are working with counties that haven't been able to complete their projects and haven't submitted their vouchers for reimbursement. It's very difficult to make decisions for extension if there is no valid cause for the extension of the project and it's reviewed very vigorously and very critically.

This is the PSAP-Operations grant which is formula-based grant. We have announced the 2018-'19 PSAP Operations grant awards and the contracts are still being developed between counties and the State, so there is no spending just yet. For 2017-'18, which will end at the end of this year, there is still over 60 percent of funding left unrequested, unvouchered.

This is a general overview for 2018 SICG-Formula. Right now, the application period is closed. We're conducting analysis. As I mentioned, the 2018 PSAP-Operations grant is in contract development stage, we have received budgets from 45 counties so far, though, we're still waiting on receipt of budgets from other counties.

I'd like to take this opportunity to remind that there is a time limit on budget submissions. If they're not submitted in a timely manner, the award might be revoked. 2018 SICG-Targeted grant. We did post the RFA, we announced it this year, for total funding of \$65 million and the application period for this one is closed. The deadline was August 31st. And right now, we are working with counties on project development. So overall, and I am excluding 2018 SICG-Formula from this number, the total of over \$400 million in grants has been provided to counties for communications and interoperability.

This is allocations for 2018-'19 that have been approved in the budget, \$65 million for targeted and formula-based interop grants, targeted \$20 million and formula is \$45 million. PSAP Operations grant, \$10 million.

As I mentioned at the beginning, I would like to get a little bit deeper into explanation for Targeted Interoperability grant since this is the active grant and we are working with counties on development of their projects.

The overall goals of this grant are Interoperability channels that need to be implemented across New York, and monitoring of CALLing channels that counties have implemented.

Backhaul enhancements, and that means backhaul enhancements inside the counties, and between consortiums and regions. And TACTical channel implementation along with CALLing channels.

Development of procedures. Once you implement additional channels, you will have to reflect that in your procedures, standard operating procedures, in the county and also between counties and regions. And CASM, we are still working on CASM. There is a big effort in New York State to move this program forward.

As I mentioned, the application deadline was August 31st. The total available funding is \$65 million and the maximum

award is \$6 million. The counties eligible to apply can only submit one application and the maximum award of that application can be up to \$6 million.

The grant performance period is different for this grant. It's four years. We do anticipate that projects that counties will be submitting, will be infrastructure, very large, labor-intensive projects.

Therefore, the decision was made to expand the initial contractual performance period to four years. So why exactly did we issue an RFA? RFA determines county's eligibility. It defines all the standards. It defines adherence of specific grant requirements that's set by our program. And we needed response from counties that are interested to work with us on development of interoperability.

Now, when we did analysis, which counties will receive the targeted grant and which will not this year, maybe next year, we based it on 2017 SICG application. When you submit your application for interoperability grant, there is a lot of data that we are collecting and that was a base for our analysis. We didn't stop there.

We also did some surveys with counties. We verified the data. We work with counties to make sure that our analysis is solid so we were targeting large gaps of interoperability.

That means counties that do not have interoperability channels installed in the system.

We look at the coverage, sufficient coverage, and also look at sufficient infrastructure that counties have to implement those channels. All those projects are eligible under the interoperability grant program.

So right now, we are working directly with counties on budget development. Once the budget is approved by our office, once it's defined and finalized, it will go to our grants unit which will make -- well, the

Governor will make award announcement. But before award announcement, we work with counties to actually define and finalize their project and define the project cost.

I'm going to bring up the map of monitoring of interoperability CALLing channels. This piece of information is very important for public safety agencies that travel throughout the state, exactly which county can hear me and which ones cannot. This map will tell you approximation of -- it's not coverage-wise, but it's the capability of county to monitor those channels, the active monitoring.

We took into consideration all interoperability channels, which is VCALL10, UCALL40, UCALL40D, 50D, so it's 700, 800 VTAC channels, CALLing channels, all of them.

Do you have any questions?

TERRY: What is the goal?

GUEDKO: Of targeted grant program or the goal of this map?

TERRY: Yeah. I mean, is your goal to get all of those channels covered in each and every county?

GUEDKO: Yes. Yes, that's the goal. Right now, as you can see, there are some counties that do not monitor interoperability channels at all. It doesn't mean they don't have interoperability channels on the system. They might be working on implementation of that, but they're not monitoring it.

For agency like yours, for example, if you're traveling through that county, it's not a big benefit because they wouldn't be able to hear you. From this perspective, this map is important to know who can hear you in case of emergency.

TERRY: Right.

GUEDKO: But potentially, yes, all counties, all interoperability channels to the extent possible.

BLEYLE: Just a suggestion. You mentioned for the targeted grant, that the projects were based on gap analysis so to speak that was done on previous grant applications. And I'm wondering and just suggesting for the future that maybe counties be allowed to -- not just in terms of filling out

the checklist on what interoperability channels they have and other things, but counties be allowed, applicants, to freeform interoperability gaps that they've identified that might be able to use this funding.

For example, I can point to where I would like to see cores interconnected which would hugely increase interoperability, but there's no way to capture it in those forms.

GUEDKO: Yes, we can work on adding the field for this type of purpose in the next grant iteration. I think it's a good idea. We'll discuss it with our management and see if that's amenable to improving that as well. But I think it's a good idea. But we do address that. When we talk to counties, we do mention that there are different solutions for regional interoperability, including core connectivity. And we are working in capital region on such project right now.

We are not forgetting that this is one of the almost ideal forms of interconnectivity.

VOU TOUR: I'm not sure if you said this or not, but for the SICG Targeted, do you have a round idea when that will be announced from the August 31 application?

GUEDKO: So we work with Governor's office on how exactly we going to announce, because this grant is very fluid and in stages. We can work only with so many counties at the

same time on project development. So, once we develop the budget with several counties, it might not be all counties that's slated to receive this grant but several, the announcement will be made.

Right now, we've worked with several counties already and I think they are ready to finalize their budget. That means the announcement -- once we get those several counties together and finalize their budget, the announcement will be made somewhat shortly. I really can't give you the specific timeline because we would have to work through the approval process for the award announcement and that goes up to the Governor. But on our end, we can probably complete and finalize it, I'd say, in a month, in less than a month. That's how close it is.

SPRAGUE: Any other questions for Larissa?

BUTTENSCHON: Hi, Larissa. This is Marianne Buttenschon from Mohawk Valley Community College. I just have one question. If I understood correctly, Larissa, you said out of the 62 counties, 42 had put their applications in when you first were speaking? Is that true? You have -- you just have some missing?

GUEDKO: You were cutting in and out. I apologize profusely. Was your question for the amount of or how many counties applied and submitted applications? The reference

of 45 counties, that was actually for a different grant, not for this targeted grant that we have discussed recently. But that was for 2018-'19 PSAP Operations grant which we already awarded that grant to all counties in New York State. All counties submitted applications. Right now, we're working on budget and contract development.

BUTTENSCHON: Okay, I misunderstood. I thought you said you were waiting on data. Okay, thank you.

SPRAGUE: Any other questions for Larissa?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. Thank you, Larissa.

GUEDKO: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: I'll just add that the Targeted grant is really different than any other grant we've done. Because it's targeted, we're actually working directly with those counties to give them as much of an education of what we're trying to do.

And one of the things we're really being very cautious about is making sure that, you know, as we go down that road, we're not looking at that county as an island but as part of the consortium operation that they're working within and making sure if there's any opportunities for connectivity throughout that region, we do that. So that's a little bit of a different thing.

You know, the question about timing on the actual announcements, we're seeing some counties are real shovel-ready. I don't even like that term, but I mean, literally, they're right at that point. There are others that still need some development within their system and there's others that are, okay, how do we build it? We've got all different levels. The ones that are shovel-ready, we're trying to collect those as soon as we can so that we can get that piece out of the door. Knowing that we have a very limited construction season in New York, we're trying to keep that in mind as we work through that process. It's been very interesting.

WHITE: Mike, one point on that. While there's all that work to develop these systems and continually improve them, our challenge is operating on them. And as we look at the \$405 million that have been invested in New York State throughout various projects through the work with the counties and consortiums, just from the state police perspective end user equipment, I'll need an investment of probably less than 20 percent of that amount to enable our patrols to work on those systems.

So that's another programmatic need or a programmatic identified, I guess, challenge is the word I would use at this point, but things are moving on and we need to be able

to stay in concert with all of that positive momentum. And that becomes an important component for us to be able to participate on the county systems, to respond to 9-1-1 calls and to ensure that the services are rendered to the public. So that's just one item I'd like to bring to balance this discussion out. We've got systems and there's operations and being able to communicate on those systems.

TERRY: I'd like to add to that, with the recent on goings and being able to non-communicate between certain agencies and certain levels of government that you know us as the Department of Transportation operating on the redheaded stepchild, quote, low band frequency, which we have because there's nothing else we can use across the state, you know, we're looking at in every county at least getting two to three radios that would give us some level of interoperability in each county between our public works and the other -- the county public works and their police agencies.

I mean, we're going to have a budgetary expense there, too, to be able to get some level of communication, because right now, with low band, primarily, we can talk to ourselves. That's about it. There's a few stragglers here and there that public works departments have low band, but on the whole, we can't talk to anybody but ourselves.

And the stretch is to get us to be able to talk to other county

public works departments, to talk possibly to the state police on road closures, things like that, the county on road closures, so I mean, we're looking at possibly giving key people radios, the ability to talk on the county platform so at least we can, through dispatchers, 9-1-1 center, could talk amongst that way. That's what we're looking at with the drive that's going on now to achieve some type of interoperability.

