STATE INTEROPERABLE & EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION
VIRTUAL BOARD MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 5, 2020

SPRAGUE: Welcome, everybody, to our SIEC Board meeting, the virtual edition. We are going to be doing things a little different with this event. I have to reflect for just a second. You kind of go "When did we have our last board meeting?" And it was in February. It seems like worlds ago with everything that's gone on in the last six months. It doesn't even seem like it was the same year, same time zone or any of that kind of stuff.

So, we're glad to have everybody attending virtually. And you know, this is our first virtual meeting and, likely, it's going to continue. We've put a lot of effort into this meeting to get it started off right. We wanted to look at a number of different platforms, both for ease of use, for the ability to see all the participants, for posting items and control of the event, making sure that we have the ability to have participants and also attendees and also keep that flavor of the meeting that we have always had.

One of the items that we had to address was the video component that's required for any board voting. We talked about that and it's in one of the ground rules that we always talk about. But if we're going to have this meeting virtually, we have to have video for all the board members. So that was one of the things we were really striving to try to put together. We do roll call, and we will do roll call, we will be able to see who's voting. When you reply to the roll call, and this is going to seem a little bit redundant, but when you reply to the roll call, restate your name and then your vote and there's a couple of reasons for that. One is the stenographer will be able to pick up who it is. Also, if somebody is an attendee and is not seeing the video, they'll know who's voting. The other part of it is it will give the video image a chance to come up on the screen. Because whoever's talking will basically pop up on the screen. And if you just say "aye", it will probably never get a chance to cycle through, especially if somebody clunks their desk or something along the same line.

So, whenever we do a roll call vote, please restate your name and then your vote or that you're here or whatever the case may be. This format allows links for attendees so they can be part of the meeting, but they cannot participate unless

we bring them in. The gate controller is Matt Delaney on this. That's why I was talking to Matt. He is going to be the choreographer, basically, for the whole meeting. We can use the chat function to allow for this option.
Matt's going to be managing the entire webinar in the background. He'll be advancing the slides for us. We just have to ask him for the next slide if you're doing any presentations. And the other part of it is he's going to be kind of reading my mind and probably prompting them anyway, because I always forget to move the slides.
The meeting is also being live-streamed and we do continue to use the stenographer to document the meetings. So literally, everything is in place, but we're doing it all remotely. So that's the good part. And it'll be interesting to see how the meeting flows as we go through. We'll make some adjustments and we'll keep going.
So, a couple of the other ground rules I'll just throw out there as long as I'm in the process of doing it. You know, guests or persons having relevant knowledge or information may attend. Obviously, we talked about that. And upon acceptance of the meeting agenda, other guests can be recognized by the Chair before addressing the board and participate in this discussion. Again, I talked about doing that virtually.
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.
So, that's our basic piece of it. I will go
through -- obviously, the safety piece of it, we don't have to worry about meeting out front in the parking lot; it would be a long drive. However, if you do have an emergency, feel free to step away.
Also, I appreciate if everybody would put their phones on stun. Again, we're trying to keep the amount of noise down as much as we can. We did set this up so that when you come in, you're on mute. If you're not speaking, if you could just mute the phone, that would greatly help us with the presentations. Other than that, I think that's the big issues that we've got.
Any questions on how the meeting's going to perform?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: Very good. With that, we'll start with roll call.

Board Members Present:
Michael Sprague
Brett Chellis
Charles White

David Kislowski
Brian LaFlure
Brian Gifford
Bob Terry
Todd Murray
Richard Tantalo
Michael Volk
Allen Turner
A. Wesley Jones
Ryan Greenberg

Board Members Absent:
Richard Anderson
Kevin Spawn
Kimberly Beatty
Anthony Tripp

GUESTS:
James Callahan
Joann Waidelich
Mark Balistreri
Matthew Delaney
Larissa Guedko
Julie Gray

SPRAGUE: Very good, okay. We got through the roll call. What I will do is move for approval of the minutes from the February 5th meeting.
JONES: Wes Jones will make the motion.
SPRAGUE: Thanks, Wes.
GIFFORD: Brian Gifford will second.
SPRAGUE: Excellent. Any discussion, changes, edits?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: Hearing none, all those in favor, say aye.
(Affirmative responses.)
SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: Approved. Very good. We have a slight adjustment in the agenda, but I'll move for acceptance of the agenda.
TURNER: Allen Turner makes the motion.
SPRAGUE: Thanks, Allen. How about a second?
GREENBERG: Ryan Greenberg will second.
SPRAGUE: Thanks, Ryan. Any discussion, edits, changes?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: All those in favor.
(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: The silence on the second one is always the best part. Very good. Accepted.

All right. Standing Committee reports. 911 Advisory Committee. And I'll turn that over to Wes and to Jim.

JONES: So good morning. There is not much to report at this point. Director Sprague and I have talked a couple of times. Obviously, with the COVID situation, there has not been much movement in terms of the standards. I'm hoping to hear from Jim here in short order and we can hopefully get that back on track.

CALLAHAN: And to add to that, with respect to the revised standards, I have been able to spend a lot more time getting back on track with that. Can you hear me?

SPRAGUE: No, you should be all right.

CALLAHAN: All right. I've had a chance to review those again, getting us back on track. At the risk of sounding overly optimistic, I will try and get back to the Advisory Committee this week. Just need to go over one or two questions. But it's looking like we'll be able to get that moving again soon.

SPRAGUE: Great, thanks. It goes without saying we're probably going to hit this several times as we go through this agenda. You know, I mentioned at the start the last six months has been a blur. Needless to say, and it goes for everybody across the board, every agency, every county, everybody has been basically overloaded with this whole COVID-19 thing and getting to a point where we're getting back to doing normal business, whatever normal business happens to be these days.

We're picking up with a big gap in the middle of all the activities. So just, you know, stating that upfront that pretty much, every one of these reports is going to have about a four-gap of -- four to five months of really no activity, only because the activity has been a hundred percent focused on the health emergency. Just so that everybody takes that into account.

This is high on the priority list and we intend to move it forward here as soon as we can. Thanks both to Wes and Jim for your reports.

Anything else you want to add to that, Wes.

JONES: No, not at this point. Like I said, we're eager to move this forward, so we're just awaiting the legal review and then we will do our part and get it back on track, hopefully.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Okay, thank you. Any questions on the 911 Advisory report?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. Let's move on to NG 911 Working Group. And Brett Chellis, Deputy Director.

CHELLIS: Okay, I'll report. First of all, it's for the 911 Advisory, but I'll just start out with it. The National 911 program annual report was filed on July -- or no, June 30th which was, I believe, the due date for that. We had a pretty good data collection for that.

