**STATE INTEROPERABLE & EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 5, 2020
DHSES - Building 7A - First Floor Training Room**

SPRAGUE: Good morning, everyone. Let's call the State Interoperable Emergency Communications Board meeting to order. I want to welcome everybody here. We managed to find a really nice February day. I don't think the two of them go together, but it's a balmy day in February, so, we'll take it.
First off, we'll call for the roll call.

Board Members Present:
Michael Sprague
Brett Chellis
Charles White
David Kislowski
Richard Anderson
Kevin Spawn
Brian LaFlure
Bob Terry
Richard Tantalo - via telephone
Michael Volk
Allen Turner
Anthony Tripp
A. Wesley Jones
Ryan Greenberg

Board Members Absent:
Johanna Sullivan
Kimberly Beatty
Diane Marie Armbruster

GUESTS:
Nicole Erickson
Chris Tuttle
Mike Rowley
Kevin Hughes
James Callahan
Brittany Gordon
Gerald Engstrom
David Cook
Phil McGeough

Joann Waidelich
Matt Gianquinto
Jay Kopstein
Kevin Hughes
Chris Meyer
Ryan Lamothe
Mark Balistreri
Kew Sill

SPRAGUE: Very good. Thanks, everybody. A couple of things. I apologize right upfront for our audio -- or our visual. We're still struggling with the same computer screen as we had last time. We're in the process of replacing all this; however, I'm not sure at which meeting we're going to get to before it's replaced. It is in the process, so bear with us. We understand the one behind me is easier to see, so we'll continue to work through that.
I just wanted to let everybody know that they didn't miss a memo about formal dress today. Brett showed up in full dress uniform, because our deputy fire administrator is retiring this afternoon and they're going to do an official walk-out for him this afternoon at 2:00 o'clock, and Brett is dressed in style.
Let's see. How about adoption of the minutes of the last meeting?
TRIPP: So moved.
SPRAGUE: Got a motion.
JONES: Second.
SPRAGUE: And a second.
Any discussion, changes, edits?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: All those in favor.
(Affirmative responses.)
SPRAGUE: Anyone opposed?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: And the motion carries.
Adoption of the agenda. You have the agenda in front of you. It's pretty straightforward.
TRIPP: So moved.
SPRAGUE: Motion made. Do I have a second?
TERRY: (Gesturing)
SPRAGUE: Thank you. Second. All those in favor.
(Affirmative responses.)
SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: Okay, very good. I'm going to run through a couple of different things. First off, please put your

phones on stun. If you have to take a call, feel free to go out in the hallway and do that. If there is a fire alarm, we will exit out through this doorway, out through the lobby and we'll go up between the cars out of the way so that the fire apparatus can approach the building and we'll do accountability out there. Restrooms are directly across the hall. Ground rules, I'll go through those quickly.

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 the 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 discussion.

If a board member is unable to attend in person or by video conference, his or her designee may attend the meeting and vote on behalf of the member, unless they are an appointee not representing a state agency.

Just an additional piece, we do have this on live video conference now. If someone wants to participate, they can see it live. And the other side of this is we can record it and post it on our website, so you can cure insomnia later on if you want to bring up one of the presentations, it should nod you right off to sleep.

With that, we'll move right along. And you have a treat today if I can make this thing move. The benefit is the next presentation, it says Larissa, but it's actually me. And for some reason, it's jumping through this and saving them all up, which is kind of interesting. And there's no way I'm going to be able to read this even if I stand close.

Essentially, this is kind of an overview of where we are with the grants at this point in time. It shows what the spend-down is currently on our grants. As you go down through, you'll see Round 4, we still have a little bit open out there. And then it works its way down through the rest of them.

2019 has just been issued, so that's on the board but, obviously, nothing's been spent so far. And our grant folks are in the back there. We continue to encourage everybody to spend down on these projects. This is the overview of the PSAP grant. And for the most part, everything's spent down. We have last year's that has a portion yet to be credited, but I assume that that's in the works. Usually, that's a pretty easy one to get

spent down.

We have one of the targeted grants out, Phase 1 of that. We're working on Phase 2 of that right now and hope to get that out very shortly. Our anticipated schedule for this year, I think Larissa's trying to be optimistic on this and put May-June. I'd like it to say May and June in succession so that we get the first one out in May, and then the SICG formula in June.

It slipped last year and as soon as it started to slip, it just kept slipping all the way to fall, and I don't want that to happen. That's one of the things that's important is we make sure we get these things out so that the counties can get them in their budgets, and understand what they're going to be dealing with, rather than waiting until after their budgets are already put together. We hear that loud and clear.

Last year, it just kept sliding and it was very difficult. Once it starts, it's hard to get that momentum back. That's why I'm going to -- if this was my slide, I'd be editing that, so it just said May and June.

And then the targeted is a rolling ongoing. My anticipation is that we'll have this next round out shortly and then we'll do another one probably towards fall. That's my understanding of that.

One thing I want to add, and she didn't put it in here, she told me to remember it, you guys can vouch for me that I'm doing it.

The federal grants now are anything you put into a federal grant that has communications involved with it, has to come and be run through and approved by the SWIC. It's one of the things they've added to the federal grant component now. If you do communications related stuff, they want to make sure that it fits in with SAFECOM guidance and also with what the state is doing as far as grant operations go. Did I get that right?