SPRAGUE: Jay first, then Larissa.

KOPSTEIN: This has come up in our SAFECOM discussions with the 2019 plan that we're working on. Caltrans brought it up with the wildfires out west and the like and the absolute necessity for Caltrans to be able to communicate with Calfire and the local county sheriffs on road closures and using heavy equipment to cut fire lines and the like. It's been elevated to the federal discussion level as we speak.

SPRAGUE: Larissa.

GUEDKO: Just to clarify. LFIRE4D is a low band channel, it's actually operational in several counties. I can certainly provide this information to you that would be helpful to you.

TERRY: Right, but that would get us quite possibly talking to fire, but that channel is a good 2 MHz down from where our radios are operating. So even trying to program them

into their -- you know, the antenna's not going to be capable of a 2 MHz gap there.

GUEDKO: Okay.

TERRY: It would be useless to try and even communicate via that way. We're looking at some type of an outreach to each county. And some counties will say, "Sure, I'll give you a radio." Other counties will say, "Well, we have to go through our county legislature, get approval to allow you to use the system", and it becomes a six, eight, ten-month process, "You need to use this radio". You know the exercise.

SPRAGUE: Yes, understood. All right. Very good. Thank you. Let's move on. Standing committee reports. Sheriff Gerace. 911 Advisory Committee.

GERACE: I have nothing new to report, Mr. Chair, but I think with the new legal counsel, we need to regroup and look at this together.

SPRAGUE: Yes. I think the best thing to do really is to have Brett work with you and kind of reconstitute, reconstruct your committee, see who's active and who wants to be on the committee. I know that there's been some changes in personnel and so on.

I think it would be good to kind of re-invigorate your committee and kind of talk with our attorney and also look

at our mission statement and kind of come up with a direction.
I guess.

GERACE: I would be happy to do that.

SPRAGUE: Great, thank you. Let's strive to get that organized by the next meeting. Okay. And Brett has one item for the 911 Advisory Committee.

CHELLIS: Under your committee, Sheriff, I wanted to report that we did apply for, or the board, we did file an application for the Federal 9-1-1 grant that was announced by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. The deadline for the first appendix was September 10th. It was filed on time and we received an acknowledgment.

And that was based on the position that we established in our annual submissions to the FCC last year and this year.

GERACE: Excellent.

SPRAGUE: Very good.

JONES: Is that a project or --

CHELLIS: The project, once they get all the applications, they decide what states are eligible and then they will do the calculations, advise the states who is going to be awarded and for how much. Then, we have 60 days to submit a project and that has to involve stakeholders of the 9-1-1 community, PSAPs, tribal organizations, et cetera. The main purpose of the grants is to move NG 9-1-1 forward in

the states.

SPRAGUE: And it just so happens that the 911 Coordinators Conference is coming up in two weeks, so that will be a perfect opportunity.

All right. Anything else on the 911 Advisory Committee?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: With that, Brett Chellis is up with the NG 9-1-1 Working Group.

CHELLIS: The Working Group has been continuing to hold conference call meetings. A few of them had to be rescheduled, but we've been averaging at least one to two calls a month. In those meetings, we've been having regular reports from all the agencies represented, the four state agencies, we have 16 County 9-1-1 representatives as well as the City of New York on the Working Group. A lot of discussion.

We have been working a little bit on the draft plan, but I'll talk more about that in a minute. We've been working, continuing to have a lot of discussions with our partners at the Department of Public Service. Mike Rowley is here today, and working on the legal programmatic reviews and preparing information we need to brief the Chamber and other stakeholders on the project for NG 9-1-1 and the path going forward.

Also, there's been a lot of discussion on the calls on federal activity in terms of legislation that's been proposed on the federal level affecting 9-1-1, NG 9-1-1.

FCC activity, a lot of activity there on location accuracy requirements that kicked in this year and that's a step through 2022 where the carriers have to improve location accuracy. I described that in previous meetings.

Just this week came out a 9-1-1 location test bed.

Basically, the three big carriers reported to the FCC as required their progress on that, and they've actually presented their first progress on what they call Stage Z, which is your vertical, trying to locate people in buildings vertically.

This is new development and that is out for review through the comments by October 1st, initial comments, and October 11th, the second wave and the Working Group will be looking at that as well.

Also, the FCC is holding an open meeting. I talked at the last meeting a little bit about Kari's law. There's also the Ray Baum's Act that was passed by Congress this year, which texts 9-1-1 as well, and we're going to be looking at those very closely and monitoring what the FCC is going to do to implement those regulations.

NENA and APCO continue to push standards out, standards that

they've been writing, draft standards for NG 9-1-1 and other topics, both on the operations side and technical side. One of note that came out this year is the GIS standard. Our own GIS program office at ITS was very involved in writing that standard with Cheryl Benjamin at the helm of that committee for NENA, representative for New York State ITS, and that standard is very exciting because it sets the standard nationwide much in a similar way what New York is doing, and Bob is going to report at the end of my report on the GIS subcommittee and how they're doing.

The Working Group and OIEC, we worked early on last year with two technical assistance contractors from the Office of Emergency Communications, DHS. At the end of that initial period, they kind of were in holding while we were doing a lot of legal review and programmatic building for 9-1-1 programming. We wanted to come back when we were feet on the ground running when they could help us move the ball forward. They are started as of yesterday. They've been reassigned to New York. We're lucky we have Nancy and Joel back. They both come with a lot of experience helping other states around the country move their program forward and come back with even more experience that they've gained in the last year.

We had a conference call with them yesterday just scoping

and planning out the next few months and we plan on using them and involving the Working Group very heavily in completing a draft plan for the state this fall.

We also are in the process of procuring consultant services to support our 9-1-1 program and these consultants will supplement our OIEC 9-1-1 program staff and provide valuable resources to work with our program and technical assistance consultants from OIEC and the whole Working Group on tasks, organization, project management and so on and so forth. The director's working on procuring those consultant services as we speak.

New York City, I had an update from New York City yesterday. Ron reported they continue to target November 13th go-live for text to 9-1-1 in New York City and they're continuing to evaluate their RFPs which they received for the ESINet and core services for NG 9-1-1 system for New York City. They hope to have a decision in the coming months.

Our goals. These are goals we set in the beginning of the year as a Working Group; they still stand. We want to develop the programmatic responsibility. I think we've done well at that. I just described our progress in that area.

We want to continue development of the state 9-1-1 plan. And we do hope to achieve that this year, and that's going to

be an aggressive tool now that our TAs are back and so on, but we're confident we can complete that.

We also want to define the roles within that plan officially of the other state agencies working with us and establish a timeline and road map.

Obviously, those timelines are subject to change, but we at least want to get it down on paper. What is our goal? What is our vision? How fast do we think we can proceed? And what is realistic in terms of bringing NG 9-1-1 to New York State?

Any questions for me? And I'm going to turn it over to Bob for GIS subcommittee as well.

JONES: Not so much a question, I guess, as a comment. I think in 2019, one of the pieces of the goals and objectives is going to have to be how we fund all of this. If we're going to have a roadmap for it, one of the numbers floating out there, at least has been through NYSIC and the Coordinators Association, of about two billion dollars statewide for this. And you know, we don't know yet -- you know, technology's change. That may be a low number, that may be a high number, but it's a number that's out there. Certainly we have to look at that. I'm not sure that many counties are prepared to or really discuss that, because they don't know -- you know, radio projects, they can look at and

go, oh, it's going to be \$20 million or whatever.

Even with -- because technology is changing and because we don't have a plan yet, I think this is going to be a big surprise to a lot of counties as to, boom, here it is and what the dollar amount is and we have to address that.

CHELLIS: I agree that is a major step in the process, every stage, is determining funding. The big thing is legislation needed, changes and updates to legislation, both on the regulatory side and on the 9-1-1 program side and the PSAP side to move the ball forward and also the funding mechanism. And a lot of that funding is not determined until you actually, obviously, as you stated, have a plan and you decide what's the state's role going to be in this, what is the local PSAP's role going to be, how many PSAPs are we talking?

And you know, many states -- most states will offer either an RFI process preceding an RFP or go right to an RFP and then you get true numbers from providers, as to what's it going to cost. A lot of that depends on -- whether you're doing regional ESINets statewide or regional with state overlay. There's a lot of options. They all affect cost. And those connections to every PSAP, how are they going to be funded.

Mike and I talked much at length, the whole structure today

of how it's funded going to PSAPs are going to change and, what is the new picture going to look like and how is that going to be done?

It's a valid point and it's a major part of the process coming up. That's probably an understatement. Bob.

GEHRER: Do you have to recognize me?

CHELLIS: Chair, would you recognize Bob Gehrler?

SPRAGUE: Don't have to. He's already on the agenda.

CHELLIS: Okay.

GEHRER: Thanks, Brett. I know we have some new members on this Board, so I'll just recap what the GIS subcommittee is all about. Earlier this year, with the recommendation from the NG911 Work Group and also some members of the New York State 911 Coordinators Association, we created a subcommittee in order to look into the readiness of counties for GIS data that will be required for NG911 systems. We have a group that consists of representatives from New York State, New York City and eight counties. And a couple of our goals that we are charged with, initially, we're to do a survey to find out the status of GIS development for the required data sets in each county and also to develop resources that might be available to help counties know what they need to be ready for and get them ready. This summer, we completed a survey on the readiness with six

required GIS data sets, street center lines with address ranges, address points, which are discrete addresses, PSAP boundaries, fire, law and EMS boundaries. All those are going to be required in order for NG911 system to route calls, for one, and also they're some of the same data sets used in CAD systems for sending out dispatch information.