Here's a few items. We had approximately a dozen counties that did not answer the survey, but we were able to compile a lot of stuff like PSAP size and so on to answer most of the questions. Unfortunately, for those that didn't report, some of the call volumes didn't get reflected in our totals. But hopefully, next year, we'll have better participation.

The FCC report is -- we've got a two-week extension on that. Again, as Mike explained, with COVID, it is very slow trickling in the answers from the counties, especially some of the fiscal questions, because they had to get answers from -- the PSAP manager has to get answers in many cases from the county fiscal folks and they're very tied up just working on the county budgets right now.

Given the delays in trickling in of information, we got an extra two weeks. And there was no issue with that. We understand that, totally. So that will be submitted by the 14th of August. So that's it for that. As far as NG Working Group, next slide, please, Matt. Basically, at the beginning of the COVID thing, we started doing weekly calls with all the county 911 coordinators to talk about COVID response and brainstorm mitigation options for the PSAPs to help keep the staff healthy and keep the PSAPs operational. With that kind of activity, we suspended the working group calls for the NG 911 through this process.

They were very focused as well, most of the players on the working group, with their own PSAPs and with their own agencies and working this COVID response. The draft plan was in executive review through this phase. We did have a meeting in July with our executive team, went over the plan and it was a very positive meeting.

NYSTEC has continued throughout over the last few months while we were working COVID, much of their team was continuing to work on the data collection from the PSAPs and where they could get data for at the NG 911 plan so that when we get down the road and we're talking RFPs, we have the data needed to provide in an RFP to vendors so they can give a proper design and quote.

So that did not stop and was rolling right along throughout and they got a very good sampling across the state. That

collection as well is not complete, because there are certain
PSAPs that have not submitted the information yet.
Hopefully, now that things are at least in a better state
than the rest of the country, hopefully, the PSAP managers
will be able to find people able to collect this data and
get it in so we can continue that process. Next, please.
The whole PSAP COVID experience helped in many of our minds,
was a great example on the need for NG 911. Throughout the
mitigation planning and COOP (phonetic) planning for PSAPs
of this event and trying to keep staff healthy and planning
for the event that a PSAP had to close either due to lack
of staff or for cleaning, what is the backup plan? Where
are calls going to be routed? Who's going to answer them?
And how are calls going to be dispatched?
As counties and PSAPs were moving through this, that stands
out heavily. A lot of the PSAPs downstate were absolutely
hammered with call volume during the peak of this event,
mostly EMS call volume.
Director Greenberg can certainly attest to what they went
through in New York City, Nassau County, Suffolk and so on
with the call volumes and finding EMS resources just to cover
the calls. You can't get the EMS resources going without
the call getting dispatched, received, call entered in the
system and dispatched.
Given this, we were looking also at alternates for offloading
calls and so on. With the legacy e911 systems that exist
today in New York, you're very limited in options. We did
explore and test some options working with rapid SOS to help
with some workarounds there and it was a very good plan. It
does not address all the calls nor provide the full ally 911
data.
The ability to move calls around and offload and switch to
another PSAP was without, you know, giving up a lot of the
effects or, I should say, location services and so on is a
very challenging issue with legacy enhanced 911.
This just screams the need to move the state to NG 911 as
a priority. We'd like to capture the history of PSAPs
through this event and capture any issues and make it part
of the report and plan to help show an example of the need.
So that is a major next step, is we do after action reviews
of the COVID experience. That was explained in a few short
words. Next slide, please.
The executive team did have a few questions for us, and we
are working some of those questions, working with NYSTEC on
that and our TA advisors, they're provided by CISA, and
working some of those questions so we can move the plan
forward.
We'd like to resume working group calls in September. We

figure August with vacations and everything else is probably not the best time to regroup. We'll begin that and plan for it in September.

And we're going to continue the data collection until we have all of it and everything we need. Next, please.

And I guess that's the end of my slides. That's the activity of the Working Group. Are there any questions?

GREENBERG: This is Ryan. Not sure if I'm supposed to be using the little hand-raising thing in the chat side or not. Director, you'll have to tell us if you want that to be used as the meeting progresses. But the question I have to ask to the group, and this goes back to everything that was going on, is one of the shortfalls that we found, and this might not -- in trying to figure out whose domain this really falls under is a hard one, is pre-screening calls.

The dispatch centers, you know, some of my counterparts will say, well, every dispatch center was pre-screening calls for emergency medical dispatch or things of that nature. But there's really no way -- it's not something that's regulated by the Department of Health and the Bureau of EMS.

And what we came to find out along the way is some places do it, some places don't, some places are trying to put something into place overnight. And I think Brett did an amazing job of just trying to provide as much information as possible on -- I think, Brett, it was weekly calls that you were doing.

CHELLIS: Yes.

GREENBERG: Is that something -- and again, I go back to the group and it's such a big issue, I think this group can help with this, is at least knowing where the state is in providing pre-hospital emergency medical dispatch and screening, the reality is that God forbid we do have a second wave, that is a tremendous component of what happens in communications and being able to handle some of those requests and switch things to other places, not only other dispatch centers but other EMS services. I'm just wondering, Brett, what your take on that was and just looking at it now after.

CHELLIS: I absolutely agree with you, and you explained very well, the issue at hand and the need. To answer your question the best way I can, and Jim can jump in, but currently, our minimum PSAP standards apply to wireless PSAPs.

The standards as they are set in place today do not require EMD programs be carried out of PSAPs in New York. They're dated. But they do require that if a center does do EMD that the EMD provided must meet the minimum standards of what was USDOT, there's a standard out there, which I found out isn't today really in place anymore. There are other standards.

But the programs that are listed, what was approved by the board, the previous 911 board, when these standards were written, they had three programs that they had approved. And if you used another one, it had to meet this federal DOT standard. But it did not require EMD. And there are PSAPs, and this is a question we asked in this year's survey for the first time, is does your PSAP provide EMD?

And I can't give you the stats this second, we're still compiling, we've got PSAPs that didn't answer. But there are a number of especially smaller PSAPs in counties that have multiple PSAPs where you only have one or two people on duty at a time that are not providing EMD as we're finding through our survey.

Now, some of those do not dispatch EMS, so they handle law enforcement only. We're still determining exactly how many centers are responsible for taking or dispatching EMS calls, do not provide EMD.

There's enough data that's been done in the last few years -- this is a problem nationwide. I hear it in my national 911 Administrators meetings. Because especially in, let's say, the Midwest and other areas of the country that are very, very rural, there's a lot of even county centers with two people on duty and they just feel they don't have the staffing to provide EMD, and that's an issue.

And the studies have proven, which I'm sure you're aware of, there's a lot of data right now by the health community showing the effectiveness of EMD in saving lives. I absolutely support it as a requirement of all PSAPs.