ERICKSON: Yes, you did. And just a note on that. We have received word that we're expecting our federal guidance to be out mid-February. That's the projection. They have 60 days from the date of the federal appropriations to be able to release our grant guidance. For our counties that receive FASP funding, that's expected very shortly. We're trying to do our best to push things out as quickly as we can.

SPRAGUE: A plug for the grants office, they do a great job of trying to help maximize the grants. There are certain things that we can do that are covered under our state grants. There are certain things that are not

allowed under the federal but also may complement what happens in the state grants. They do a good job of trying to help piece that together.

It's not always easy but, you can take advantage of the way the -- what's available and what's allowed within the grants to maximize your ability to add to your communications system.

They were announced, the counties are submitting the budgets on the formula at this point for contract development. That's still in the process. The awards are announced on the PSAP and we're going to be doing the first quarter of 2020 for the other. We're up to about $540 million now as far as what's been put out in the last 12 years, 13 years.

Statistics. These are just a few things that she put in. It's interesting. As the systems are building out, and as the counties are networking, there's some interesting synergies going on. Right now, 39 counties are monitoring National Interop CALLing channels.

That's based on what we have from the grants themselves. National CALLing and TACtical Interoperability channels are installed on 311 towers across the state. 75 percent of the counties are utilizing SICG-formula grants for upgrading their Customer Premise Equipment in their PSAPs.

And 34 counties now have operational Text-to-911. Six more have been added from last year. That's just some little things and tidbits that we pick up out of the grants as we move along. But those are big milestones, each one of those.

Interoperability repeaters must be off when not in use. That's our mantra anymore. We keep running into situations; there was one last week they tried to activate downstate and there was another one in New Jersey that was interfering. And it finally got turned off, and they were able to use it, but it made a rather interesting e-mail string that popped up.

That's one of the things, we're going to keep talking about that, because as we get more of these out there, we need to make sure they stay off until you're using them. And there's a process to let people know you're using them, so that we can all coordinate for them.

Yes, Ryan.

GREENBERG: I understand timing is probably some of these factors, but when we look at 39 counties monitoring national interoperability and the 34 counties that are using Text-to-911, what's the gap on the remaining counties in the state that they're not using?

Is it just time? Is it resistance? Is it --
SPRAGUE: I think it's time. They're in projects of some type or another. I think everybody is gradually working to get that done. One of the things I've asked Larissa to do is give us an updated map that shows where these things are. That's part of I think what she's putting together here, because I think a picture is worth a thousand words.
Which tower sites, which gaps do we have, we're still working that. I know a number of counties that, we've already funded and they're in the process of building systems. That would be my suspect as to what the holes are at this point.
I don't think there's any direct resistance, anybody saying, no, we don't. I think everybody wants to. It's just the case of getting to a point. And it's not as simple as just putting up a repeater. It's the backhaul, the tower sites, all the stuff that supports it that can be difficult.
GREENBERG: Thank you.
SPRAGUE: Any other questions on this?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: Okay, very good. And that would be Larissa's report.
Standing committee reports. 911 Advisory. Wes.
JONES: Good morning. A couple weeks ago, January 22nd, our committee met with Director Sprague, Counsel Callahan at Oriskany and we discussed the draft 911 standards for the state. It was a very productive meeting.
We were waiting for some guidance from counsel in regard to what we could do and what we couldn't do. We started the meeting with a real good discussion regarding what he saw as the issues, what we wanted him to understand we were trying to do.
After a while, we came to an understanding where both sides were at. And then after that, for about four hours, we plugged through the document and came to a general understanding as to where we're at.
The biggest change from what we had proposed is that there were certain standards in there that we -- or certain things that we put into the standards that were considered more recommendations than not, directives, if you will. Because these are standards, we'll have to remove those. We're going to create a second document that will probably be best practices or recommendations, those type of things.
Just giving an example, in our director levels, 911

director levels, we have people that have come up
through the 911 system, and then you've got larger
agencies where the folks are political appointees they
may not have institutional knowledge. There are certain
courses or programs that we thought would be applicable
but maybe not to everybody.
Some of those things are being pulled out and will go
into a separate document, and we'll probably expand upon
that document some other best practices that we think
will be helpful for PSAPs.
Right now, it's back in Jim's lap. He's finalizing what
we discussed at that meeting. He's going to get it back
to us. We're going to read through it one more time,
and my hope is that we can push this forward. I think we
have an April meeting, whenever the next meeting is, to
be out before that, it can be brought before the board
here at that meeting.
SPRAGUE: April 29th.
JONES: The schedule looks good in terms of that. We're
just waiting for Jim to produce that to us. Then we'll
go back through it one more time to make sure that
everything's there, and we'll have an official draft.
A second item: A lot of people are probably not aware
of this outside of the 911 communities. Our committee
has some concerns, and 911 coordinators have some
concerns, regarding a bill that's currently making its
way through the Legislature. It's Assembly Bill 08952.
There's a senate version of it also.
The bill would -- there's a specific part of the
Executive Law 717-A that directs the calls made from
landlines and multi-line telephones go directly to a 911
PSAP.
This bill that's out there would amend the Executive Law
and the education portion of it that would allow calls
from public buildings of SUNY or CUNY campuses to direct
those calls to a security office instead of a 911 PSAP.
Our committee had significant concerns in regard to
that. This bill has -- there is a three-way agreement
on it. As we understand it, it has passed the senate
and is now before the assembly.
Our biggest concern is the calls are not going to an
actual 911 PSAP. They're going to go to a security
office who do not have to meet the 911 standards. We
don't know who's going to take these calls, whether
these people are trained; are they able to do emergency
medical dispatch; are they just going to take a call and
transfer it?
If you look in the 911 standards, it specifically states

