

STATE INTEROPERABLE & EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION
VIRTUAL BOARD MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 28, 2020

SPRAGUE: I want to welcome everybody. Hopefully, you're somewhere other than here. It's pretty dreary. We're working on our second virtual meeting. And Matt, if you want to jump to the next slide.

So, I want to touch base for a few minutes. This is the second time we're doing this virtually. It seemed to work fairly well the first time we did it back in August. And obviously, the situation causing us to need to do things virtually is still continuing, so this will be our second meeting and probably continue for a while.

With that, I'd like to welcome everybody to the meeting. A little bit about our meeting process; we are doing this all virtually. We're using Webex. We have a controller. Matt Delaney is our flight controller for this particular Webex and he has the ability to mute everybody.

Also, we have the participants' log-in and we also have an attendees' log-in. The attendees are listen-only. We can change that should we need to if we need to invite someone in or if there's a question that we need to accept.

With that, we'll go through the process. Hopefully, everybody was able to get on as well as the video. That's part of the -- one of the ground rules which we'll talk about here in just a couple of minutes.

With that, I'm going to go to the roll call and we'll have Joann call the roll.

WAIDELICH: Good morning, everyone.

Board Members Present:

Michael Sprague
Brett Chellis
Timothy Morris
David Kislowski
Brian LaFlure
Brian Gifford
Bob Terry
Todd Murray
Kimberly Beatty
Michael Volk
Allen Turner

A. Wesley Jones
Ryan Greenberg

Board Members Absent:

Richard Andersen
Richard Tantalo
Anthony Tripp

GUESTS:

James Callahan
Joann Waidelich
Mark Balistreri
Matthew Delaney
Larissa Guedko
Julie Gray
Christopher Tuttle
Eric Abramson
Jay Kopstein
Nicole Erickson
Terry O'Leary
Steve Sharpe
David Cook
David Cucchi
Frank Dipisa
Josh Green
Lana Cawrse
Michael Rowley
Mike Simmons
Ryan Lamothe

SPRAGUE: Very good. Thanks, everybody.
All right. The next thing I'll ask for is an approval of
the minutes from the August 5th, 2020 meeting.

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

SPRAGUE: Okay, Allen. Thank you.

TERRY: Bob Terry. I'll second it.

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Bob.

Any discussion, comments, changes, corrections?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay. Hearing none, I'll ask for approval.
We'll do it by voice. All those in favor.

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. The minutes are approved.

How about the approval of the agenda for today's meeting? Everybody should have received the agenda.

CHELLIS: I'll make a motion. Brett Chellis.

SPRAGUE: Motion made, Brett Chellis. Second?

GREENBERG: Ryan Greenberg.

SPRAGUE: Ryan, thank you.

Any discussion, questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Again, all in favor by voice. All in favor.

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anyone opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All right. And that carries. Very good, thank you.

A couple of things in the way of etiquette; because we're doing this by video, if you would state your name and where you're from as you start to acknowledge, especially when we do roll call, your name and then actually give your vote, that allows the system to switch your audio or your video over so we can actually see who's voting. That's one of the things that we'd like to do.

Some ground rules: Board members attending by video -- we all are -- shall constitute present at such meetings for all purposes, including quorum. The participants must make notice of their location pursuant to Open Meetings Law. Guests or persons having relevant knowledge or information may attend and speak as part of the agenda upon acceptance of the meeting agenda by the board. All other guests must be recognized by the Chair before addressing the board or participating in 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.

Any questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. Let's step into the actual agenda. With that, we just received a notice from Sheriff Dagostino that he is going to be stepping down from the Board. He is at a change in position and sent us a notice back in September.

He started out with the Rotterdam Police in 1989, retired in 2009 and he's been Sheriff in Schenectady County since 2010. He's been on the Board since 2018 and we really appreciate his participation with the Board and the activity; he's been with us for quite a period of time. We are going to be sending him a Certificate of Appreciation. Matt, if you want to step through a couple of slides there.

We'll be sending that to him in recognition of his time on the board and we greatly appreciate all his efforts. Very good. Okay. Moving into Standing Committee reports. 911 Advisory Committee. Wes, I know we have talked a little bit about the standards that we're working on and I know your committee, I don't think, has met lately. Have they?

JONES: No, the committee has not met. I've been in contact with them a couple times via e-mail. Again, I was waiting for the standards. I had hoped that they would be here by now. We are a little frustrated by that process since we did meet well over a year ago in Oriskany and felt that within a few weeks, we'd get a draft back. But we have been waiting for those, so we have not met.

SPRAGUE: Right. And we know that they have been worked on. We had some correspondence back and forth until COVID hit and, literally, that just dissipated any activity on the process. There has been some internal workings on that and we are in the process of trying to get that back to the committee as fast as we possibly can. We've got some reviews internally that we're still working on and we'll get back to you, Wes, on that. Anything you'd like to add otherwise?