We have the results in, we're working on a report which, in October, we'll submit to the work group to have the draft and to get feedback on that and then, ultimately, we'll be looking to this Board and to the Work Group to find out who should this report be sent to. And what's important with that is we believe GIS very often is not right within the domain of 911 communications or emergency services operations. It might be a county planning department. It might be a shared resource. It could be an IT.

We want to make sure that the right people involved in emergency communications know about these GIS requirements and know what the status of their county is in compiling the data that's going to be needed.

We want to make sure the report doesn't just go to GIS peeps and die there but that it gets in the hands of the right people who make -- we don't want people to be caught unaware that they need data that might take a year or more to develop when it comes time to turn up a system or to start work to turn

up the new NG911 system.

We have some good results from that survey we're going to share as widely as we can beginning with a draft to the Work Group in October.

SPRAGUE: Thank you, Bob.

GEHRER: Questions for me?

(No response.)

GEHRER: Thank you.

SPRAGUE: We'll move on to CIWG. Jay.

KOPSTEIN: Good morning. I'm going to do SAFECOM and the like, what I normally do. First, at our last SAFECOM meeting, Secretary Nielsen anticipates that there will be at least \$158 million available nationally for IO grants coming up. That's what they're looking for. NIST, National Institute for Standards and Testing, right now, they're doing a slight challenge with varying payloads for UAVs to be used over wildfires, hurricanes, whatever, once the weather darkens down a little bit.

They're working on heads-up indoor displays for firefighters and other rescue personnel. Their KPIs are available on the NIST website.

The SAFECOM NCSWIC Tech Policy Committee, we've had discussions on the differences between FirstNet and Verizon Wireless offering capabilities. Perhaps, Dave can talk

about that a little bit later.

Also, discussing the interoperability of developed applications for the broadband network, whether you're on Verizon or FirstNet. There is no obligation to go onto FirstNet even if the state has opted in. It's still discretionary. We're still trying to get a hard definition for public safety grade and mission critical. The vendors are stating their products are either PSG or MC. Right now, those statements are vague and somewhat large, but there are no actual standards in vendor hands.

The Communications Task Force still in play. They're creating now what they're going to call a Data D when establishing the data side of communications, similar to the Planning P that we do in the planning session.

The Task Force may ask for FDNY and other MI INTs to support establishing a communications sections chief within the ICS. There's ongoing talks from FEMA on that.

As far as SAFECOM goes administratively, there were 28 applications for membership and 13 were recommended for acceptance at this time.

SAFECOM staff is also looking for AARs to determine the usage of COMM units or COMM leaders. Since there aren't a tremendous amount of AARs available, they're now looking at transportation accidents and incident fatalities reported

to hospitals to get NTSD reports to find out the use of COMUs and COMLs. On UTACs, apparently, there's been some interference primarily on Long Island and it's being looked at. Chris Tuttle is looking at it.

I understand that the New York UASI, NYSTICFOG have been completed, but I have no further information on that.

On grants, there is still talk about requiring states to have SWICs in order to get grant funding. We're looking at defining the minimum requirements for SWIC roles and responsibilities, requiring SWICs or STOs to more closely monitor grant-funded drills and exercises; requiring that ICS positions be filled on grant-funded exercises; and requiring the use of outside evaluators for grant-funded exercises.

Here, they separated drills from exercises. In a drill, you're looking at one particular item. On full-scale exercises, now, they're saying we want an outside evaluator just to keep the process honest.

On NECD 2019, it's an ongoing process. Two work groups were formed and a series of teleconferences were held throughout the summer. The consolidation of those teleconferences will be discussed at a teleconference on September 24th. Finally, as part of the NECD 2019, there was discussion to include nontraditional first responders into

interoperability, as needed, DOTs, DPWs, utilities, that need to communicate with traditional first responders when jointly operating.

We're talking about wildfires, hurricanes, we have road closures or road clearing and you're working as a team or a task force and the ability to communicate within that. This has come up, most recently, as I said earlier where all of the wildfires out in California. Caltrans is having difficulty communicating with Calfire. That has to be corrected.

We have this Hurricane Florence coming ashore and you're going to have debris movement and road closures and road clearing, and there's going to have to be coordination. And it's something we're going to be looking at going forward, especially with the adoption of the national broadband system.

Questions? Comments?

(No response.)

KOPSTEIN: Thank you. Back to you, Director.

SPRAGUE: Okay, thank you. Phil. We've got a few things going on with our COMU program.

MCGEOUGH: So I'll make this quick. We're continuing to develop the COMU program. Right now, we have 37 COMLs across the state with two COMTs and we're continuing to work on our

train-the-trainer program for next year in 2019.

We're also putting together a CASM training and an equipment demonstration with OIEC's equipment at SPTC on November 8th and 9th. The NYSTICFOG, New York State Tactical Interoperable Communication Field Operation Guide, is exactly what it seems. It's an operational guide for communications and we are working on the final draft. We put it out for review with consortium members, some COMU personnel and also within the office. That's expected the end of this year.

CASM efforts are continuing to be worked on. We're trying to reach out to the counties across the state to increase the usage and develop the assets tabs and keep them updated, make sure that they are entering their assets, personnel and communication equipment frequencies, keeping it as up-to-date as possible as well as using it.

In the very near future, we're going to start reviewing it for quality assurance to make sure that counties are fulfilling that part of the SICG grant. And that's basically it.

Oh, one last thing. The symposium for next year will be in Saratoga at the casino. We're finalizing the details on that, but now you guys are aware of the general area of where it will be for 2019.

SPRAGUE: One other thing I just want to add to that. The C3 group, the Communications Consortium Chairs, is also scheduled to meet on the 23rd of October in New York City. New York City is hosting, and we'll have the meeting down there and they're actually going to get a chance to tour some of their facilities. That group continues to meet and it really has a lot of energy involved.

We're getting feedback from them and incorporating that into a lot of the programs we're working on.

Any questions with any of this?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. Thank you. Public Safety Broadband. Matt, you're up.

DELANEY: Good morning, everyone. So first, I just want to -- I talked about this before, but I just want to refresh -- there's some new people in the room. I just want to refresh on FirstNet user types a little bit, the different categories of users who are eligible for using FirstNet. You've got primary users with agency devices, police, fire, EMS, emergency management, 9-1-1 or PSAP.

This is an agency account so that Empire counties, licensing department has an account with AT&T/FirstNet for devices and they pay a monthly subscription rate, they pay them for the agency, they issue those devices to their employees, the

property of that county or municipality or department.

These are eligible for those categories of users for priority and preemption at no cost.

Extended primary users are a much larger range of public safety and public service and general government users to include transportation, health, and a whole variety of service users in government.

Again, this is an agency account and an agency device, so the county or municipality would own the device and provide it to their employees and it remains the property of that agency and they pay the service fee.

The base plan includes access to FirstNet but not priority. Priority can be added for an extra fee for those devices or those users for extended primary. During an incident, however, they can be uplifted to priority and preemption at no extra cost.

If you have a FirstNet account and FirstNet device for your business, for example, or if you have an emergency and use it for evacuation, an authorized administrator can uplift them for up to 24 hours at a time for priority and preemption at no extra cost. But they must be on a FirstNet data plan. Just any old AT&T user can't be uplifted to priority and preemption. They have to be authorized and using FirstNet. And then primary users and personally owned devices, these

are for this same category of primary users at the top, so police, fire, EMS, emergency management, PSAP. But this is where the person purchases their own plan and their own device. They go into an AT&T store and "I'm a volunteer firefighter with Acme Fire Department. Here's proof of my identity, proof that I'm with the department."

And there's a couple kinds of eligibility verifications that AT&T can do and they are eligible then to obtain a device themselves priority and preemption. This is only for a primary category of user. Extended primary is not eligible to purchase their own FirstNet device.

But this is to recognize that not all departments and agencies purchase devices for their members. Many volunteer fire departments, volunteer EMS, do not purchase devices and provide devices to their users or members. But they are in the category where they probably will use them, and I think it's probably not that uncommon that they're using them through their volunteership.

This is a recognition of that and allows them to purchase their own devices and still receive the priority and preemption.

I just want to talk about a couple of the offerings in New York State. Again, it's just more of a reminder and update slide. AT&T and FirstNet will, and does, provide priority

and preemption services for public safety. This is contractually obligated for the life of FirstNet and enforcement by the federal government.

This is AT&T/FirstNet, what we've been working on for years. This is the major program nationwide.

Verizon has advertised that they will provide priority and preemption services for public safety. They have stated it will be no extra cost to existing public safety users.

We've been told it will only be for primary users, police, fire and EMS; however, the details on this integration/interoperability are still uncertain. We're still waiting for more detail on what exactly this means, how it's going to work. It's not yet available on State contract. It's not a contractual offering with the federal government, but it's been in the news quite a bit so I do want to mention it.

Some of you may have heard about an issue in California during the wildfires with throttling. That came up here as well and Verizon has now stated that they will not throttle any public safety user on their network. They actually will have a separate way to identify those public safety users; they don't throttle.

Competition should provide a benefit to public safety. Now, there's potentially more than one choice, so price,

equipment, options and applications in theory could provide competition. But is there a cost of interoperability? Now, we have two potential choices for public safety broadband, two potential networks that may or may not have full interoperability between them. If an application is hosted on your network, it doesn't matter, but if it's something that's trying to be developed nationwide, Jay was talking earlier about how some of these things will work in the future with nationwide broadband network, with communication between disparate agencies, what will happen if they're on two different carriers, and if that really harms the ability to have interoperability between them and frustrate the goal of FirstNet.

This is something that we're going to have to see what happens and be cautious about it and see exactly where it goes.