the definition of a PSAP and things like that. And I think that that goes back to the first part in regard to the 911 standards. Right now, as you know, our 911 standards by law only apply to wireless PSAPs. As the state finally develops and gets a draft 911 plan and we take a bite at the -- probably one bite at changing some legislation in regard to implementing that, the intent and our hope would be that the standards that are being developed would apply to all PSAPs and that if you're going to take 911 calls that you would have to meet the standards, whether you're primary, secondary PSAP, whatever. From a committee standpoint, that's absolutely our intent.

The other concern in regard to this bill is there is a federal law that goes into effect on February 16th called Kari's law, which is also tied to the Ray Baum's Act. For those who aren't familiar, Kari Dunn was a mother who was killed in a hotel room in Texas in 2013 by her estranged husband. Her three children were in the hotel room. One of them attempted several times to dial 911, but at that hotel, you had to dial 9 first.

The specific intent of Kari's law was to remove that, so that if you dial 911 it dials directly to a 911 PSAP and removes any type of prefix. It's a direct dial.

But the specific law or specific portion of Kari's law says that calls from multi-line telephone systems, MLTS's, will be delivered to a 911 PSAP.

I guess in some point, it is open to interpretation as to whether this law would be in violation of that and whether the FCC would choose to act on that or not.

We'll see as it potentially gets implemented.

But I wanted to bring that to the attention of the board, because at least from our standpoint, it's a significant issue. It obviously is not going to get the attention that, say, bail reform might have from our community. It's certainly a significant issue. And the other concern being that it's potentially opening up a Pandora's box.

Once you crack a door, it's a whole lot easier to then push it all the way, and who else wants to take calls instead of them being directed to PSAPs. I think that's it.

SPRAGUE: I asked Jim if he would just go through a mechanical clarification of where we are with these particular bills, if you don't mind attacking that one.

CALLAHAN: Yeah, sure, no problem. Wes gave a good summary of essentially where we are right now. There are a few elements I want to hit on again or emphasize a

slightly different way; one is with Kari's law, in particular.

The direct dial requirement for 911 calls on multi-line telephone systems, one caveat of Kari's law that's important to keep in mind is the way they design the implementation is that it's like a rolling, forward-looking implementation that applies to multi-line telephone systems that are manufactured, imported, for sale, sold or installed after the effective date.

It's not a requirement that makes everyone have to change their systems right away. The requirements are going to be changing systems over time as they get installed or updated. Like a rolling implementation.

Then, with the New York State law, the original version of the state, similar requirement for 911 direct dialing was signed into law back on December 20th of last year, was given an effective date of coming into effect 90 days after that. That means the New York State version will be coming into effect on March 19th. And as Wes mentioned, because the modification to that bill has not yet been passed, right now, it's just on March 19th, it'll be the state of affairs that multi-line telephone systems in public buildings across the board will have to connect to 911 public service answering points. However, if this modification is passed, then, indeed, public buildings that are under the control of the board of directors of SUNY or CUNY will be permitted to have their 911 calls connect to on-campus answering points. Now, as to the question of whether or not that may be inconsistent with Kari's law, it's important to keep in mind that both Kari's law provisions say that nothing in this section is intended to alter the authority of state commissions, or other state or local agencies with jurisdiction over communications if the exercise of such authority is not inconsistent with the act, it only preempts things that are inconsistent.

And as part of that, the definition of PSAP that applies to Kari's law in implementing regulations is fairly broad saying an answering point that's been designed to receive 911 calls and route them to emergency services personnel. Leaving some wiggle room there. That's where we are right now. If there's anything else you want me to cover, let me know.

SPRAGUE: Okay. I wanted Jim to walk through that and clarify it, because I have heard different versions of where things stood and it's interesting that it still has to be modified. It has not been acted upon as you

mentioned. I think that's some important clarification. If it doesn't get acted upon, then it won't change. There's a number of different pieces. And then, neither of the laws are explicitly clear as usual, because laws are written by folks that don't know all the details, and some of the finer details get lost in the translation.

I just thought it was important to get a good clarification from Jim on that. That's the status of where that is. And I agree with you; our meeting with Jim went very well. I think we got some good headway. And I think the intent there is that we, once we go through this, will have some standards that we can enact and then also have on record as supporting the best practices or the suggested guidelines with the intent that somewhere down the road here, we're going to have to go for changes in legislation; we know that.

Part of this is making sure that we capture everything that we need to have changed over the next period of time, whatever that is, until we get to that point to make those changes none of this stuff gets forgotten. Because we want to make sure that we -- we're only going to get one bite at this apple. We want to make sure we do it right.

We want to make sure we collect all these different things that we're going down through, that we list them somewhere that we can include them all when we get to that point.

We could go after a change for this, but then if we came back with something else, it would be very difficult to push it through. I think it behooves us to make sure we get this sorted out so when we do make the change, which we know is coming, that we get it all at one time.

Anymore comments, questions?