The second issue here is the fact, as I said earlier, there are standards today that only apply to the wireless PSAPs and not to every PSAP in New York. So that's a statutory change required.

Am I correct, Jim?

CALLAHAN: That's accurate.

SPRAGUE: Ryan, there's a couple of components here and you kind of touched on it that Brett was having weekly meetings with the 911 coordinators and the PSAPs. This is to Wes's committee's credit is they're trying to address this in their revision of the standards. With the weekly meetings that Brett was doing they were addressing this, and they were also addressing COOP planning for all the 911 centers.

There was a big effort early on to share COOP planning across all the 911 centers to be able to do that. There were many things that Brett was working on, literally weekly with the 911 centers throughout this whole thing, and one of them is what you're talking about.

So, there are really good lessons learned and there's some really good things that we accomplished during the actual

event there with the 911 centers.

CHELLIS: I thank you, Mike, for that point. Because I will say that whenever a guidance came out for PSAPs early on, whether they came from the CDC and then were -- you know, you guys were very good, Ryan, in the Department of Health in putting them into New York language and policy and pushing it out in New York guidance as well, and those were pushed right out.

The issue, I believe, that you're saying is even despite -- and I will say the 911 coordinators attended our calls and weekly, every one of them said they were using them in their centers and those centers are the ones that probably, you know, have EMD protocols. And priority dispatch, APCO, all those that are the major EMD systems were pushing out pandemic guidance as well for their protocols.

I don't know of any of the PSAPs that fall under the wireless standards that were not doing it. Now, I think when you get especially downstate, we have a few counties with a number of PSAPs and there may be some smaller PSAPs that are not doing EMD or maybe that protocol wasn't followed.

But that's something we've got to do as part of an after action and looking at this issue.

GREENBERG: I just think if we go to look at this in an after action, you know, A, who's not using it and, B, the other concerning part was during this situation, we found out that some PSAPs -- I think, as you said, some of the smaller ones and, actually, beyond this, even some of the fairly large ones, if they felt it was a medical thing that needed to be addressed, they would push it to a medical control or someone else who really didn't have emergency medical dispatch training but they're medically trained. They felt like, oh, push it to them and that was okay.

I think that some people might think they're actually doing the right thing, but in some cases, that can even be more complex in this situation. And then just that last point, as much as EMD, the Director spoke about in relation to saving lives, it also has the ability to really sustain a system.

When we talk about the pandemic protocol, we talk about card 36 and things that go with that one, that really has the ability to help us maintain on the EMS side getting through a pandemic and being able to handle the call volumes and what is the appropriate resource for dispatch and so on and so forth.

I just wanted to bring it up and, obviously, if there's anything we can do in helping those standards on the EMD side, it's obviously something we'd be very strong in working towards.

CHELLIS: Thank you for the support on that. We totally agree. And it's important that not only to have a standard requiring EMD but also have a standard requiring a quality assurance program of that EMD system, because you know, it does no good to have a card set sitting there on the console if it's not being utilized, if it's collecting dust or we're going to surf it and just pick the questions that we feel like asking today, and that's not a common thing.
The centers that I visited and know of, many of them, they not only have trained certified EMDs, but they also have a quality assurance, many of them have full-time staff just doing quality assurance. And to meet the standard of priority dispatch on all these, you have to review a good percentage of the calls and have a good rating on them. So quality assurance is important with any EMD program. I think Wes could probably attest to that.
GREENBERG: Thank you.
SPRAGUE: Okay. Any other discussion, comments, questions on the Working Group?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: Very good. We will move on to CIWG. Jay, did you happen to get on the line?
(No response.)
DELANEY: No, Mike. He's not an attendee either.
SPRAGUE: All right. Well, we will move along and catch up with Jay after-the-fact. With that, let's move on to the next one. Communications, COMU. Mark.
BALISTRERI: Good morning, everybody. As you know, we were moving quickly with our program, we were pushing it along, things were going really well and then COVID hit. Matt, you can go ahead to the next slide.
I like starting with this slide, because a lot of the history of COMU, everybody thinks of COML and COMT, but there's seven ICS positions in the COMU program in the state: COML, COMT, INCM and then your INTD and AUXCOMM fall under that. And then the newest one which is still being fine-tuned is the ITSL. Next slide, Matt.
I like also showing everybody our progress as we go along. In 2017, the end of 2017, we had one COML in the state. In '18, we started building the COML ranks. And last year, we started moving into the different areas. One key point of 2019 was creating a pool of our own instructors, which basically will allow us to teach the course ourselves and allow us to move to different areas if we wanted to try and build up certain regions.
The course itself, the materials for the course are still provided by CISA ECD, but we have our own instructors. It gives us a lot more flexibility. And then we started working

on the AUXCOMM portion, because we had quite a few folks that were close to finishing up their credentialing. We got that completed.

This year, as we know, we hit a roadblock in March. We were, however, able to get some COMTs done. We had a couple more COMLs, INCM, INTD and RADOs.

Then, we had a couple people that fell off, retired or didn't want to continue in the COML role. The totals down there basically are showing you where we're at. Go ahead and go to the next slide, Matt.

So just to give you an idea on what we postponed, basically, we had 96 potential students that we had to postpone, and one was a COML course, a COMT course, a COMT train-the-trainer so we could get more instructors, RADO and AUXCOMM. Go ahead, Matt.

These were the courses that we canceled. As you can see, we had a pretty aggressive schedule this year. We had two in April, one in May, one in June, one in July. Go ahead, Matt.

We still have three courses that are upcoming. We all know this is kind of fluid. We don't know where this is going to go. Currently, we're not sure about getting instructors from the federal government. We haven't canceled these officially yet and we're going to leave them on there and see if, hopefully, we can open back up and restart our program. Go ahead to the next one, Matt.

One of the things we're looking at is what our future training course is going to look like. I'm sure you all are looking at the same things we are. Are we going to get back to some sort of normal? Is it going to be strictly a virtual environment or is it going to be a combination of both virtual and hands-on? With all the COMU positions, the hands-on piece is important. It gets people using the equipment, setting things up. So, it's hard to do it all virtually, but we're looking at potential ways to be able to do that. Go ahead to the next one, Matt.

We are again, like I said, planning to start the program back up with INTD in September; however, it's fluid. We're not sure if it's going to happen yet. We also plan on when we start our 2021 program, we're going to try and get the postponed classes that we had and do those first and then we'll continue with our five-year plan. It'll just be a short, hopefully, delay in what we had going. Go ahead to the next one, Matt.

That's it. Any questions? I tried to make it brief. The Director knows I could put 25 slides in here, but I didn't want to do that to you guys.

SPRAGUE: And there weren't any videos.