JONES: Just even if there's certain sections of it, even if we can do it piecemeal, there's certain parts that are ready to go now or at least for us to review, that would work out. You know, we don't have to tackle it all at once. So, if there's pieces of it that can be worked on now, we're ready and willing to do that as opposed to delaying it further.

SPRAGUE: Copy that, okay. We'll look at that and see if that's something we can pull out and add or put into the mix. Very good.

Any other comments or questions?

DELANEY: Mike, this is Matt. Steve Sharpe would like to be recognized by the Chair.

SPRAGUE: Okay.

DELANEY: Steve, I'm going to unmute your line. Steve, you're now unmuted.

SPRAGUE: Steve?

DELANEY: Steve Sharpe, I've unmuted your line.

SPRAGUE: Steve, you may have to unmute the Webex even though you've unmuted your phone.

DELANEY: He's on the computer.

SPRAGUE: Okay.

DELANEY: I'm just going to try making him a panelist here. He says he's talking but nothing is coming through.

If you want to type your question into the chat, Steve, I can read it for the Chair.

He asks: "Can we ask the Board to set a date for comments

back to the working group?"

SPRAGUE: Comments back on the standards?

DELANEY: "This way, it stays on track," he says. "Yes, on the standards."

SPRAGUE: We can do that, but we need to have something to post comments against. I guess that would be the question. Once we get it back to the committee, I think then we could get some questions to post. But I think setting a date without the standards to comment against is not a good way to go.

My hope is that by the next board meeting, we will have it to the committee and back. That would be my goal, I think, for the SIEC Board is to get that out and get it back by that next meeting date. I guess I'd like to set that as a goal if that works towards what you're trying to accomplish.

DELANEY: He now types: "We need a timeline for the comments back to the committee. We need an actual date versus a hope."

SPRAGUE: I understand fully and we'll work on that. Okay, very good. Anything else for the 911 Advisory Committee? (No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. Let's move on to the NG 9-1-1 Working Group.

CHELLIS: Good morning, everybody. This is Brett Chellis, Deputy Director of OIEC and State 9-1-1 coordinator. Do you hear me okay, Matt? Is the audio better?

DELANEY: Yes.

CHELLIS: Okay, good. Next slide, please. Okay. As many of you know, just like many of the processes, when COVID hit, a lot of the activity as far as the working group, we had to put on hold so that the working group members could work within their counties.

We have representatives of 16 counties, 9-1-1 programs. We have four state agencies on the group and everything and everybody was kind of scattered into priority projects. We did continue to work on some of the tasks as we could as we've been working through this challenging year. The executive review has been ongoing. We have had a couple meetings with executive staff reviewing the draft plan and fielding questions that we could field at that time. Other ones, we had to do some work on.

NYSTEC has continued to assist us as well as Joel McCamley, our Technical Assistant from Federal CISA. And we've been working through these. We've been providing some productive answers back and compiling data that we feel we're going to need down the road a bit if the plan is approved in developing an RFP. NYSTEC has submitted a survey statewide to every county to provide technical information

on equipment and positions and so on, trunking, other items that they need in developing a spec so to speak for ESInet and core services for New York State should that plan be approved to go in that direction.

Either way, to migrate to NG 9-1-1 in any of the models, this data is going to be needed somehow by somebody to be compiled. So, we feel that is the way to go. It's something we could productively work on while we are working through all this. So that's been going well; however, there's a number of counties we still lack data from. We probably have a sampling to work with, you could say, that we feel confident with. However, we would really like to have the data of the entire state. So, we're going to be contacting the counties individually, it will mostly be the NYSTEC staff reaching out to complete that survey.

We've also been continuing dialogue with a lot of stakeholders and those who keep on track of different items and questions along the way that we need to work on the project.

The GIS subcommittee, cheers to them. They have been meeting regularly throughout with representatives from around a dozen counties. They'd like more. A few of them have had to move over to other priorities, but most of them have stayed active and they continue to work on the PSAP boundaries, working with state ITS on developing a system where, the street address points and centerlines that were developed over the years with the street address mapping program can continue to be built upon with PSAP boundaries, the next and most vital portion of the GIS which is needed in order to go live with correct routing of 9-1-1 calls under NG. Moving forward, they're actively working. Next slide, please.

We are going to resume the working group calls in November. We initially planned one for yesterday, however, we felt we really want to have a call and there are some items that are kind of moving in dynamic ways right now that we wanted to have a couple more weeks to plan, have an agenda where we can roll out some ideas to the working group and bounce them off them so to speak and also get ideas back and thoughts moving forward on the plan and how we move forward through the winter months as we're waiting for final executive review and approvals, hopefully.