TURNER: I have a question.

SPRAGUE: Yes, sir.

TURNER: Regarding the SUNY/CUNY possible legislation, do we know the basis of why that, or who, what the reason for it is? Is it to retain jobs at security offices, anything like that?

SPRAGUE: I don't believe we receive any feedback as to the intent behind it. Do we?

CALLAHAN: With the proposed legislation, there's a justification section from the legislators that put it forward. In that justification section, what they mention is that, typically, on-campus services can respond to on-campus emergencies much more quickly and efficiently than a nearby PSAP. This chapter amendment

clarifies that the SUNY and CUNY institutions that route
calls to answering responses can continue to do so. At
least, in the eyes of the legislative board, the idea is
response time, if they're dispatching on campus already,
they might have resources that could get there promptly
depending on the situation.
GREENBERG: SUNY and CUNY schools, I know a lot of them
have state police, state university police. Are they
PSAPs that are answering that or just security or
secondary PSAPs?
CHELLIS: By definition, they are not PSAPs, because
they're not tied to the 911 system. But the MLTS, the
multi-line telephone systems, on campus do in many of
the these, especially the larger university centers,
already go to those university police dispatch points.
Some of them have EMS services on campus, some of the
campuses -- the community colleges and all of them, they
have to reach off-campus to get those services.
But they are technically not PSAPs, because in all
cases, the wireless calls are already going out to the
911 centers.
And then, depending on what's needed, what the nature of
the call is, it's either transferred to the university
police or, if it's a fire call, usually, they're
dispatching fire direct out of the PSAP.
It all depends on the size of the campus and what
services they have. But on the larger campuses, today
and historically, the MLTS is rang to the university
police on campus.
And this law in December changed that to make them go
out to the 911 center similar to where the wireless
calls are going; however, this amendment would put it
back on campus. I think that's in reality what's
happened.
The concern is that the standard of care, EMD and
whether or not, as Wes said, the university centers have
the same standard of care as a 911 center.
GREENBERG: Do we think that's what's driven this,
though, from that point of view, saying this is the way
that happens today when they're calling in, this law
would possibly change this. Now, all of a sudden, this
bill comes up and is bringing it back to them. Is that
possibly what maybe drew up this to be presented?
SPRAGUE: It's hard to know exactly what's in those
comments. I think one of the key things to keep in mind
here is, as with anything in New York State, there are
all different sizes of these things. It's done
differently in a lot of different places depending on

the size of the campus, the services that are at the campus, and what counties are out there, and how their connections are.

I mean, there is a permissive piece of this, maybe that's what their thought was. I can't really speak to that. But one size doesn't fit all is typically what happens in New York in a lot of places. The overall intent of this doesn't fit a lot of small campuses that don't have those resources on board. It's one of those question marks. And that's one of the things thatwe're encouraging. All the 911 coordinators, and everyone in the counties, to take a look at this thing and be aware of it. So, depending on which way it goes. As we know, it's not a done deal yet. Any other comments or questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. Thank you. 911 Working Group. You're up, sir.

CHELLIS: I'd like to thank the Chair for his comments at the beginning of the meeting. It's the first time I've ever been told I was dressed in style.

The first slide is a summary of where we are. The activities to date of the working group has been right from the inception when this board created the working group back in 2016.

We've worked down through a number of steps and have been attending a number of meetings, both NASNA, NENA, been very involved. We've had in-person meetings and numerous regularly scheduled calls.

The draft plan, the framework was developed, the input and review process, stakeholders throughout the state, amendments, updates and it's been presented for executive review.

We've now moved into a phase while that is in process, a PSAP data collection process which we've taken underway so that what we do is prepare for what we hope will begin the next phase of this, which is developing an RFI or RFP for Next Generation 911 ESInet and core services.

The data collection is going to involve collecting from all 176 PSAPs throughout New York State, and that includes the primary PSAPs, secondary, backup PSAPs, the respective counties or cities, and what we call tertiary PSAPs if they are to be considered to be part of the Next Gen 911 system.

We just had a long conversation about the university police dispatch points on campuses. An example the committee's been talking about is the Thruway, State Police Thruway dispatch point. All day long, counties

are transferring 911 calls that they receive from
motorists to a dispatch center on a 10-digit line that
the State Police conduct for the Thruway Authority that
manages the Thruway and emergency response on the
Thruway; should that be considered to be included and
made a PSAP as part of the Next Gen system, if they're
going to be taking calls and dispatching.
The large university centers, if this amendment goes
through and they may become responsible for taking the
dispatch and emergency services, should they be
included. These are questions, we don't have the answer
to yet, but that's what I mean by tertiary centers.
They could be considered emergency communication centers
in the future to be included.
We want to collect data on all of these things so that
an educated decision can be made down the road and
working with the respective counties and what works best
for those counties in the emergency service provision
within those counties.
As the director said, one may not fit all, one size shoe
may not fit all. It depends probably on the situation
and the local aspects of emergency response.
We feel that this will be efficient in collecting this
data while we are finalizing the plan and, that way, we
can move forward.
That summarizes the whole thing, what I just said, and
how it will be useful in the RFI and RFP process should
we be granted the approval to move forward with the plan
and concepts as it is written.
Sample data that we'll be collecting includes,
obviously, the name of the PSAP, who the authority
having jurisdiction is, is it managed by the county,
Sheriff's Office, a city, town, village, who is the
authority, and the proper contact info.
Other examples, including who's the 911 provider, where
the selective routers are, where the trunks currently to
serve the PSAP are located, so we understand the
physical architecture as it works today. Through the
whole transition of legacy to NG services, the proper
processes and everything can be designed so that both
systems has to be -- the new system has to be built up
and the current legacy kept live until all the
transitions are made. It's a lot of design and process.
Also, the existing physical environment, the equipment,
the call handling equipment, and including make, model,
version and so on; the number of CAMA trunks currently
serving the PSAP; their call volumes, because that has
to do with how big a pipe you need to design for the