I do want to mention something that just recently happened, the State Fair 2018, the end of August, beginning of September in Syracuse. Some FirstNet data plans are now available on State contract, so DHSES has become a FirstNet subscriber in August. We have transitioned some of our AT&T devices to FirstNet devices.

We bought and tested several at the State Fair. These were actual new purchase devices, they're owned by the State. We had good results. Even on Saturday of Labor Day weekend,

it was an all-time attendance record for the State Fair, a one-day attendance record, 134,000 people in one day. We had manageable speeds. We saw some slowdown time but never to the point where devices were unusable. We saw -- especially with some of the newer devices, they had the latest LTE bands and chipsets and some newer technologies, had some very impressive speeds. So, we are optimistic. This was just one example, one event, but certainly it's something that we've had many years of experience with and been able to characterize what has occurred in the past with issues. We're optimistic at every test and every point we tested, even at the point of when we believe there was probably the maximum number of people on the ground in the afternoon, we had manageable speed. We're in the process of moving our mobile assets' AT&T services to FirstNet, but many of our devices will remain dual provider, Verizon and FirstNet. This is something we recommend.

It's not feasible to have every police car, every officer have two devices, two carriers, I mean, the cost issue, not just the specific device but just to have two service plans. But if you have key vehicles, you have a command post vehicle, a communications vehicle, it might be worth paying for two services, one of each carrier,

So, you have both options.

If you're into an area where you have coverage issues or network issues, you have another option, there are some devices that allow you to manually choose one or the other. There's others that automatically choose the best carrier. That's something we recommend, it's something we do in our communications vehicles as well as our portable communications assets. But we recommend using dual providers.

I just want to mention a couple things since December. End of December last year is when the Governor opted into FirstNet. AT&T has committed a significant number of new sites as part of the FirstNet build-out, which will serve both public safety and consumer users. There's 100 FirstNet sites and 86 BAU, which means they were built to serve the needs of the consumer. However, they have hundreds more planned in future years. So literally, what this means is in New York, over the next few years, AT&T will be adding hundreds of new tower sites to improve their coverage in New York. They have said that improving coverage in New York is a high priority of the company.

What I would say, is if you have prior experience with coverage from one carrier or the other, if your experience is not current, don't let that prejudice you. It's

definitely something you need to evaluate with what the current conditions are and, potentially, as time goes on, if you have an issue now, keep track of it, make sure you're in contact if you're interested in FirstNet. Just walk up to their salespeople and say, "Hey, I want to check the devices, I want to test and see if it's changed."

"Oh, it's going to be changing, we're adding sites."

Okay, well, go back in six months and test it again and see if it improves your coverage in that area. And they are focusing -- we told them we want to focus on where there's no AT&T coverage today with an area, you know, certainly, in public safety, there is a need, of course, where people live and there's also a need to use it where there's less population. We want to make sure that focus is not just on high population areas but the focus is on overall areas. AT&T is also adding many generators to the sites that didn't have generators, many especially that already had generators but they're adding a lot more, and all new sites will have a generator installed where it's permitted.

AT&T has submitted pricing to OGS, Office of General Services, for State contract, adding the FirstNet plans to the existing contract. OGS has approved the unlimited data plans for primary users and they are available for procurement.

The pooled and other plans are expected to be approved soon. AT&T and OGS are just going back and forth on some terms and conditions of pricing. OGS is researching to determine what's being offered in other states and getting the best value. There's some of that back and forth necessary any time they add to the contract. I would expect that will be done soon.

But if you are a primary public safety agency and you're looking at unlimited data plans, they are available today through the State contract, central telecommunications services contract, wireless carriers.

I know that AT&T has been meeting with counties and municipalities asking what the needs are, are there new towers available, do you want to offer up any tower assets, do you want to subscribe? It's your choice whether to take the meeting and what to agree to. I mean, that's an individual conversation between your agency and AT&T/FirstNet.

I would just recommend if you do have such a meeting that you make sure that what they are promising or what they're offering is clear and written down and if there's future improvements that there's a timeline to it, test if you're looking to transition, test some demo devices and verify that they do what you need and the coverage is what you need.

One of the things, though, that still needs some work and we're still working with that is governance and policies. In fact, actually, we're looking to schedule a meeting, they've been working with each state, Fred Scalera, some of you know Fred from New Jersey, he is now running their emergency management program at AT&T/FirstNet and they are looking to meet with each state, and they do meet with each state, to develop an emergency management plan and how they will integrate into emergency management in each state to determine pre-appointment of assets, devices, extra capacity, whatever is needed in the case of maybe hurricanes, snowstorms, tornados. They're trying to move around the country and stay ahead of weather events around the country and develop a plan to really integrate FirstNet as a public safety communications provider into emergency management. That's all I have. Questions?

VOU TOUR: I'm not sure, maybe Bill can answer this better, but for the State Fair, how is the coverage for AT&T? How was it preexisting before the testing?

BLEYLE: You've got a site right there at the State Fair. I mean, we've done coverage testing in our county and we found Verizon's still the strongest carrier but, you know, FirstNet has been very cooperative. They've brought in network people and discussed their plan for build-out in our

county and we sat down with them. Since we originally started talking in the last probably six months, they've implemented two sites that we know of and there's other plans to implement. So, I'd say they're almost comparable in our county, but they certainly seem to be moving in the right direction at least in our county.

SPRAGUE: If I can add to that. You may remember when the Governor signed, I think it was the 3rd of January, I sat down with both carriers and said, I want to do a test for State Fair and both of them worked very hard and, a lot of things were out of their control. OGS acceptance was one of those.

Unfortunately, Verizon wasn't able to get on State contract, so we weren't able to try that piece. However, we were able to work with FirstNet/AT&T. They were able to do that. They had a site up there they completely rebuilt right before the fair. They were still tweaking it when we got up there. Verizon, on the other hand, has put a DAS throughout all nine major buildings there and added two CoLTs, one at Chevy Court and one out on Midway. Both carriers really stepped up their game for the fair.

It was an interesting exercise to test out to see how things would work and Matt was out there for a couple of different times to try to do some testing when there's a loading on

the system. Because it's difficult to tell, if you're getting priority preemption if there's no load on the system. We've had, probably seven years of really bad experiences out there, so this was a big step up for our coverage and capability and that type of stuff at State Fair. So that's kind of a summary real quick of what we did for State Fair but, it sounded simple on January 3rd and I knew it was not going to be. We made it, I think, two days before the fair actually started or the day of.

VOU TOUR: I recommend Matt test at a Buffalo Bills game. Seriously, I think maybe an unannounced test would be accurate, because it's, I believe, the only football stadium in New York State. The other two are both in Jersey. Nobody plays in New York except the Bills. I know I have a very difficult time when I go there, very difficult time, to get through.

SPRAGUE: When we have some equipment, I'll be happy to help you with the testing.

TERRY: Have they set up a public safety NOC yet where a public safety user's able to call in to the NOC to address any issues that they're having?

DELANEY: They have two things. They have the global Network Operations Center, which is the existing AT&T and combined and, really, the FirstNet network. There's a lot

of shared components with AT&T commercial network, the RAN and all are shared. At the tower site, they basically split the network from the IT perspective, but the infrastructure is basically the same. So, they have that existing one. They have a help desk, call in center and they have a number for any FirstNet users to call in. They have a PIN the user can use to identify themselves as an administrator. They actually have a US based, English and Spanish help desk, you can call in and seek support, device support or network support. We also have, as a FirstNet user now and agency, and as administrator, the ability to log in and see network outages. On my phone, I get e-mails about network outages. Right now, they're kind of generic in the location, how they refer to the network outage. That is something that they're working on revamping to make it more useful and specific and they actually have a map where you can see the network outages that are reported.

TERRY: Do they have an escalation procedure if there's an issue at like an area of the state, Schoharie Valley say, where there might be a dam issue or something like that where their coverage is weak, a contact number that's set up either a colt or some type of device? Is there a process set up for that to escalate that?

DELANEY: Yes and no. There is the ability to request, call

the number. We have a state contact you can call. There's a FirstNet sales team for New York. Is there an actual process paperwork? I have not seen it. I don't know if there is a formal escalation process. There's a way to request one, but I have not seen a formalized version of that.

TERRY: I think we should look at pressing to get it formalized.

DELANEY: That's something I was referring to earlier with the governance policies, something needs to be in writing, rather than it just sort of happens. We're hopeful to maybe meet with the emergency management team there to work on some of that as well.

KOPSTEIN: You mentioned bring your own device, and USDOT for some reason is a 9-1-1 regulator. There's some serious legal issues to bringing your own device. And hopefully, Mr. Callahan can start looking at some of it if we're going to recommend it.

If you have evidence on a phone, that phone may be vouched by a local police agency. Who reimburses the owner of the phone for the loss of the phone for the duration of the case unless a defense attorney agrees to a download? Currently, a defense attorney can look at the phone.

What if there are things on the phone that the owner of the phone doesn't want the defense to see, pictures of his kids,

et cetera? That's not addressed. You've got other issues. If that firefighter or EMS technician or medic or police officer shows restricted information to somebody, it could be a HIPAA violation. It could be a privacy violation. It could be a violation of New York State law on sex offenses. There's a huge training aspect that has to go with it. Using your own device is not simple as somebody just saying, "Okay, do it". There are a whole host of legal and financial pieces that go with it. And I think that has to be explored before we continue to look at bring your own device is an acceptable alternative. It may not be and you may be putting employees at risk.

SPRAGUE: Anything else, Matt?

DELANEY: I have nothing else.