BALISTRERI: Yeah, I didn't put any videos in either, so I'm being good.

SPRAGUE: Needless to say, it's a challenge to get back to where Mark was going. This has put a pretty big monkey wrench into it as far as our COMU program and, obviously, our symposium was postponed for a year. We hope to be able to do that in the same location again. We've got the place basically booked. They allowed us to just roll it over to next year.

But at this point in time, long range planning, it's kind of interesting to try to figure out. We're going to try to kind of reset and move through this. I appreciate everybody's patience and, you know, Mark's patience to try to reset this thing and move forward. This is not an easy thing to do.

Any questions or comments?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All right, very good. With that, we're going to go to the Public Safety Broadband User Group. Matt Delaney.

DELANEY: Good morning, everyone. I just have a couple brief updates here on the Public Safety Broadband User Group. So, a couple of things. The big thing was during the COVID-19 response, deployable asset location coordination, supporting data needs for sites, we supported the National Ambulance contract. We did this with the wireless carriers on a regular basis regarding this response.

We started daily talking to the carriers. We had all four major carriers as well as some of our other agency partners on the call every day at 4:00 o'clock. We got the carriers on and we talked about the needs, the locations that were coming up. As we heard about the locations that might need support, we passed it along to all four carriers at the same time and said, "okay, we hear there's a testing center or a field hospital opening up at location X, please be prepared, check your network, determine if you need a deployable asset there to support us".

And we used cellular data at many of the test locations to support the on-site operations. Some of them, as time went on, became fixed connectivity, hardline connectivity, with cellular backup. Some of them are still being supported today on wireless.

We put wireless routers in, Wi-Fi, supporting tablets that were being used for the intake at the test centers. You know, the nurses would go around with tablets and they'd be running applications and they'd be supported on wireless.

On July 8th, we held a webinar in partnership with the FirstNet Authority. The Authority presented on deployable assets available to FirstNet agencies. It was a good

webinar, very interesting. They had a lot of good slides on the different types of assets, and it's not just trucks. It really depends on what the need is. Is the need a truck? Is the need a trailer? Is it a flying asset? Is it not an asset at all? Is it just supporting the network? Perhaps, it's an in-building extension solution, temporary in-building extension and not a truck?

So always, when you make a request to FirstNet, you need to request the need of what you have to do and not a specific asset and then AT&T and FirstNet will figure out what that asset is.

Scheduling soon. A GETS/WPS discussion for user group. We had a very interesting presentation by CISA last week for our office on GETS and WPS. A lot of good information on how it relates to FirstNet and the other cellular carriers. We're going to be scheduling one soon for the user group. Then, we don't have a date yet, but we're hoping to do a very interesting webinar or set of webinars on some of the other capabilities that FirstNet has to offer. That's all I have on broadband update, if there's any questions.

SPRAGUE: I'm just going to jump in here for a second. We were doing the daily updates with all the carriers. The carriers were very engaged. They were willing to be on every day. Sometimes they had stuff, they were offering things, letting us know when they had issues going on. And Matt talked a lot about the different operations and stuff that were out there, basically, supporting all the testing locations and regional operation centers and data centers. And I know this is near and dear to Dave Kislowski's heart, so I think this is a good opportunity to bring Dave into the conversation here.

Dave, anything you want to offer.

KISLOWSKI: Quite frankly, I would just mirror what you said, Mike. The carriers were fantastic. It was extremely helpful to coordinate daily for startup and then beyond. And it really provided a stable platform for all the test sites, which I think everybody knows was and still is super important to the success of New York State's COVID testing.

SPRAGUE: Yeah. And just to add to that, some of those are still running. Jones Beach had to drop one of their portable antennas for the storm, is putting it back up, so they should be operational again today. It's still going on. This is sort of the activation that won't stop and it just kind of keeps going on with a very questionable when this will stop. And you know, it obviously changes your idea of short- and long-term planning. I guess that would be the one thing to add to what Dave said.

Any comments, questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: And thanks, Dave, for jumping in there.

KISLOWSKI: Absolutely

SPRAGUE: Okay. With that, we'll move on to Channel Naming and Use Working Group. Matt Delaney.

DELANEY: All right. Thank you very much, Mike. So again, on the COVID-19 response, and on the civil disturbances that unfortunately were occurring at the same time, we worked with our other partner northeast states to coordinate the use of the interoperability channels.

As you may know, the interoperability channels are a common set of resources nationwide. They are in limited availability. And RF does travel, especially in some parts of New York where you've got mountaintops and one site can cover a hundred miles or you might have a very short amount of water between us and a neighboring state. It's very important to coordinate that channel usage so that everybody's not trying to do that at the same time.

In addition to our normal use of the interoperability reflector, the State of Connecticut runs as part of our state guidelines any time the national interoperability channel is used, you must put a notification on the Connecticut Listserv reflector. A couple of other guidelines went into effect.

We worked with the other states. This started in New Jersey with John Miller and then we pushed in New York. And I know the other states were also pushing, Connecticut with Scott Wright, is to, wherever possible, use the direct mode, simplex, at most locations.

In many locations, the locations to be covered were very small, you know, a parking lot, a small campus operation or something along those lines. You know, a protest may occur only in a small area, a couple of city blocks.

We emphasize, wherever possible, to use the direct mode to keep the actual use of the channel and the RF footprint very small and then reserve the wide area repeaters for where they're really needed.

So if you had an operation with incoming mutual aid from a distance or you had to coordinate a much larger area, maybe it was multiple events with a common command structure, that's where you use the wide area repeaters and save them for those and then not tie them up. You know, you go through the interoperability repeaters, there's only a few in each band, channel pairs, we would go through those very, very quickly if everybody just lit up a repeater to cover two or three city blocks.

At the peak, we were tracking 123 channels at 67 locations across the northeast. Our office was taking information in

that was coming from the states through the reflector through information being provided from the SWICs in the other states.

We were keeping a spreadsheet and we created a GIS map showing the location and the channel assigned to them. This assisted in assigning new channels as locations came online. You could look and see very quickly 8 TAC 92D being used here, so half a mile over, I'm going to use 93D. Just look at the map.

Obviously, there are a lot of channel plans, 205s available for these events, but we start looking at so many locations, you don't necessarily know without looking at a map how close some of these things are. That really helped having a map available.

Every time there'd be a major update to channel usage, we'd update the map, we'd redistribute to all the neighboring states and they could see as well where to assign channels. We worked through the SWIC office in each state to do that. A couple other things. Encryption --

SPRAGUE: Matt, can I jump on that interoperability for just a second?

DELANEY: Yes, sure.