future, what the call volume is in that particular area; and what their current text-to-911 solution is. Is it an over-the-top, a workaround of the current 911 system, a temporary type thing, or is it embedded in the current 911 system and upgraded to handle texts?

These are all important questions that need to be determined for every single PSAP in the state in order to spec out what is required for an NG system.

CAD systems. Although a purist would say CAD doesn't have anything to do with NG 911, you know, NG 911 is taking the call, not dispatching it, we are taking a wholistic approach to NG 911.

Because operation is just as important as the technical delivery of the call. And the ability to dispatch the services and for interoperability between PSAPs requires a look at CAD systems in order to manage call flow and be on the same plane and able to work together in the whole ecosystem of emergency dispatch.

As far as the timetable on this collection, we're leaving it open, as long as it takes to get the data, get it right, and make sure it is accurate and is consistent in its meaning and content. The director plans on briefing the consortium chairs in a meeting next week on this, and we're going to brief the 911 coordinators at our symposium, 911 coordinators meeting in March and the data collection period will immediately follow.

Then there's going to be a time of review, compilation and we may have to go back to certain county 911 coordinators to tweak the data or if we have questions or correct something that we see may not be right or whatever to make sure everything is as accurate as we need it and we get the picture we need across the state. That is the whole process that we see moving forward.

I wanted to take a minute before I conclude and just mention the NENA 911 standards and best practices conference two weeks ago. Three members of the working group attended that, myself, Matt Campbell from NYSTEC, and also present was Dave Hopkins, the Steuben County 911 coordinator, and the NENA chapter president for New York State.

And just in there, if you can read the micro writing, is the topics that were included. This is a conference where NENA which is -- I'm not going to say they're the only standards writing organization. There are other players in the playbook for 911 services. However, NENA wrote the I3 standard which most of Next Gen 911 abides by, and many standards that are being used in the

implementation of GIS and full NG 911 system.

All these workshops have to do with the different elements of 911, not just NG 911 but 911 as a whole, and the services that we provide both operationally and technically.

You can see there's close to seven workshops just on GIS. That is such an important part of NG 911 in terms of call routing and dispatch of services. So, very, very informative. And what we did yesterday was we -- in our working group, we used one of these sessions and we laid out in detail what was learned and had discussions from the working group based on what we brought back. And we plan on continuing to do that on the calls with some of the important topics that the working group has identified that they want to go over and drill down into for more information.

Talking about GIS, I asked Gerry Engstrom from New York State ITS to just give an update on the GIS subcommittee if the Chair would recognize him.

SPRAGUE: Yes.

ENGSTROM: Good morning. We had a full meeting Monday, I believe, with the GIS subcommittee. The biggest items I have to report to everyone at this point are that we continue to collect PSAP boundaries across the state for the different municipalities.

We are in the process of expanding the user group. We have been contacted by several counties, GIS people that would like to join the GIS subcommittee to assist with pulling the PSAP boundaries and just become more involved.

The Central New York consortium has joined, so Madison, Lewis, Oneida, Onondaga, I think that's most of them. And the GIS coordinator from Washington County has also asked to join. As word continues to get out about this, more people are becoming interested in it, which is great, especially for Chris and me. As co-chairs, it helps us to gather more information easily and makes gathering up the information for nonparticipants just a little bit easier so that they can communicate with their neighbors and moving forward, edge matching, which will become increasingly important, just improvement on the data will help out. So, it's a good thing. Word's getting out, more people and data is starting to come in now. We are making headway.

CHELLIS: Great. We're lucky to have this group in New York so proactive and embedded in the whole process, because talking to my counterparts around the country in other states, you know, many states lack a GIS component

and they're struggling in trying to figure out whether they're going to reach out to a private vendor for GIS services, or wait for a vendor to provide that. We're very lucky, lucky that this group has put together representatives from the counties.

Just like the working group itself, we have stakeholders from around the state. It can be built from the bottom up instead of the top down. I think it will be much more meaningful and beneficial to the local counties. Thank you, Gerry.

ENGSTROM: Thank you.

CHELLIS: Any questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I'll start this and then see if CIWG shows up afterwards. Public Safety Broadband. Matt is not here today, so I'll run through it.

Essentially, we held a WebEx last week and went through a number of different things that we talked about, lessons learned, our observations from different events, discussions of requests, deployments, processes, how to review those, some nationwide New York-specific updates from AT&T as far as how their systems are developing out, the first responder network authority. We had our own Dave Cook on and did a section on the FirstNet authority. We updated information on Verizon Wireless and we had an open discussion on projects, experiences, and different things from the counties and agencies.