SPRAGUE: Okay. I want to highlight something as Matt pointed out, the governance. We are really pushing on the whole governance thing. We have been doing it for well over a year. It's something that gives me great pains because of the lack of governance.

You know, the development of FirstNet as it's rolling forward and AT&T has not been without bumps, and I'll say that right up-front. One of the counties discovered that the bring your own device and you go in and you try to sign up for that device, AT&T never considered there'd be more than one

volunteer in that family. I hate to tell them this, but it usually runs a family, so you have more.

What I will say is, and Matt has run into some issues, just -- it's glitches as the new system comes up with log-in issues and, you know, the control portal issues, it's stuff they're learning as they're going. There is a problem with learning as you're going. And as Jay pointed out, that's one of the issues that comes up with learning as you're going. That's one of the reasons why we keep pushing on trying to get some of these, because there's even bigger issues. What I will say is as these have popped up, both AT&T and FirstNet have stepped up to the plate and they've fixed the problems as we go.

The problem with that is you're fixing them as you go and you can run into some serious issues that you're trying to fix after that train wreck has happened. And I won't call it a train wreck, it's not a train wreck, but it's a problem, the challenge that's come along.

So that's why we are pushing as hard as we have for a year now to try to get what is the policies and the governance procedures behind these things, and they're not showing up. And we're not sure if it's because, this is how we do things and it's just coming along that way or if it's because we just haven't been shown them because of, agreements or

whatever the case may be.

We hear everything you're saying and, we're trying to get ahead of this but, as Matt said, we're trying to get some governance meetings and that type of stuff to really address these things. Because down the road, we can see some real issues, as uplift and a lot of other things are -- it's a great idea in a small scenario. In a large scenario, it becomes real problematic.

I just want to make you aware that we have meetings, conference calls weekly with FirstNet and AT&T on just these issues. As they pop up, they are resolving them, but, some of these would be nice to be anticipated before they popped up. It's just kind of an observation.

Anything else for Matt?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. Yes.

MCBRIDE: Real quick. The prioritization, how does that work? Are there different levels of prioritization?

SPRAGUE: Matt, do you want to handle that?

DELANEY: There are different levels, the ability to assign four categories of priority to primary users. They are not preemptable. The primary users can't be preempted by the network. They can preempt the general public or extended primary users but, yeah, there are adjustable levels.

Really, that would only come into play if there was significant network loading on a particular -- and all of this, when we talk about priority and preemption, we're talking about one particular sector of one particular cell site.

Each tower site has usually three sectors of 120 degrees each. It only occurs if the traffic, the loading in that particular 120-degree slice of that particular site. An incident occurring on this side of the city has no bearing on the priority and preemption needs of somebody on the other side of the city being served by a different cell site. It's what's happening in that incident.

Of course, if you have a really big incident, it could be on multiple cell sites. But it's not the whole network capacity of the entire nationwide network. We're talking about basically the wireless portion of the network. So yeah, you can assign levels of priority to different devices, and it's by device.

MCBRIDE: Okay. Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Okay. State Agency Working Group. State Agency Working Group hasn't met during the summer. We set a meeting for October 15. There have been some communications meetings with state agencies recently and some key topics that we're going to look at for this meeting is

interoperability between state agencies during multi-agency operations. One of the things that we need to do, and it's kind of come through, is that, life safety issues take precedence always.

But when it comes to communications, we need to get someone on the ground that's thinking communications, not life safety, so that communications is considered during some of those early hours to be able to try to put together some sort of a COMM plan, a very rudimentary one. I think one of the things we can do as a State Agency Working Group is really sit down and flesh out some skeletal structure to a base COMM plan.

We all know what we show up with at most areas, it may have to be tailored regionally, but we should have a very base COMM plan that somebody can walk in and it doesn't have to be -- it could be a COML from any agency that can set up and just start to fill in some of the gaps so that we have a base COMM plan that's put together early on, in an instant.

TERRY: That's key. And I think, exercises are a key. I don't see a lot of exercises going on. You talk about a COMM plan, but you never practiced it until you've gotten to the point of that where I think we should actively pursue some multi-agency exercises to where we actually put what we have to the test, to show, so people aren't scrambling around.

It's just another key to being ready when it's time to implement.

SPRAGUE: I agree with you a hundred percent and I think the other part of it is, I've got COMM guys, you've got COMM guys, whoever shows up, it doesn't matter who it is. They can pick up whatever that sketch is and just start filling it out so that if somebody wants to know, we have a COMM plan and have some method -- communications doesn't get thought of sometimes until a day later. That's really too late in an incident to do what I think is a good job of putting it together.

I have to say right up-front that the conversation you guys both had at the end of the last discussion, about resources and needs, need to be part of this conversation. Let's build this out and that may drive us to be able to, get some resources or get some direction and put it together.

That's really -- from what's been discussed over a few weeks, I'd like to have that be the main topic of the meeting. Then, we can push that forward and I think that may address a few concerns at the same time. That's really all I have.

Any other comments or questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay, very good. Channel Naming and Use Working Group.

DELANEY: I have just one thing for today. Encryption guideline. We talked about this in the past. We did some work on it since the last board meeting and included in your packet today, and it's been sent out by Joann, was a draft guideline regarding it.

But basically, I'm working with NLECC, which is the National Law Enforcement Communications Center, which is part of Customs and Border Protection, and others, just a way for New York and really any state to move forward, create a guideline that instructs agencies and counties wishing to deploy AES encryption in mobile radios, to e-mail NLECC and ask for CKR or SLN and a KID. They will assign a unique set that does not overlap anyone else in the country. They keep a master spreadsheet of the numbers, the CKR and the KID numbers. They will assign you the next available one essentially.

That way, there's no chance that your key, your encryption key, your radio, the ID, not the actual value of the key but the ID associated with your encryption key doesn't overlap your neighbor or a neighboring jurisdiction.

Then, if you want later to share encryption, you're able to, because if you want to put your key in someone else's radio, you want to share the encryption, you can, because there's no chance of overlap.

What this comes from is a problem that we've seen, and it's happened in New York and in many other places, where people deployed encryption and they chose KID and a reference number one, for default, they just chose one and then they go to share encryption with the neighboring jurisdiction who also chose one and that doesn't work. You can't have two key number ones in the radio. You upload key number one, it overrides your key number one. So, the idea here is that they would be coordinated and nobody would overlap. There's also a reserve set of 20 or 24 nationally reserved keys for interoperable encryption that are administered by the federal government that can be obtained. It's a process and it has to do with key loaders, you have to call the CBP essentially and get that information put into your radios, something you want to really move forward with. But the idea here is New York, this guideline, you say, hey, best practice, if you're going to choose to do encryption, only if you choose, the guideline doesn't mandate encryption, it simply says if you choose to, here's the best practice for coordinating the assignment of that KID and that storage number or key reference number.

All it does is prevent you from overlapping with your neighbor when it comes to actually having your encryption key so if you wish to share it later, you could. It does

not release your encryption key -- the actual encryption string protects your information, it does not release to us, to CBP or anybody. It does not require you to share it with anybody.

It simply says if you want to share it in the future, you're not going to overlap because it's been coordinated. We printed the guideline, we passed it around, we had a small working group of some of the counties that were using encryption and a couple others and we said, "What's the best way to do this?"

We were looking at originally creating our own state matrix, we had a table and ID's and we said, "Wait a minute. Maybe there's another way to do it."

We start talking about it, "Hey, I think NLECC supports it." We reached out -- Connecticut is already doing this.

Through Connecticut, we got in contact with NLECC and said, "This makes a lot more sense. Let's just do it with the federal coordination instead of trying to come up with our own process." And it's not going to work for any of our border counties that border another state, ours may overlap with what the feds are assigning in another state or whatever that state chose to assign.

The guideline was passed around by Joann. It's in your folder. It's very simple, it's one double-sided page. It

basically says what I just talked about. Encryption is optional and to encrypt, contact NLECC, get assigned a KID, and CKR. They'll actually assign up to three KIDs for one CKR if you do over the air encryptions.

It's real simple and it doesn't impair or release anything about your encryption. It basically says, hey, I'm unique and I'm not going to overlap with anybody else.

The final version is ready for publishing. There's a resolution in here, a draft resolution, requesting the Board recommend it be published.

SPRAGUE: Comments or questions?

BLEYLE: A couple things on the procedure under "definitions". "Advanced encryption standards", the last two words there doesn't make sense. It probably should be state recommended form or standard.

On the last page, down under "technical parameters", it says, "Agencies purchasing radios capable of encryption". Should that -- where it says that you should procure radios with multiple encryption keys, does that specify -- I know the grants specify AES, but does it specify that you should multikey only in the grants and, if not, should it?

DELANEY: I don't think the grant specifies multikey.

GUEDKO: It does not. Just that it has to be AES.

BLEYLE: Okay. Should it specify multikey or no?

GUEDKO: We can discuss it, right?

SPRAGUE: Yeah. I mean, I would say if we do adopt this, then we probably should make that adjustment.

GUEDKO: Based on the resolution.

BLEYLE: The other thing I had is "Encryption is not permitted on VHF, UHF and 800 megahertz national interop channels", should we expand that to the state interop channels also?

DELANEY: You think it should be not allowed or --

BLEYLE: Well, should we -- it's not allowed on state interop channels, correct?

DELANEY: There is no FCC restriction on that. I'll have to double check. I don't think our guideline says it's not allowed on the --

BLEYLE: Should we not allow it?

DELANEY: I guess that's a discussion that we should have. Is it something we want to take advantage of? Just because we can't do it on the federal channels, do we want to have the ability to do it on state channels so that we have interoperable encryption or do we want to say, you know what, it's better not to have encryption at all on these channels so there is no chance of problems that arise from using encryption.