SPRAGUE: There's a couple things. We were doing this in coordination with the other SWICs. At one point, we had five states that we were tracking in Canada and Canada was the only place there was interference, lo and behold, of course. But the five states, everything worked out well. And I have to say, I've got to give credit where credit is due.

You know, Chris Carney started a regional planning workshop down in the lower Hudson. And you guys have seen some of where it morphed into a quad state cross border planning project that's taken about two years. We're in the final stages. The final edits are going in right now to finish that.

However, as with any plan, the value of the plan is the people working together to make that plan come together. And honestly, we would not have probably done this effort if it hadn't been for the planning that went into that quad state group. It identified the people. The people were talking to each other before the event. It became kind of a routine thing to talk to each other. We figured out a couple of things and shared the information amongst all the states right off the bat. And you know, it worked out well.

And we were able to do it during COVID. And then, of course, when the civil disturbances popped up, it really ramped up to, as Matt showed there, 123 channels at 67 different locations.

But the value of every plan is really the effort that goes

into getting everybody talking to each other and it really paid off in this event. Everything that was done was done in coordination and each SWIC put in a little bit of different flavor to this thing and it worked out well.

Some of you probably have wondered at times when we've gone through the symposium, and we did that whole section, you know, well, that's downstate, it doesn't really matter to me. Honestly, this bridged the entire state. And as Matt said, at one point, there was something that came up from Massachusetts throughout Nantucket and I really didn't pay much attention to it until we put it on the map and realized that, oh, wow, there's nothing between that and the tip of Long Island. We had stuff going on in Stony Brook that might have interfered. So, the map really helped to pull everything together in relation.

Hats off to the whole group that was working on this from our folks, from Connecticut, from New Jersey and all of you folks that were putting stuff on the reflector. Because without putting it on the reflector, we wouldn't have known what was going on.

I just wanted to summarize that, because this was really kind of a unique event, a unique effort that really doesn't go on in many states around the country. So, there's my soapbox. Thanks.

TURNER: This is Allen Turner. I have a question.

SPRAGUE: Sure.

TURNER: Did you find that most people when they were doing an interop that they were just picking a channel themselves or were they contacting your office first to see which was the best way to go?

SPRAGUE: Matt, I'll let you jump on that one.

DELANEY: Yeah, sure. We saw a little bit of both. There was certainly quite a bit of coordination. I'd say all the sites that were being run as a state operation or the state was supplying equipment, we were assigning the channel. So that worked out well.

Even in the county operations, I would say that most of them in New York were coordinated. I can't speak for the other states, but I do know that the SWICs were providing information to us from the operations in their states.

I can't recall hearing about any interference issues during this based on the coordination.

So, I think, certainly, it worked well. And if there had been sort of a lot of freelancing, I think we probably would have heard more about some of the issues, just because there were so many areas in operation that I think people would have been using those channels otherwise and we would have heard if there was interference being received.

SPRAGUE: Yeah. And Allen, I think the other part of it is John Miller came up with some basic guidelines. We all jumped on them and pushed them out over the reflector. I think that gave some guidance to everybody initially going into the event.

Whether everybody fully paid attention to it or if they used it as some guidance, I think it helped a lot and everybody on the reflector received it.

TURNER: Okay, thank you.

SPRAGUE: Anybody else?

BALISTRERI: This is Mark. I was going to jump in just to plug our COMU program, if I could. ICS 205, people were providing those to us, and we combined and created a statewide one and we shared it. It was a good on-the-fly training program on creating 205s. And I think it worked well. So, I just wanted to comment on that.

DELANEY: Also, I'll just say, too, speaking to the COMU program, the COMU program at the state level did provide -- several of the counties did provide support to some of the testing centers and provided some of that programming and setup of those channels.

SPRAGUE: Yeah. And I'll reinforce that, because that one, I don't want to lose. You know, the folks that have been involved in our COMU program really stepped up and helped us out covering some areas totally by themselves. We checked with them: "You got the availability to help out?" Okay, they did. That took a load off us.

We have over 400 portables that we pushed out across the state to support these different locations that were set up. It helped us and took a little pressure off us that we didn't have to go out and purchase a giant number of portables, because we knew we had some backup and we had some reserve and it helped me a lot in the planning process.

So, hats off to all the folks in our COMU program that participated. We knew you were out there. It made life so much better to be able to get through this event. So, I don't want to let that slide. Thanks, Mark.

DELANEY: Okay. So on to the next slide here, next topic. I want to talk a little bit about encryption. With recent events that have occurred, more agencies have been discussing encryption. This is obviously an agency-by-agency choice whether to encrypt communications based on operational needs, but some items to consider.

OIEC has a guideline posted on our website on Land Mobile Radio Encryption. The document describes the process to obtain a unique CKR to ensure that your encryption does not overlap with your neighbor's.

The guideline does not tell you to use encryption or not use

encryption. It does not tell you who to encrypt or how to encrypt; simply, to coordinate that. So that if you are going to encrypt, make sure that that is unique so that if necessary, you are able to share it.

Early on, without a lot of guidance, there was a lot of overlap and when people went to share encryption because they chose to, they found there were issues trying to share because of overlapping key identifiers and CKRs. And think about who you need to talk to during an incident.

Did you provide your key to them ahead of time? How are you going to talk to the ones you didn't think of? Encryption requires a lot of ongoing maintenance. You can either statically key, key once and not key again. The entire time you are on your radio system, your security goes down over time. If you lose a radio, do you rekey then because, now, you've had a radio loss. And do you need to think about, okay, all the people that I keyed the first time, I have to go back and key again because, now, I've changed my keys. How are you going to talk to the ones you didn't think of? When you have an event that maybe you didn't plan for or even one you did plan for but you didn't think of everybody who might respond, are you going to have somebody have the resources, the people and the equipment available to key them on the fly? Is that something you really want to do?

Do you want to look at over the air rekeying and then, of course, how does that work again with the outside agencies? So, there's a lot to think about if you want to do encryption. It's very powerful having encryption, but it's also much more complicated. So, there's a lot to plan for. And I would just say exercise is always important. We always emphasize exercising communications. I would say that it's doubly so if you're using encryption.

And just as a reminder, the VHF, UHF and 800 MHz interoperability channels, the national interoperability channels, as well as the 700 MHz CALLing channel, must always be in the clear. The only place you can use encryption on interoperable channels is the 700 MHz tactical channels. The 700 MHz interoperability channels are the only place in the national interoperability sphere that you can encrypt. That's all I have.

SPRAGUE: Any comments, questions for Matt?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All right, very good. Moving on. State Agency Communications Working Group. I'll be right up front with you on this one. State agencies have been overwhelmed with all the operations going on with COVID and we really haven't had a chance to pull together a meeting. We need to do that, partly after action, partly, you know, some of the civil

disturbances that have gone on and a host of other things that we're now facing on this side of the curve, as we call it.