There was some different parts and pieces that came out in this about what's being developed from AT&T and FirstNet, some of the new things that are coming along. We had an interesting review of some of the after action requests that we've done. We had an actual after action that was done with the FirstNet authority and a process that they're using for that, which we thought went very well. There are some issues. They can do the after action, however, whatever their findings are, they can't share it because it's covered in the contractual issues with AT&T. I thought it was a very worthwhile experience and they're willing to do that with anybody that has a request for services.

They're also willing to come out ahead of time and sit down and plan out your request for services from a first responder's perspective, not from a cellular provider perspective.

The cellular providers are worried about covering a whole lot of people. FirstNet is worried about making sure your operations work, and that's different than covering a whole lot of people. It's interesting that

we went through some of that.

That was the gist of the conversation. It lasted just about an hour and there was a lot of good feedback back and forth.

These working groups seem to be pretty beneficial, I think, for people to catch up on what's going on we keep trying to share those as we move forward.

Any questions on the broadband public safety working group?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. Well, we'll keep hunting around here and see if we can find the CIWG one. It's in the deck here some place.

State Agency Communications Working Group. Essentially, we had a meeting on November 15th. We went through, finalized the rapid deployment document. We distributed the radio channel use agreement. That's where we are sitting right now.

Chuck, did you get in many of those responses back on the channel use agreement?

WHITE: Yeah, that's been squared up with our agency. I think the next step would be to schedule the next meeting with the working group and work out the mechanics from here.

SPRAGUE: Okay, very good. The next piece of that would be training, and then working on exercising the actual operations. So, stand by, we'll have another working group meeting shortly and then we'll give you more of an update on that.

Citizens Alerting Committee. Okay, I'll keep moving and then we'll let you clean up; how's that?

Citizens Alerting Committee. We have not had a meeting. We're going to have one on the 26th of February.

However, there is a lot of stuff going on right now from the alerting perspective. Our agency with New York State OEM is conducting monthly tests and the monthly tests now are happening. In November, the alerting authorities faced some challenges. Some were aware of it, some weren't aware of it. The alerting software with some providers were not ready to go.

Many of the COGs did not receive and install their demo/training certificates. The demo and training certificate is different than the operating certificate. You have two different certificates you have to use.

The primary contact that IPAWS was using, what FEMA was using is by e-mail, which presents some issues.

One, it has to be a current e-mail address. Secondly, the people have to open the e-mail. And third, read,

reply to, do whatever is in the e-mail.
And if you didn't do your required test, then they would send you an e-mail. So, if you didn't get the first e-mail, you might not have gotten a second e-mail. That's one of the things that's been popping up and I think it's cleaning itself up as they're not getting any responses to e-mails.
The notifications for the results of the testing in November didn't go out until the middle of December. So, that was a little bit of a slowdown. But they saw 667 COGs with successful proficiency demos, and that's nationwide. We've got around 70-some-odd here in this state. It gives you an idea of what the perspective is. It's starting to pick up momentum, I think. This is just a reminder that effective 2019, all COGs are required to conduct monthly testing. It has to be done; it's not optional.
So, a little bit about COGs and MOAs. The MOAs and digital certificates are good for three years. I say that, because to get your COG, you have to do an MOA. The COG remains in active status even though it's outside of three years. But if your MOA has not been updated within three years, the digital certificate stops working, which would result in an e-mail, which if you didn't get the e-mail, you might not get the e-mail, because it may be going to someone else in your agency. Part of the issue is who's signing these things, who's sending them in, who ends up being the person that has the e-mail that's recorded and is that the person that's doing the process with the testing.
Some of those, they're eventually lining up, but it's a real challenge. I think that they're starting to have to dig through. Many COGs were approved in 2015, which means that a lot of these digital certificates are expiring now. People may not know that they don't work until they don't work. It's a process, let's put it that way. So, just be forewarned, I guess.
IPAWS update. This is a test for your eyesight. If anybody can read this, you get an extra bonus point. But this is an update. These are some of the rules. "As a result of FCC rules, the following improvements are now available."
These are the changes they just put into place. The geographic accuracy has changed. Wireless providers that participated in WEA, wireless emergency alerts, must deliver the messages to the area specified by the alert originator. They're tying it down so there's no more than one-tenth of a mile overshoot.

The idea is that if you try to do a geographic area, it's going to hit closer to the geographic area. That's one of the requirements that the FCC's put in place. Longer messages and better reach. Basically, wireless emergency alerts now can handle 360 characters. There's a minor detail to this. When you do the alerting, whoever is your provider, they will give you two boxes now to put alert messages in. One is a 90-character alert message and the other is a 360-character alert message. So now, you're making two messages.

One of the keys to it is make sure that even on the 360, the first 90 characters are the same thing as in the 90-character. Because if, for some reason, it truncates, you're only going to get that first 90 through.

And if you push out the 360 with key information such as who sent it, where it applies, and what the time frame is, in the end, people are not going to get it. It's got to be in that first 90.

Essentially, you're reproducing the first 90 in that second box. That was one of the things that we were surprised at when we got looking at it.

There is a new alert type. Public safety messages are now in there. This has gone back and is a rehash of what used to be simple emergency message which went away and then they came up with public safety message.

You can conduct state and local wireless emergency alert tests that only reach customers who participate, and it does not require a waiver from the FCC. They used to have to do a waiver from the FCC. They put a box into some of the phones that can say you elect to participate or not participate. That's not a popular thing, because the people decide to go in and modify, and not participate, they're not even getting a test. But that is an option.