BLEYLE: From an interop standpoint, one of the things you

say in here, that is, if you use encryption, you should strap it. So, if somebody straps it on a state interop channel, it still goes interop.

DELANEY: Yes, unless you designate a particular channel to be -- so one thing we talked about, and it's not part of this guideline and we haven't circulated it or anything, we talked about, perhaps, a guideline that designates a particular 700 MHz TAC channel as encrypted so you can encrypt on P25 and it allows you to encrypt on a TAC channel.

If you talk about maybe designating one of them in New York as a common key, a 7TAC whatever to be the encrypted channel with a common encryption key so we can encrypt, so that's a thought, too. We haven't circulated anything yet.

TERRY: I think you should be able to encrypt at least one of the interoperable channels, because I could see the use for that.

WHITE: It was a challenge during the Dannemora detail having an encrypted channel that we could use in an interoperable environment. That's something we've struggled with to figure out a solution to. Frequencies are not easily mined. We've had some success trying to find some regional channels that we might use for an interoperable environment, but it's a need. Getting air was the channel and how we make it available to those law enforcement

agencies that need that for that environment is significant.

SPRAGUE: So let me try to summarize that. The first two points you made, I don't think there's any -- we can incorporate those right off the bat. I guess the third one, there's two options. Is it enough to hold this up and make that consideration or is that something we can use for further discussion and adoption at a different time?

BLEYLE: The third item was just a thought.

SPRAGUE: It's a good thought. I just wanted to keep that in this --

TERRY: I don't think you have to change it. It isn't permitted on the national interoperability channels. It doesn't even address New York interoperability channels.

DELANEY: The reason I put it in there is to remind people they have to be analog, which simply means -- I think your point, Bill, is that's something we definitely want to do one way or the other. If we have a guideline without those channels, we would incorporate that language into the guidelines to make it clearer if it's not.

SPRAGUE: Okay. Any other comments or questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: So what I would entertain is that we consider your first two changes as part of this. Does anybody have any objection to that? I mean, this has been out and I guess

what I'm trying to do is move this forward. I want to see if anybody objected to that. If not, do I have a motion to consider the resolution which would incorporate those changes?

TERRY: I'll make the motion.

SPRAGUE: We have a motion. Do I have a second?

BLEYLE: (Indicating)

SPRAGUE: Bill, okay.

Any discussion one way or the other?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. I'll call the question. All those in favor.

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. It's unanimous. Thank you. Thank you very much.

DELANEY: We'll get corrections made and we'll publish it.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Thank you. Citizens Alerting Committee. The next meeting scheduled for Citizens Alerting Committee is Tuesday, October 9th. We've already set that. There are a few things on the agenda, some that are to be considered just in the interim. There is a national test of the emergency alerting system and the

wireless WEA on September 20, 2018.

The state plan -- our state part of the plan has been finalized. It's ready to be posted. And right now, Dan Miller would have been here today, but he's working the midnight shift for the EOC right now. We'll get that out to everybody and he'll do a further presentation at the meeting.

The other thing out there right now is the feasibility study. You may have heard about this, 4383-A. It's implementing an emergency alert notification system that requires alerts to be displayed while using a video streaming service.

This is something that came to legislation last year that it goes to GPS and to DHSES. So, a little bit on the wireless test that's coming up. It's going to be at 2:18 followed by the EAS portion at 2:20. There have been notices that have gone out to the PSAPs at this point. We've also done some public information and we'll probably do some more as we approach it just to make sure people are aware this is going to go on.

This is the first time they're sending a WEA test message to the cellphones as part of the test. This is going to be a little different. It's been done before on regular media type stuff, but peoples' phones haven't gone off. This time around, they will.

They're doing it in collaboration with the broadcasters, emergency management officials. Cell towers will broadcast it and it will go out for approximately 30 minutes, which means that during that time frame, cellphones will pick it up, not every time. It's only going to go off once.

But WEA-compatible phones that are switched on, so if people haven't disabled it, and are within range of an active tower and whose wireless carrier participates should be capable of receiving this message.

So, a lot of people are going to go "What is my phone doing?" And we're all going to have to reassure them that it's supposed to do that, and don't turn it off. That's the other thing that they've been concerned about and one of the reasons why they haven't done these tests in the past is they don't want to encourage people to turn the phone off because it's bugging them. And that may be -- you'll have to watch that and see how that progresses.

What's it going to say? "This is a test of the National Wireless Emergency Alert System. No action is needed." Hopefully, everybody gets this part right here.

TERRY: Have they made concessions for phones that are logged onto Wi-Fi only instead of the mobile network?

SPRAGUE: That's a good question. I don't believe that those phones will go, because I think it's direct off the

tower. It's the geo location.

TERRY: So they're not going to push anything over IP networks?

DELANEY: So WEA, if a phone is on network and Wi-Fi both, you should receive it.

TERRY: You should get it. If you're Wi-Fi only, you're not going to get it.

DELANEY: Today, there is no standard or technology for like a mass IP or...

TERRY: Okay.

SPRAGUE: So I thought I'd put this slide in, because I was able to get it. Current IPAWS Alerting Authorities, Adoption Nationwide. It shows you where states are. And this also shows you what counties right now currently have the alerting authorities or the cogs to be able to push these alerts out.

One of the things we're pushing is trying to get every county so that they have the ability to do it. I mentioned the feasibility study. This is something that we're working on. It's a pretty interesting topic. Mike, if you want to chime in, you're more than welcome to or if you'd rather sit there and not say anything, that's even better. It's up to you. But basically, what it was, it's legislation that requires alerts to be displayed when using video streaming service.

This is a feasibility study.

Now, so video streaming service, that's what it means.

Looking at ways to ensure that the alert shall convey timely information concerning emergency incidents and stuff like that. There's a geographic component to it. It'll be displayed while you're using the video streaming service, which really starts to get kind of deep into the mechanics of how does video streaming work and there's a lot of details to that.

Examining how an ISP and video streaming services would ensure that. Any relevant federal, state and local laws. And you know, part of it would be recommending statutory changes if it's within our ability to do it.

There's a lot of what-ifs that go on in this process. One of the things we did is we reached out to IPAWS, because they have a mechanism already in place for WEA and some of those things. They gave us this really nice little graphic which I stole, which basically shows the public feed, public alert gateway and then they started looking at this very same thing as well.

And some of the conversations we've had with them, they're kind of struggling with this. They've had some real interesting discussions with some of the -- Microsoft and some of those folks, pretty high level. So, it's an

interesting thing.

Mike, anything you want to add to this?

ROWLEY: Only that we are working closely with you to get it done. There are some, I think, lofty goals.

Observations to be made about whether this should be a New York solution versus a national solution. There's very little oversight and jurisdiction of the carriers that provide streaming services. You wouldn't have to look too closely at our laws to see that we would need to do a whole overhaul or create new law to try to do some of the things that are going after that.

So, I think, you know, looking at the federal actions taking place and some of the movements, that they're obviously looking at this as a viable method to get these alerts crossed. I mean, everybody knows that video -- commercial video cable companies is on the decline. Programming is being migrated to other devices. So yes, there's obviously public benefit, but you know, feasibility comes with a cost and I'm not sure that cost is going to meet anyone's appetite at this point.

SPRAGUE: It's a very kind of interesting challenging concept to be looking at and that's kind of where we're at with it.

Any other questions on Citizens Alerting Committee?

GEHRER: Is there any coordination with the NY Alert for this IPAWS? Is there overlap there that should happen or shouldn't happen?

SPRAGUE: Yes is the short answer to that. NY Alert is actively working with IPAWS and pushing stuff into the IPAWS system from the federal side of things. It's kind of hand in glove as part of the actual activation process.

Anything else?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Steve Sharpe is the director for Genesee County 911 and he's also embarked upon his master's degree. And as part of his master's degree, he has developed a thesis, which is about that big, and he's asked to give us some of the excerpts from it, of what he's learned and the processes that he's gone through and it's much shorter than this. It's a really unique viewpoint and I thought it was -- you know, with the charge for this group and the people we have on it, it would be, you know, beneficial to, you know, hear what he's come up with and some of his thoughts on 9-1-1 leadership. So, we'll do that.

If you have questions or comments, we hold those to right after the end of the meeting and we can address them as soon as the meeting adjourns.

With that, thanks, Steve. I appreciate you offering to do

this for us.

SHARPE: Thank you for the opportunity. This was part of my doctoral dissertation. I'm taking 172 pages and about a 45-minute presentation and I'm going to try to shorten it to about 15 minutes with respect to time.

As Director Sprague said, I am the Director of Emergency Communications for Genesee County. We're going to be talking about 911 leadership and quality improvement.

As most of us in this room know, the first 9-1-1 call was made in 1968. It's kind of significant that we're only 50 years old. We've been practicing police, fire and EMS for about two or three millennia whereas 911 is really new. So, we haven't had a lot of experience and we don't have a lot of science behind what we do as a profession.

The quality of 911 matters and that's because if we don't do our job right, peoples' lives are in danger. Two examples are DeLong versus County of Erie and then Denise Amber Lee. I could get into it more, but just for the sake of time, we're going to keep moving.

The quality of service provided through PSAPs is actually inconsistent, and that's primarily due to a lack of mandatory standards of care at the national, state and local levels. Most PSAPs are governed by the local government, so there's not mandated standards. There's a lot of recommended

standards but not mandated standards. In 2015, the PSAP community created this new minimum standard for PSAP quality improvement. This APCO/NENA standard right here outlines how quality improvement should occur in PSAPs.