We need to put one together, but there hasn't been time, to be honest with you, to try to fit that in. So that's one thing on the top of the agenda moving forward. Next slide. Citizen Alerting Committee. You can move on to the next one there, Matt.

Our last meeting was February 26th. Again, there's another one of those things that was pre COVID. I can tell you that New York State OEM has been conducting their monthly testing. FEMA delayed their national public alerting test until 2021 because of all the events that we started going through and the rest of the world is still going through, the rest of the country. So that will not be happening this year.

We did receive an updated New York State IPAWS alerting status. That's the thing where they have been doing their monthly test or not doing their monthly test. As it stands right now, there are 16 COGs that are suspension eligible. I haven't heard if they were suspended or not, but they missed at least three-monthly tests.

So that's something that we will from a state perspective are going to have to get together and address as to what and how that's going to move forward.

I did talk to Donovan with the Broadcasters Association. They had a big meeting, I think it was about a month or so ago, in Washington, D.C., The National Broadcasters Association and, apparently, the FCC has rolled out their online planning tool. This has been rumored to be coming for quite a while. But they're basically going to get it so they can update all the state EAS plans online. It's one of the things he's been waiting for, because we didn't know -- he had no idea what the format was going to look like and really didn't want to dive into a total revamp of the plan only to find out that the planning tool was going to change the process.

So, that's one of the things that will be coming along shortly is some further guidance. He was going to get that information and get back to me. That was a couple weeks ago, so I expect to hear pretty much any time.

But that's kind of what's going on with the citizen alerting side of things.

Any comments, questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All right. Hearing none, we will move on to the PSAP, SICG and Targeted Grant updates. Larissa.

GUEDKO: Good morning, everyone. Here's our quarterly, I guess, update for grant PSAP, SICG and also Targeted Grant.

Next slide.
SICG program overview. The one, two, three, four, five grants that you see on top, which is from round one to round three, they have been closed and right now, we have open round four -- back, please, on the slide. Could you please move the slide back?
Okay. The round four SICG and 2016 SICG formula still accepting vouchers, so please send your vouchers. For 2017, '18 and '19, those grants are still open. Now, for 2019 SICG formula, several contracts were delayed due to COVID and so development of those contracts was delayed. However, right now, all those contracts are being moved forward. Next slide, please.
This is the PSAP Operations grant and we have four grants closed from 2014 to '18 and vouchers are no longer accepted. The PSAP Operations grant for 2018-'19, the spending period is closed, however, our grant office will work with counties to make sure that all vouchers are submitted.
The PSAP Operations grant for 2019 and '20, it will end at the end of this year. Next slide, please. Targeted Grant. We have awarded about half in phase 1 and right now, phase 2 awards are pending. They will be announced once all the approval is received.
Right now, there are additional steps that we have to go through for the approval for any financial considerations and it takes a little bit longer. However, we are ready to announce phase 2. It will take us a little while to get through the approval process.
We don't have a specific schedule for this year for our phase. None of the RFAs right now are on the schedule, but they are being reviewed. They are ready to be posted and they are being reviewed. They go through the approvals right now, Division of Budget, Governor's Office and so forth. Once we have any more specifics, we will send everyone a note. You will know as soon as we know. Next slide, please.
So, this is an overall overview of the program. As I mentioned, all the RFAs are ready to be posted and they are going through the approval process. And so far, we are over half a billion dollars with all the grants that we have awarded for public safety communications.
There's one thing I wanted to bring up. Please submit your vouchers for your expenses. If you don't submit it, you can't get reimbursed. All the eligible grant expenses will be reimbursed, but you have to submit your vouchers. Next slide, please.
And any questions?
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: I just wanted to follow up here. As we have said

a number of times coming through this process that with the current budget situations going on, not only at the state level, at the county level, everybody's kind of on hold and we're kind of in the same boat at this point, as you can guess. We are pushing through any vouchers that have been pushed ahead. I said this early on, but I know there were rumors out there that we weren't going to be doing that. That is not the case. We are moving stuff through.

I know Eric Abramson is on the attendee's list there. I don't know, Eric, if you want to mention anything in regard to your program, even the change in your leadership. Feel free to jump in there.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

SPRAGUE: So anyways, anybody who doesn't know, and I'll fill a little bit in case he does pop in here, Eric is now the Acting Director on the grant side of things. Shelly has retired and Eric has been filling in valiantly with a lot of the stuff that's going on, not just with our program but a lot of other programs. And he's been stepping up helping us to make sure that vouchers are getting paid and that kind of stuff.

So, if you have a -- I know if you've got a good up-to-date voucher that's ready for approval, you'll be good to go. It looks like he might be there. Eric?

ABRAMSON: Can you hear me?

SPRAGUE: You got it.

ABRAMSON: All right. It took me a while, a little challenged. Yeah, so regarding the vouchers, we work continuously with Division of Budget to push everything through that can be paid. We keep encouraging all the locals to submit their vouchers. It's just another step. But Budget has been very good about approving a lot of vouchers so far.

And as they approve, we send them a new batch. A new batch just went to them last week. We continuously push to get the vouchers approved in the fiscal climate that we're in. That's pretty much it.

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Eric. We realize you're stepping in and picking up some big shoes there, and a lot of activity going on. So, I appreciate all your efforts.

Any questions or anything for Eric while we've got him on?

JONES: Not for Eric, but I have a question.

SPRAGUE: Sure.

JONES: Actually, it's probably more of a statement. I know you're aware of this, and I know your hands are tied, but certainly, and particularly as it relates to the PSAP grant, that there's no extensions available on that, the ability to get that out is very time-dependent. And you know, since

these grants are set in law, I don't know if it can be pushed from the executive level in the Division. But certainly, I would hope to see some movement on these, because I think it's very important.

SPRAGUE: And I would agree with you. You know, that's probably our number one priority when we're able to start moving grants. But you know, I think until there's more certainty, I think, into anybody's budget process, we're probably going to be on hold for a period. And again, those grants are seriously tied to a year process.

So, two things I'll say right off the bat. One, we understand that fully. And secondly, you know, we are going to do whatever we can to make adjustments to be able to make it so these grants can be executed by the recipients.

It makes no sense in my mind to give you a grant that's a one-year grant in November. We've got to adjust the time frames and the processes. Like I said, we've got the RFAs ready to go, but we're going to have to revise them once we know what the landscape looks like when we're able to move them.

And you know, Eric and I have had conversations about this. It's just, you know, right now, we're just in a holding pattern.

Any other questions, comments?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. Thank you. All right. New business. We're going to go into the next slide there, Matt. In your packet -- go to the next slide, Matt, then I'll let you pick this up.