Probably the biggest change is the change from 90 to 360 characters. That's the biggest thing. February 6th, the Weather Service in New York basically said they're going to start using the length of the message using the 360 characters. But the caveat is that 90 characters may work on 3G systems and not 4G systems. There's a lot of detail to that, but the Weather Service is going to start using it. That was just something that was just an update that just came through. And I took that word for word right off of what the Weather Service put in their message.

Any questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. We're not doing the new business. We're doing the CIWG report. Jay, you're up, and then we'll put Mark in there, as well.

KOPSTEIN: All right. Good morning. I'll try to go through this rather quickly. Technical policy. I sit on two committees, Technical Policy and Governance. Things we're looking at right now. Personnel tracking, either through Smart devices or other technology, and we're working on a dependencies document. That's a document that's going to speak to third-party dependencies, companies or vendors that we rely on. Have we looked at their COM-U, operations plan, et cetera? What are their contracts? What's their reliability?

Right now, as some of you may be aware, there's a major communications company that may be going Chapter 11. Chapter 11 means reorganization. What does that mean to us?

Well, federal courts have said that contracts may fall under Chapter 11. So, if you're paying X millions of dollars a year to a vendor and that contract becomes null and void and that vendor now wants 2X, what does that do to you and your budgeting? Or if the reliability of that vendor and his service commitments degrade, what does that mean to you? Something that we have to look at. Many agencies are using cloud-based services now. What if we have a cloud outage? And where are those clouds housed?

Our laws may not have any validity if the cloud is in somebody else's country. It's things we have to think about.

CISA. During this past month, they conducted two teleconferences on cybersecurity, one having to do with Iran and one having to do with the breach on Microsoft where they put out a patch. They were both done prior to public announcement.

We were notified and we notified people that if they wanted to be on the call, they could be on the call. As part of what we did, and I'll pass this around and give Joann a copy for the record, it's what CISA has available and what we covered in our meeting last meeting. Pass this around, please. And Joann, if you can figure out a way to copy it, you're more than welcome to put it on the website.

CISA also puts out a bulletin called Insight. It's available on cisa.gov. I would take a look at it. I was just looking on their website. They have cybersecurity updates on an almost daily basis and

that's on cisa.gov. I would suggest that you take a
look at that as well. Mark, the new COM-L course come
May 1st, I don't know if you're aware of it.
BALISTRERI: Yes, four days instead of three.
KOPSTEIN: Yes. Minimum of four days. The impact
that's going to have fiscally on agencies in the state
has to be looked at, as well as, the loss of personnel
for an additional day of training.
We talked about the ICC Deputy Commissioner Frank
McCarton has been transferred. He's now a Deputy
Commissioner for Environmental Protection. Whether he's
going to continue on the ICC or not, I don't know. And
we haven't had an IMAC meeting. I tried to go through
this as quickly as I can in the interest of saving time.
Questions?
(No response.)
KOPSTEIN: Director.
SPRAGUE: Mark, do you want to talk a little bit?
BALISTRERI: Our COM-U program continues to move forward
with thanks to everybody that's been participating.
Currently, we're up to 104 credentialed personnel. We
still have some positions that we need to work on
getting people credentialed in, such as RADO, INCM, INTD
and ITSO.
We now are over 600 trainees out there that are working
on task force -- not all working on task force, but some
are. We're offering 10 more courses this year in our
third year of our five-year plan. We are instructing
the COM-T and COM-L courses on our own now just with the
federal support and supplies.
We have 18 planned events this year and our
state-recognized COM-U people are currently signing up
for those events to go and work with the state equipment
becoming better proficient on it. That's pretty much
all I've got. We're still doing our CAD and WebEx.
Unfortunately, January-February this year, we had to
cancel them. But we've got seven scheduled over the
rest of the year, the third Wednesday of the month. If
anybody's interested, send me an e-mail and I'll send
you the invite for them.
Anybody have any questions?
(No response.)
BALISTRERI: That's it.
SPRAGUE: Thanks, Mark. Very good. Mark continues to
keep pushing that program forward and he's making
tremendous headway with it.
One little piece of business here for new business. The
state -- we had an interoperability IP addressing plan

that was drafted several years ago. As we started
working on the librarian project in Central New York and
helping them document their networking working through
that process, we discovered that the original plan kind
of stopped short.
There were some creative workarounds that were put into
place, but we wanted to clear that whole thing up so
that there were no issues. The whole purpose of it is
to prevent IP address conflicts. And as the different
regions are starting to build out, Adirondack has gone
quite a way, Central is -- they had put a network in
place, it hadn't been documented. One of the things
we're trying to do is get the full documentation and, be
a custodian of that information.
As people change, as people retire, the vendors that
come along, that kind of stuff, how do we make sure that
we don't wind up with IP address conflicts on the
borders of these regions?
One of the things we did was reconstitute this group to
look at it and we went over it and, we have a revision
that we put together. Part of it is we try to make it
into an easy-to-read format. We reorganized it so that
it is easier to address. It helps clarify the details
on the WAN addressing and gives guidelines for external
connections.
There are different pieces that are tied to particular
addressing that can be done by county that's an already
accepted standard. We're not reinventing the wheel,
we're just going off of that.
We're trying to add some cybersecurity considerations to
be able to hold this to a higher level. When we first
looked at this, cybersecurity was not even talked about
way back, I don't know, probably -- I think it was four
or five years old, this particular document.
One of the things we're trying to do is work on the
edges just off the network. How does that impact the
networks connecting to each other? And obviously, you
don't want to end up getting to a point where one region
goes to connect to another one and, now, there's a whole
IP addressing conflict and somebody's got to change.
That is time, that's money and that's just plain
inconvenient all the way around. One of the things that
we're not trying to do is we're not trying to impact
subscribers, we're not trying to mess with MDTs. We're
not into the down-low. This is a high-level
connectivity where things come together.
And part of that is we're trying to get -- as part of
this addressing piece goes through, we're trying to