The engagement again will be needed to fine-tune the plan with our stakeholders. Again, this plan is being written from the bottom up, not the top down. It's been written by your peers across the state and emergency communications and we want to keep it that way.

The Department of Public Service has been active in drafting

framework and addressing the regulatory needs relative to 9-1-1 service delivery under Next Gen. There's a lot of work to be done both on the legal side and decisions to be made on the best model. We've been talking to other states that have similar structures with public service commissions, public utility commissions, those type of things, that have a regulatory framework in place now and what they are doing with NG. This is kind of a question and challenge across the country to make sure that service delivery is good, that every person who dials 9-1-1, their call is completed and is addressed properly, technically and procedurally. But this in terms of delivery is a very critical piece and that has been moving along as well.

We've had dialogue with New York City along on their project. I think since the last Board meeting, it became public that their RFPs for ESInet and core services was awarded. So, their project is moving forward for Next Gen 911 in New York City in the five boroughs and they have target sets for their system and their dialogue with us in terms of how they're going to be interoperable with the proposed state system. So, New York City's a big part of this picture in the state. A third of the 911 calls made in New York State in a given year are in the five boroughs. That's a big number. So that system is an integral part of any statewide deployment. I believe that's it, but let's check, Matt, and see if there's anything else. Yes, I think we're done here. If there's any questions, I'll be glad to field them.

SPRAGUE: Any questions or comments for Brett?

(No response.)

CHELLIS: Okay. Just the last comment I have is I want to thank the working group for the service so far. We hope you'll jump back to the table and we want to have a lot of ambition moving forward to get this moving in the state once we have the green lights and also working on all the pieces of the puzzle that we can be doing while, you know, the more of these answers we get, the more things we get done. So, we look forward to working with you all and thank everybody for their participation so far.

That's it, Mr. Chair.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Thanks, Brett. And again, thanks to the working group.

All right. Moving right along, CIWG is on the agenda next. Jay, are you in there?

KOPSTEIN: I'm here. Good morning.

SPRAGUE: Good morning, sir.

KOPSTEIN: Okay. We have a little bit on the agenda, my agenda anyway. First, as we all know, Admiral Hewitt retired. He was initially replaced by the Deputy Assistant

Director in an acting position. The last several weeks, a new Assistant Director was named. That's Billy Bob Brown. He's now the Assistant Director for ECD.

A number of states, because of litigation, have gotten away from using SOPs and instead are using SOGs, guidelines instead of procedures, because their court system, they have ruled that a procedure has to be followed while a guideline is just that.

There are three new products in the offing that haven't been approved yet. One is on unmanned aerial systems, one is on life cycle and sustainment, and there's a new continuum, interoperability continuum brochure coming out.

This past week, the dependency, third-party dependency document has been approved and is now on the SAFECOM website. In August or September, there will be JAMEX 21. That's going to be an exercise, a jamming exercise, that will be done in White Sands, New Mexico. And along with that, they're developing, or hope to develop, two courses, one being a jamming awareness course and one being a technical discussion of the jamming.

Hopefully, everybody has been getting the CISA cyber alerts that have been coming out. If not, please go on to the CISA website and look at those cyber alerts. Not only are they alerts due to malicious intent, but they also alert you when various vendors have emergency patches.

California is going to initiate a statewide law enforcement frequency. I don't know if Mark is going to cover this or not, but again, they're talking about extending COML training by an additional day.

DES on radios will no longer be funded unless they're being used for radios for backwards compatibility. EMI has announced that if you are currently an instructor, you can keep your instructor status without having to remain ICS course current.

The FEMA NIC has tentatively agreed to adopt a communications branch with the next NIMs update or refresher. We're also talking about returning all of the COMs courses from ECD -- from EMI back to ECD with EMI just doing the documentation.

On grant guidance, SAFECOM grant guidance is mandatory for all communications grants and the grants.gov website has all grants listed. Two more items to go.

4.9 gigahertz, it appears that the use of 4.9 may be granted to the states to decide who gets what with the stipulation that the state cannot monetize it.

What that means is if the state has the approval within the state, they can't rent the frequency to one of the vendors to use it as a means of getting revenue.

And last but not least, this was brought to my attention somewhat recently, some volunteer or districts are programming the IO channels into their radios for use for regular agency business, not for IO. I think we may have to put out a document reminding everybody that the IO channels are not to be used for regular agency business. That concludes my report, Mr. Director.

SPRAGUE: Very good, sir, Jay. Good to hear from you. And there are a number of things in there that we'll touch on at different points.

The 4.9 is an interesting topic by itself. The monetization and the leasing and all that are a very interesting topic that's come up from Order Number 6 and are supposed to be defined further in Order 7, which has not been posted yet for comment. So that's going to be an interesting topic all by itself.