In your packet, there is a guideline that we provided you. I'll let Matt pick it up from here.

DELANEY: Thank you again, Mike. And I just apologize if there's any background noise while Larissa or I are talking. Apparently, there was a water leak with the heavy rain and OGS came in and started pulling the ceiling down in our office area.

So, this topic has been discussed at previous meetings. Several years ago, there was an IP plan developed for public safety communications systems in New York to support interoperability, connectivity between the systems, in-particular.

Over the years, as systems have developed, some gaps in the plan were found. Things need to be clarified a little better. So, in working with NYSTEC, our consultant to New York State, as well as with some of the microwave network providers, the original plan is still the same in concept, just some more details have been added to it. And this plan helps prevent IP address conflicts when you're trying to link

systems together.

If you have maybe two systems that needed a common shelter, two different county systems or two different consortium systems that needed a common shelter, the ability to try to connect them without having overlapping IP addresses from the two systems, try to enable interoperability at the system level. We're not talking about subscriber units. We're not talking about device computers in cars. We're talking about system interconnectivity.

So, specifically, it's an easy-to-read format reorganization. Basically, we took the document, added some graphics, changed it around a little bit, changed the formatting, clarified some of the details for the land addressing, provided some guidelines for external connections, added some cybersecurity considerations.

This was not in the original plan, but this is certainly something that has taken much more interest in recent years with cybersecurity. Just some of the considerations to think about in network design; reflects IP addressing at the edge or just off the network. So, talking about interconnectivity. Does not impact the subscribers, the MDTs, county PCs. This is not talking about re-addressing a county's IT computer system or LAN; strictly, that interconnectivity standpoint.

It designates OIEC as the central coordinating agency. Basically, it lays out sort of the structure and how it would look in every county. But of course, there's always going to be exceptions or specific situations that aren't accounted for.

The idea here is to designate OIEC just to help coordinate that. If there is an unclear part of the plan or something that needs to be a special occurrence or maybe there was an existing system that wasn't accounted for in the original structure, the idea here is that you could build in that exception and track it so if somebody else came to you and said, "It's not in the plan, but it's also being used by exception from an original participant."

We just wanted to clear all that stuff up. The guideline will be posted upon approval on the OIEC website. It will reference the plan. However, due to security, critical infrastructure-sensitive information, the plan itself is not posted on the website. The guideline will reference the plan.

The plan will be available to public agencies constructing who are constructing or otherwise addressing radio systems. They can share it with their vendors who are authorized to work on their system.

It's not real detailed, but it's detailed enough that it

would have a cybersecurity consideration in terms if it would make an attack easier because you would sort of understand the basic structure of the system. So, the plan itself is not public and will not be posted online strictly just to prevent anyone from seeing it and having a little bit easier way to attack, because they would see how the basic layout of the system might be.

So, as I mentioned, it would be centralized coordination. OIEC would just provide that coordination. We work also through our librarian project. NYSTEC is working with many of the counties right now in New York to collect system information and document it. And this would just be another sort of piece of that and would help make sure that any conflicts are addressed or prevented in the first place.

So, a guidance document has basically been developed. The guideline was available and distributed as a draft before this meeting. The plan itself also has been developed. It's been looked at by networking consultants. It's been looked at with input from some of the vendors who make microwave and network systems to provide that guideline.

So, I think, Mike, we're just looking to formalize the guideline today.

SPRAGUE: Very good, sir. I will say that this is something that when we started doing the network documentation project kind of popped up right off the bat. And we've had to step back and re-look at it and address this so that we can make it obviously more modern.

A number of those points that Matt reviewed were not in the initial plan and, quite frankly, you know, cybersecurity wasn't really a big issue way back when this was first done. So, they've done some work on putting this together. You've got the guidelines for the network IP addressing.

With that, I'd like to entertain a motion to accept it. Is anybody willing to do that?

LAFLURE: Brian LaFlure. As you know, I was involved in this from the very beginning and I am looking forward to the new plan and glad to see that Matt and the gang and NYSTEC have taken that on. I'd be glad to introduce that to approve the plan.

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Brian. And I appreciate your efforts in this as well. Anybody want to second it?

JONES: This is Wes. I'll second.

SPRAGUE: Wes Jones seconds it. All right. We will do this by roll call. We'll do this by roll call and Joann will call out for the roll call --

WHITE: Hey, Mike.

SPRAGUE: Yes, sir.

WHITE: And I apologize to everybody on this, but I haven't

seen or read through this. So, I apologize. I guess I didn't see this in my in-basket. But State Police does have a lot of system administrative responsibilities. We've worked with our partners on this. Is this something that needs to be done? I really haven't read it. That, I'm going to apologize for. But is this something that needs to be done during this meeting or is this something that can be at least held while I get up to speed on it?

SPRAGUE: And thanks for jumping in there, Chuck. I had jumped past if there's any comments, questions or concerns. I'm glad you jumped in with a concern. Yes, if you have not looked at it -- I know we sent it out with the initial invitation. If you have not looked at it, I would suggest that we table this until you get a chance, because I know that State Police has a lot of activity in this side of the equation here.

Is that acceptable by the person -- by you, Brian, for nomination?

LAFLURE: Yes, I'm fine with that.

SPRAGUE: Okay. And for the second?

JONES: Yes.

TERRY: Bob Terry. I'll second it.

SPRAGUE: All right. Very good. We'll table this until the next meeting. I don't see a reason why we can't -- the guidelines still exist, but we'll give you a chance to review them and provide any comments.

WHITE: I really do appreciate it. I know similar to this, and it's not the IP addressing specifically, but one thing we're having a challenge with at State Police is some of the adjacent counties, the systems that we either administrate, provide administration on behalf of counties or counties on their own making, you know, various upgrades to their systems, some of the software is not backwards-compatible, which creates from our end and our microwave network where we are connected or part of a system some significant challenges for us to make sure that any software update or new version of something does not create some unintended operational vulnerabilities or consequences for us from the hardware side of things.

And although it's not part of the IP address, it plays to a larger discussion maybe where there is maybe some better coordination of system upgrades that being tied to other systems may have unintended limitations of performance.

SPRAGUE: Yes, I'm aware of some of the issues surrounding that. We've had some conversations about it. Obviously, that's a much bigger issue than the IP piece of it.

WHITE: Absolutely.

SPRAGUE: Agreed. There are some serious concerns there.

And part of -- I guess I'll say part of our statewide networking process that we're going through right now is really identifying who's connected to whom and who's got what. That will probably exemplify the problem and give us at least an idea of who's touching who and how it's impacting going down the road.

So yes, that is a bigger issue. We'll put this one on hold for the next meeting just to make sure that everybody gets a chance to review it. So very good.