become the centralized coordination group. Somebody
needs to work between all these different regions as
they come together to help manage any of the issues that
pop up.
That's part of what we're looking at here. We've got
the draft done. It obviously -- one, it's fairly
technical. Number two, security-wise, we're not going
to pass it out to the board, because then it would be an
open document; we can't do that.
One of the things that we're going to do, in the next
steps is that we'd like to -- we're going to develop a
network IP guidance document that we want to get your
input on.
That would be the public-facing piece of this IP
addressing plan, so that, people know that it exists.
It provides coordination for IP addresses for use by
public safety. It prevents the IP conflicts and
promotes easier system, system operability, and it helps
with the administration and maintaining a central
database.
We think this is key. The days -- years ago I've said
this to a lot of people, I had a guy that would come in
and out of my office when I was in the county building
the network, and this particular guy would walk in and
out with a suitcase.
And it didn't take me long to realize if he walked out
the door and got hit by a bus, I was in big trouble,
because all the records for my system was in that guy's
head and in that little suitcase. That's one of the
things we're trying to do is help come up with a place
to keep all this stuff safe. When we did Central New
York, we worked well with the folks down there, but a
lot of the information was in the hands of the vendors.
People didn't have it where they could get their hands
on it, which is fine if you're the guy to build it and
knows which vendor. But if you change out and somebody
else is sitting in that chair, how are they going to
know how the system was built? And it can go two or
three down the road before you get to that. We're
trying to help with that whole piece.
We're going to put this guidance document together and
bring it back to the board, probably at the next
meeting, and get your input on any suggestions, or
whatever. We want your support, as far as the board, to
push this plan forward. That's where it sits.
Any questions or comments?
SPAWN: If there' an agency already at the point of
building it now, who do they talk to to make sure

there's no overlapping issues there? Is there somebody
in particular in your office?
SPRAGUE: Yeah. Talk to Matt and we'll put it right
into the system.
And it's nice as people are building out a system, you
got the information, and we need to capture it while
it's either being built, or just done, because that's
when all the information is fresh. Three and four years
down the road, we come back and ask you, it's like, "uh,
I think, uh".
If your vendor is good and you insist on getting a good
as-built, you'll have all that information at your
fingertips. If you don't, or the vendor gets you to
sign off without doing that, then you don't have that
information and, most likely, it's in the hands of the
vendor.
Comments? Questions?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: Okay, very good. A couple other things for
new business. One that's not on here that I want to
push: Symposium is coming up. If you haven't
registered yet, please do. The 12th of this month is
the deadline. We're looking forward to it. We've got a
lot of people coming.
We have some good presentations coming from all across
the country. The first afternoon is going to be
building all about exercises and how to get to that
point. We're going to look at what some other states
are doing, some other resources that we have available
and recap a training session that we're going to do.
We are bringing in the 911 coordinators as part of this
conference. We've got a national panel coming in to
talk about implementation of 911. CISA, and our own
agency, are going to be doing a big session on
cybersecurity. We will have our workshop for
interoperability, as well, and tie up some loose ends.
There's some movement on the quad state program that we
were working on. Then we're going to talk about cross
border. We're working on some projects from the Niagara
and the Erie County area across the border in Canada and
we're hoping to get some conversation -- bring some
people from Canada over, and have a good conversation
about cross border operations. That is not just in the
Niagara region, but that's also upstate in the
Adirondack region in St. Lawrence.
I'm looking forward to that, getting some real good
cross border discussion going on. And Niagara Falls is
out the window. Literally, we're right there on the

Falls.

We're looking forward to that. Please, be sure to sign up. Our attendance is going well right now. Anything I'm missing that you need to know, JoAnn?

WAIDELICH: No. But if you still don't have the link to register, you can give me a call so you can get registered.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Let's see. Annual report, we're working on right now. We should get that to you shortly for your look-see. We have some ethics training set up-in-person ethics training- set up for right after lunch in our office in the back there. Jim is going to personally give that training.

There's three people signed up right now, but if you would like to attend it, feel free to jump in. We won't charge you extra. It will be there for your convenience; that's the whole purpose. We're trying to save you meetings and travel.

The next meeting is going to be April 29th.

Anything for the good of the order? Comments? Questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Well, if I don't hear any, then how about a motion to adjourn?

JONES: So moved.

TERRY: Second.

SPRAGUE: Got a motion and a second. All those in favor.

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed, you're welcome to stay.

* * * * *

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

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

<u>Theresa L. Ardia</u>
Theresa L. Ardia, CSR, RPR, RMR

Dated: February 9, 2020.