The thing about it is, it's a recommended standard. The good news is, it is a national standard. The thing that we face, and especially this Board faces, is which standards should we adopt, who controls which standards are adopted and then, more importantly, who's going to pay? Because usually when you start implementing standards, usually, money has to follow.

One of the things that my study took a look at was from evidence-based management theory perspective and that's the basing of managerial decisions on the best available evidence, the best available research, the best available data and the best practices that we've established over time. Right now, we have some limited research indicating that evidence-based management is useful for improving the quality of care that PSAPs provide but there's not a lot of research done on PSAP leadership.

As part of this project, we developed this PSAP standards model. And what it's doing is, it's showing there's multiple influences on your local PSAP or your local 911 center coming from national standards of care, federal

government, state government, there's all these different kinds of accreditation and this model reflects the different interactions.

Three things that are sitting outside the bubble so to speak, these are three external factors that none of us control. We don't control how technology is developed. Government just doesn't do that. We adapt to how technology gets developed, but most of the time, we're just reacting to it. Civil cases. We never know what civil case is going to be brought to bear, we never know what the jury's going to decide. So again, those are things that change how we do business. Then, critical incidents, things like 9/11, the Columbine shooting, they all changed how we react to emergencies.

In fact, the Parkland shooting changed how my county reacts to school fire alarms. Now, we're sending law enforcement on every school fire alarm. Those critical incidents that reached the national consciousness changed how we handle emergency response.

This all comes back to governance, what level of governance is required and, usually, that governance is tied to funding. And it's different for each state.

In some states, the state controls all the 9-1-1 centers, they staff all the 9-1-1 centers. In other states, there's

no control. It's a mixed bag.

Then, finally, how does accreditation influence what level of care or standard of care that we provide?

Just to put things in context, there's over 6,000 primary PSAPs in the United States right now. That was according to the United States PSAP registry downloaded back in the summer of 2017. In New York State, there's 191. Of those, there's 56 that are designated as county wireless PSAPs, and that excludes the City of New York. Again, this is off of summer last year.

In 2002, we established minimum standards for PSAPs. The biggest problem is or the biggest nuance to that is the way the law is currently interpreted, only the wireless PSAPs have to meet these standards.

And if you look back at the meeting board minutes of this very body, you've got a number of local members that say these standards should apply to all PSAPs, not just the wireless PSAPs.

The other thing about the standards is they haven't been updated since 2002 and things have changed quite a bit. And the current standards don't really address quality improvement. What we end up doing is we -- the main question is: How do PSAP leaders support effective implementation of quality care? Then, four sub-questions: How do we

measure quality? How do we define quality?

We ask: What are the factors that are involved in a quality improvement program? What helps a quality improvement program? What hurts a quality improvement program? Do local PSAP leaders think that the national standards are the appropriate standards to measure their performance or should they be local standards and personal experiential models? Then, finally, how do PSAP leaders' views align with evidence-based management theory?

So that was a lot of thinking. I looked at the current research out there and I'll tell you right now there's a lot on evidence-based practices and the effectiveness of practices, whether or not the diagnostic works, whether or not if you do certain things, you can improve compliance to evidence-based practices, tons and primarily out of the medical practice field because they have so much practice doing that.

We looked at business decisions and accreditation. We looked at call center reviews and how much importance those were. We looked at operational and organizational leadership, because the leadership of an organization will affect whether or not they adopt quality improvement practices and evidence-based management.

And then we looked at PSAP standards themselves. The

biggest thing missing in all the research was nobody was talking to PSAP leaders. No one was talking to the people doing this on a day-to-day basis.

Now, people are talking, but nobody did it in a scientific empirical manner. What we ended up doing is we talked to three former and nine current PSAP leaders. We did four focus groups right across the state with three attendees each, used a semi-structured, open-ended interview and the whole purpose of those interview questions was to point back to those research questions.

And then we did some data analysis. What we did is we take the transcripts and then we code them. We take little snippets of each transcript, figure out what codes to apply, then you go through this iterative process and those codes become categories, the categories become the theme and the theme is what I'm reporting to you today. "The biggest thing about defining quality in the 9-1-1 world, it really boils down to two things: Fast and accurate". It's the ability to use technology yet handle it when technology fails. So, you can't depend too much on it.

And then experience, "done it a thousand times". A thousand times means that you get better at it. But if you use your judgment and not follow the protocol, then it becomes a problem. So, it's following the protocol and experience all

at the same time.

Measuring quality, this was a surprise for me. "It's all arbitrary". That's a concern. If it's arbitrary from center to center, then we're not going to get a quality product that's consistent across the state. It's not because people are bad people, it just means that they don't know what they're doing wrong.

The biggest thing that came out was "it's important to have standards, state standards", and this is not me talking. Everything you see in quotes is from the participants.

"It's difficult in most instances because you need a formalized plan for review and calls". So how do you -- what are the factors that go into this? The biggest thing that came out was buy-in. You could have the best plan in the world, you could have the greatest standards, but if people don't want to follow you, your bosses don't want to listen to you or you yourself don't want to adopt those standards because it's just too much work, it's going to fail.

You need to have stakeholder engagement. If it doesn't, it's never going to work.

Training. I had a lot of comments on training, but I boiled it down to just one comment for this presentation, which is continuous training. You have to do it.

Staffing and time. Some things that were alarming: "We

don't have any QA or QI at all. Just don't have it. And that's because we don't have anybody to do it." "Formalized plan and the time to do them are a luxury because of funding." And supervisors then also popped up, the fact that a lot of our frontline supervisors are actually either just giving breaks, because that's all they do is just provide breaks, or they're doing frontline dispatching duties, they don't have time to do reviews sitting down with people and, again, do a qualitative review with those folks. And this was across multiple agencies, across multiple sizes of organizations.

Culture. "Successes are celebrated by all and so are the failures." It is not the Suzy Q dispatcher that failed, it is the dispatch center. It is not Joe Schmoe that did a good job, dispatch did a good job. Dispatch isn't listening to us, dispatch doesn't care. They're kind of collectively referred to, especially in agencies, referred to as a whole. In this, we have the good, the bad and the ugly. You have people at 9-1-1 centers, 90 percent of them are great people. I'd say actually 99 percent of them are great people. They got into the business because they want to serve. And when their houses are underwater, they're still showing up at the center, they're still sticking around, they're dispatching calls even though they don't know what's going on with their

own family because they care about the community. They're great people.

But then you have those one percent and it's hard to get rid of them. The reality is it should be hard for people to lose their jobs, because you don't want to be arbitrary and capricious, but sometimes it's really hard to get rid of the people who aren't meeting the standards.

Accreditation did come into play. The biggest thing that we saw is that by seeking accreditation, you force yourself to abide by the standards. This is a self-motivating factor. It's the agency's decision to choose somebody to get accredited and that's what kind of forces them to change their behaviors.

When we talk about standardization and whether or not local PSAP leaders felt that national standards should apply to the local situation, one of the biggest examples that we kept finding out was in EMD was the national standard that local PSAPs adopted and figured out, you know what, this works. We have a protocol, we follow the protocol and you know what? We save lives. And we adopt these things because we see the empirical evidence that we're saving lives and we're doing what we're supposed to do.

The other thing we found out is "APCO and NENA have great standards, but they're a template". The reason why the

template is important is because you have to apply your own local data with your own local demographics to that national standard and also your local resources. It's about balancing the national standards against your local situation and finding a way to mesh them together.

This is one of the biggest things that we found is: "You do your reviews, you do your evaluations, you measure everything and you take each and put it all together. If you don't use multiple tools, you're not doing it right." Our local PSAP leaders are using call data, being call to time of dispatch, they're using how long tones take. I mean, I had one guy walk me through how they change their tone set sequence just to get to the 90-second fire alerting -- NFPA. The funny thing is we got a bunch of like mini scientists working in our dispatch centers. It's great to see. One of the big things that came out that was a surprise was that dispatch is its own discipline. Again, we have millennia that practice police sciences, fire sciences and the medical sciences. We're just now getting into that first generation of scientists that are 9-1-1 professionals.

It was funny that one of our participants said, "you know what, as a dispatcher, you've got to know four disciplines. You've got to know police, fire, EMS and dispatch" and we're one of the few professions out there that is truly

multidisciplinary in nature. I like the 3-by-5 comment. Peers were very important. The biggest thing is, yeah, we're kind of normal, but it's also important for standards development. Every standards best practice that we have started out as some person just doing it a different way and then talking to their neighbor and saying, "How do you do it?" Those two talk together and they figure it out and they go regional and go state. The State Coordinators Association was very important in developing the standards as they exist today in New York State. It's these kinds of organizations that take a really good idea and elevate it and it's the peer review process that makes those best practices better. Governance is another thing that was a very big surprise. "Fifteen years ago, 57 9-1-1 coordinators in New York State say we don't need a 9-1-1 coordinator, we can do it on our own. We don't need the state telling us what to do. Well, that's changed, that's completely changed. Now, it's the complete opposite." And we need the coordination. The reason why we need the coordination is technology. I mean, we just can't keep up with it. NG 911 is one of those forces that's pushing this. The reality is if we try and do this all one county at a time, we're going to get it wrong or there's going to be a lot of mistakes along the way.

The reality is if you've got one county talking to a vendor, they're going to ignore you. I know that for a fact. When you have 62 counties talking back to you all at once and then the state behind you, all of a sudden, the vendors start listening. And this again comes back to standards development. We can do this, but we need to do it together. Some of the key findings: PSAP quality is this nebulous -- if I could have done a cloud graphic, I would but Microsoft Office is just being a pain with me. But it's fast and accurate. If you think of fast and accurate as a seesaw, the faster you go, the less accurate information you have or the more accurate the information is, the longer it takes. It's finding that balance and finding somewhere along this continuum where it's fast and accurate and hit somewhere in the middle.