WHITE: I greatly appreciate it. Thank you, everybody.

SPRAGUE: Okay. With that, next slide. The next thing we've got on the new business side of things is you should have all received a copy of the statewide -- basically, the SCIP.

We went through the SCIP last summer. And you can go to the next slide. And this is basically what the cover of it looks like. Hopefully, you all have it in your packets or in your e-mail. You can go to the next one. And basically, this is kind of re-capping what we did last summer. We did the virtual SCIP. It allowed us to go through and do this during the summer. We had tremendous participation. I really want to thank everybody for doing it.

ECD facilitated it with the virtual SCIP process and it was probably only the second one, I think, that was done nationwide. But I think from everything we got, it seemed to work very well. We had, as I said, a lot of participation. It came out with some actual and measured goals and objectives, timelines, that kind of thing. And basically, we were at a point for board acceptance, we got the final -- I think it was right around the time of the last board meeting, so we weren't able to get it to you.

But other than that, it's a complete document. I think it goes through and hits all the issues that we wanted to do. And again, there was a lot of participation that helped frame this.

I think we're at a point where we'd just like to formally accept this through the board. With that, I'd like to see if anybody would be willing to give me a motion to entertain acceptance of the SCIP.

That's where you guys step up and do a motion.

TURNER: This is Allen Turner. I'll make the motion

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Allen. Do I have a second?

TERRY: Bob Terry. I'll second it.

SPRAGUE: Thank you, Bob. All right.

Any questions, comments, concerns?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Hearing none, we'll go through and do a roll call vote.

WAIDELICH: Brett Chellis.
CHELLIS: Brett Chellis. Yes.
WAIDELICH: Charles White.
WHITE: Charles White. Yes.
WAIDELICH: David Kislowski.
KISLOWSKI: Dave Kislowski. Yes
WAIDELICH: Brian LaFlure.
LAFLURE: Brian LaFlure. Yes.
WAIDELICH: Lieutenant Brian Gifford.
GIFFORD: Brian Gifford. Yes.
WAIDELICH: Bob Terry.
TERRY: Bob Terry is a yes.
WAIDELICH: Todd Murray.
MURRAY: Todd Murray. Yes.
WAIDELICH: Chief Tantalo.
(No response.)
WAIDELICH: Rich Tantalo.
(No response.)
WAIDELICH: We'll move on. Michael Volk.
VOLK: Mike Volk is a yes.
WAIDELICH: Allen Turner.
TURNER: Allen Turner. Yes.
WAIDELICH: Wes Jones.
JONES: Wes Jones. Yes.
WAIDELICH: Ryan Greenberg.
GREENBERG: Ryan Greenberg. Yes.
WAIDELICH: Richard Tantalo, we'll go back to you.
(No response.)
WAIDELICH: And Michael Sprague.
SPRAGUE: Michael Sprague. Yes.
Very good. Thanks, folks, appreciate that, and everybody that participated throughout last summer. It's hard to believe it was last summer already.
All right, very good. Future meetings. Obviously, I think we're going to be doing this type of meeting format for a while. Our next meeting would be October 28th. That's what we had scheduled. I don't see any reason to change that unless anyone out there has objections to that date.
(No response.)
SPRAGUE: Hearing none, I'll assume that's good. I've got one thing here from Jim.
CALLAHAN: For those of you who are filers under the JCOPE system, if you don't know who you are, please reach out to me, I'll let you know. This is a reminder it is due by Monday, August 17. So that's just under two weeks away. Those were originally due back May 15th. It won't have universal extension, but they are now due again quite soon. You can file online, by mail. For general questions, talk

to me. If you have question specific to your submission, you have to reach out to JCOPE on that. Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Any questions for Jim on that?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. And again, if you have any questions offline, feel free to give us a call and we'll work through it.

So, this is the new meeting process. We've gone through it and it seems to have gone smooth. Any comments or complaints, I guess, working through this? (No response.)

SPRAGUE: I'll assume everybody's good with it then. So, we're going to continue to work on the new normal, whatever that is. You know, it's trying to get the stuff that we're used to doing back up to speed and moving things forward. It sometimes seems a little bit like pushing a snowball uphill, but we are getting there with our training, with several our programs, our grant program, the stuff in general. We've made some really good progress, I think, in some of the interesting things that we've had to work around and be able to accomplish during the COVID response.

It proves when we put our heads together, we can really get a lot done. We may have to continue doing that as this moves forward. But other than that, that's what I have for the good of the order.

One thing I will mention, it kind of came into the timing of this, we wanted to have everything well set up ahead of time and everybody in place, but as with typical things, you know, there was an outage last night with Orange County 911 and that was kind of taking up a lot of our time leading up to this. We had to have Larissa jump off for an NCC conference call right at 10:00 o'clock that got scheduled because it was an interstate issue. We handled it, got it done and kind of moved through the meeting at the same time. It's just one of those things that no matter how far you plan, something will always get in the way.

Any comments or questions, anything for the good of the order before I close the meeting?

(No response.)

GREENBERG: I just wanted to say thanks for putting this together and having it go as smooth as possible, and thanks to Matt and whoever for all the prep beforehand to make sure technology works to have this go through smoothly. Thank you on that.

SPRAGUE: Well, and I appreciate that. One of the things I wanted to do is make sure this went smoothly. I've been on some awful conference calls and webinars over the last few months. I'm sure people can commiserate with that. I wanted to make sure that we didn't fill out any squares

in the conference call bingo and that we are a tech shop.
I really wanted to make sure this kind of flowed and went
well. Hats off to all the team that helped put this
together, because we did a lot of testing and a lot of things
to make this work.
With that, unless there's other comments, I'm going to close
the meeting. I appreciate everybody jumping on here this
morning and participating in our meeting. We did it in about
an hour and a half, which is close to what normally happens.
I appreciate everybody being part of this. And you know,
if you have any comments or questions, please feel free to
let us know as we continue to try to work through what will
be the new normal.
I'll just say one thing, and maybe some of you, especially
in a state position, are running into this. You know, I've
had some conference calls, webinars with my counterparts
from other states who are where we were four months ago, but
they're there now. And it's very interesting to see and have
this kind of interesting visibility or perspective of being
on the other side, hopefully, and we stay there, but being
on the other side of this and try to figure out how to go
back to normal when they're actually losing their normal as
we speak. It's been interesting, and I appreciate all the
effort that everybody statewide did to get us where we are
now and deal with whatever happens to come in the next few
months.
And it should be interesting when we meet again in October
to see at what point and where we are in this whole process.
With that, I want to thank everybody and conclude the
meeting. Everybody have a great day.

* * * * *

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, CRR, RPR, RMR

Dated: August 9, 2020.