Judgment and protocol. Again, you could have the best policy and procedure in the world and you're going to have that one incident that just doesn't fall within that policy and procedure and that's where judgment comes in. This is where your clinical judgment -- and when we talk about judgment, we're talking about clinical experiential judgment as a dispatcher that comes into play.

Now, if you have a dispatcher that does his own thing all the time and doesn't follow protocol, you have a problem.

If we're following protocol to the point where it becomes ridiculous, and I've seen that where people use EMD as a hammer against the caller, they just want to keep asking the same question over and over again because they don't like what the caller's telling them, then that becomes a problem. You need to find that balancing point.

Same thing with technology and as one of the participants said, you need to go old school. You need to be able to dispatch with, hand portable map, a piece of paper and a pencil and that's it. You need to be able to go old school and do it. Sometimes we rely too much on technology because we want the CAD to tell us what to do. Well, sometimes the CAD goes down. Sometimes the map freezes. You need to figure it out. You need to get people going.

What was really interesting and, again, going back to the research that I did, you know, all the way in Australia, they're making decisions whether or not somebody should be calling emergency services, going to the local emergency room or calling the doctor the next day.

And it's funny, because it's the same complaint that I hear from my dispatchers. Bosses are telling you to use your clinical judgment but, no, you need to follow the algorithms. So, it comes back to this line here. It's both. It's not one or the other. You need to use both. It's

computer-aided dispatch, not computer dispatch. It all comes back to that.

PSAP quality is inconsistently measured. Again, you need training, constant reinforcement and constant reviews. If you're going to get better, you need to know where your strengths are, but you also need to know where you're falling short. Again, it's not because our people are bad people. The reality is they just don't have the time, because it takes time, culture, staff and relationships.

First-line supervisors play that critical role. If you don't have them on your side for buy-in, it's not going to work, because reviews won't get done. They'll always have a reason not to do them.

To put it in perspective, training, reviews and accreditation, if you're doing those, you're going to have a good quality improvement program. If you don't have time, staffing or funding, you're not going to have a good quality improvement program.

Things that are neutral: Organizational culture and stakeholder engagement. That depends on the individual. That's the local part of this. If you're not talking to the agencies that you support, talking to your legislative bodies who are in charge of funding this and you're not talking to the people underneath you, you're never going to

succeed, and that goes both ways.

So, recommendations for this body, I have a whole bunch of recommendations from my study but I limited them just for this presentation.

Right now, we're getting \$10 million of \$185 million collected to the PSAPs, the people who are actually answering 9-1-1. That's a good thing. And as you saw from Larissa's presentation, we're pretty good at spending that money. We're really good at spending that money. The biggest thing, that's only 5.4 percent of the revenue that's collected. And if we're going to do what we need to do, we need to increase that to around 10 percent.

The problem is you can't just give the counties more money. You need to apply the standards at the same time. And you can't just apply the standards, because Tom Roche is screaming in my head and he will strike me down from heaven, if you create an unfunded mandate. Okay? And that's the truth. You cannot do one without the other. You have to have both.

And the biggest thing is we've proven it with SICG funding. If you went to the symposium this past April or listened to Larissa, if you look at the number of P25 systems in our state before SICG funding and what we have now, there's a huge difference. And the reason why we have more P25 systems in

the state right now and we have better interoperability now is because we tied standards to funding. And when you tie standards to funding, you create accountability and you also create an alignment of priorities.

And this is where this body has a unique opportunity; we're going to get more money because of prepaid wireless surcharges. I've already seen it in my county as far as the revenue that we're bringing in. If we balance these two, we can get the 10 percent without really hurting the state budget and still meeting the standards.

Another thing is we need an inspection regime. We need to make sure that people are actually doing, physically doing, what they say it is they're doing.

I know it's tough, it all goes back to the whole trust but verify. I used to be a weapons inspector. You know what? If you don't inspect, people are going to move things along and maybe something gets left alone for too long, something that should be addressed gets put on the back burner too long and that's why we need that inspection regime.

Another thing is we need more data. One of the ways that we can collect that data is you got a great survey tool. One of the reasons why I don't have a lot of quantitative data is because as a single researcher trying to do this project, I would have had to have 52 of the 56 counties reply to a

survey for me to make statistical significance.

In other words, I could have collected the data, but it wouldn't have meant anything, because I didn't have enough data points to attach significance to it mathematically. Well, guess what? You've got the operations application form. The biggest thing, we've gotta clearly state that the data does not impact the current funding algorithm.

If we just start messing with the funding algorithm, I'm pretty sure Sheriff Voutour and Bill will come at me with sharpened sticks. We don't want to affect the current algorithm but what we want to do is use that data to project what the new funding stream and what those allocations will be.

So, this is the third part of this. If we don't collect the data, then we're not going to know if we're headed in the right direction and we're also not going to know if we're accomplishing our goals. So again, that data is used to inform this body to make policy decisions and you need both quantitative and qualitative data.

In my study, I've got kind of a preview of the data that you want to collect. I already previewed the survey. It works. The next step is to incorporate that into the next round of PSAP Operations grant applications. And the State Coordinators Association, 911 Coordinators Association,

fire coordinators, emergency managers, Sheriffs associations, you need to let them know that we're asking these questions, we want you to be truthful and it's not going to affect the current funding. We're collecting data so, that way, we can make better policies and procedures. The full dissertation, if you really are bored and want to fall asleep, it's right there. My contact information is right here any time you want it. Do you have any questions at this point?

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Steve.

SHARPE: Oh, yeah, you were waiting until the end.

SPRAGUE: Yeah, I appreciate that. When he asked to do this, I wanted to give him the opportunity. You know, Steve is kind of indicative of some of the talent that we have out there in our 9-1-1 center. Between the directors and between the people that are out there working, we've got some amazing resources and talent out there in these centers. Steve has taken it upon himself to go on ahead and get his master's degree and do this, all on his own, literally at his initiative. And I think it, is worth hearing him out to get that information and, we'll continue to listen. And these guys are actually on -- he's actually on our advisory committee, so you know, there's a lot of talent out there and we're going to make sure we keep listening to him. I

really appreciate it. Thank you very much.

SHARPE: Thank you, sir, for the opportunity.

SPRAGUE: With that said, we have one last thing on the agenda, Grant Regional Workshops. And Nicole, are you up?

ERICKSON: I am. Just quickly from my seat, so on behalf of our director of grants program administration, we just wanted to inform you that our October event is our DHS regional workshop. These are five regional workshops; these are throughout the state. Our invite goes out to county and city officials, local law enforcement agencies, emergency management offices, fire departments and other agency officials.

It's really an opportunity for us to be able to discuss Homeland Security initiatives at the state, discuss some of the grant funding, how that plays out in terms of DHS requirements, FEMA requirements. We also provide an opportunity for all of our offices to present as well. You will hear from our Office of Counterterrorism, OIEC will be there, our Office of Emergency Management, our Office of Disaster Recovery Program as well as the State Preparedness Training Center.

The locations this year, our first location is in Buffalo and that meeting is going to be hosted on October 10th. That will be at the Buffalo Niagara Marriott.

Our Syracuse meeting will be on October 11th and that's at the Crowne Plaza in Syracuse.

Our Long Island meeting will be at the Long Island Marriott in Uniondale, and that's on October 18th.

Our Hudson Valley meeting will be at the Best Western in Kingston, and that's on October 24th.

And then our Lake George meeting will be at the Courtyard Marriott in Lake George, and that's on October 25th.

More information in terms of registration details and information will be sent out shortly. They just issued the dates today, so please keep those dates in mind.

SPRAGUE: Thank you, Nicole. I'd like to, recognize Ryan and Nicole both, because they're our main contacts with our grants division and they are a tremendous resource for us with our grants and we greatly appreciate that. So, we wanted you to hear it first here, hot off the presses. We talked about the symposium, so we can move right into closing remarks.

The next meeting is going to be November 28th. That will be our next meeting. And from there, we also build our meeting agenda for the next year, so we'll work on that. There's one other thing that we'd like to do. Brett, I'll let you do that.

CHELLIS: Oh, thank you. I'd like to recognize -- I

mentioned Cheryl Benjamin earlier in my presentation on the Next Generation 911 Working Group and how important her work has been both at the state level and the national level and moving GIS forward for NG 911, and her chair of the NENA working group and her coordination of what was initially a project; the NG 911 GIS project became a program at the GIS office which Bob, of course, can attest to.

Cheryl is retiring effective next week and I feel that although she's retiring from state service, I hope she'll stay involved in the national platform, however, you know, that's obviously up to her. But I think we should as a Board, I'd like the Board to recognize her service to the state and to NENA and thank her for moving New York forward and being a leader in the country and developing GIS for NG 911. And if Bob would take that back to her.

GEHRER: I certainly will.

SPRAGUE: So we'll make sure that's reflected in the minutes. We'll send her the fact that we recognized her at the board meeting and thanked her for her service and a letter to follow up. Very good. Anything else for the good of the order?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay, very good. Motion to adjourn?

MEMBER: Motion.

SPRAGUE: Motion made to adjourn. Second?

MEMBER: Second.

SPRAGUE: Over there. All those in favor.

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed can stay. Thank you very much.

* * * * *

(Concluded at 12:19 p.m.)

* * * * *

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

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

Theresa L. Ardia

Theresa L. Ardia

Dated: September 18, 2018.