As far as interoperability goes, we have been doing a lot over the summer from COVID and through some of the civil unrest to coordinate and manage interoperability. I just sent out a memo to everybody just to remind everybody to, you know, the first option is not to turn on a wide area repeater; it's to do stuff locally as best as you can. Make sure it's on the reflector so everybody knows it's up there. And by all means, give us a call. We can help coordinate that channel and also be able to map it for everybody else so they know you're there.

Over the summer, we have actually done that coordination with five different states and we have offered to do it and continue to do that going forward so that everybody kind of stays on the same playing field.

So that's one of the big things, I guess, from CIWG I'd like to stress. There's a bunch of stuff going on with training and we'll let Mark handle that in a minute, but those are a couple of points that I really wanted to put out. Any comments or questions on Jay's report?

TURNER: Mike, this is Allen Turner. I have a question.

SPRAGUE: Yes, Allen.

TURNER: Regarding what he said about the agencies programming the inter-ops into their own, are they doing that because they don't have anything else to use or are they just doing it to take advantage of it? Do we know that?

KOPSTEIN: What I'm being told is it's a lot less expensive for the district to use what's existing where they get better coverage from the existing IO infrastructure than creating their own infrastructure or modernizing their own infrastructure. They're using it for financial reasons.

SPRAGUE: Well, that specifically violates what the IOs are intended for. So, if we're aware of that, then we'll have

to -- who's doing that, we'll have to take a look at that.

KOPSTEIN: I'll talk to Matt offline.

SPRAGUE: That would be great. Appreciate that.

Any other comments or questions for Jay?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay, I'm going to move on to Communications Unit Program. Mark.

BALISTRERI: Okay. Thank you, Director. Mark Balistreri, OIEC Radio Engineer. Can everybody hear me okay?

SPRAGUE: We got you.

BALISTRERI: Okay. Go ahead, next slide, Matt.

So, I always start with this just to reiterate what the communications unit really looks like and the seven positions: COML, INCM, INTD, RADO, AUXCOMM, COMT and then ITSL is still up and coming. There are some courses out there, but it's not officially been added to the chart yet. Go ahead, Matt.

This is what we look like so far for state-recognized folks across the state. And I started this chart back in '17 to show the progression of where we are. Obviously, 2020, we hit a roadblock and we had a couple people that retired that are no longer doing it. Go ahead, next slide, Matt.

This is what we postponed in 2020, roughly 161 students that weren't trained. We are trying to do a course, COMT course, which I'll touch on in a couple slides later. We're hoping to get at least 15 or 16 people trained as COMTs before the end of the year. Next slide, Matt.

These are the courses that we postponed. I say postponed, because our goal is to, once we can start back up training, we are going to offer these courses that we were hoping to offer in 2020. So, we'll start off with that. There will just be a delay in our program. It won't be a total revamp and we'll just pick up where we left off. Next slide, Matt. As I stated, the COMT course, the SPTC is not back open yet officially. What we are trying to do is to come up with a COMT course at the end of November, possibly at Montour Falls. It's not finalized yet. We are going to take the registered students from the SPTC and I've already reached out to them, we have 24 of them, narrowed it down to 16, but I've already reached out to them asking if a change in date and location would work and we're working through that process.

We are also going to have a COMU instructor meeting probably not all three days in December, that's what we originally had scheduled, but now if we're going to do it virtually, it will probably be a one-day event, maybe a day and a half. And what we've been working on for the COMT is a hybrid type course. It's going to be two days virtual and three days

in person. We feel this will -- it will be a first of its kind, I believe. We've been working on it over the last couple months and we'll see how it goes. We think it's going to be a good course. Go ahead, Matt.

So again, we don't know what the future holds with all this COVID stuff. Are we going to go back to normal? Are we going to have to do all virtual or a combination of virtual and in person?

With the COMT course, there's a lot of hands-on with that and that's kind of to me the most important part, working with the state equipment and setting up the equipment. So, we'll have to see if we can -- I don't believe we could do that all virtual, so we're going to do the combination and see how that works out. Go ahead, Matt.

We are planning again, like I said, to restart the program in November. I'm not sure what 2021 is going to look like, but we're going to start with what we had to postpone and then we'll continue on with our five-year plan. Go ahead, Matt.

While I'm on the questions slide, I'll just mention that we did notice that during COVID-19, the state-recognized COMTs were very, very helpful. We partnered with them in a lot of different areas and it worked out real well.

So, we're probably going to try and do more COMT training out there in 2021 than we did in 2020. I think that's it. Jay, you mentioned the COML four-day, it is a four-day course now. I know that CISA ECD is working on some different things for virtual versus non. They have a virtual COML train-the-trainer coming up. It's totally virtual, it's a beta. And we have a handful of people that have already showed interest in that.

Other than that, if anybody has any questions, I think that's the end of my report.

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Mark. A couple things. First and foremost, I want to thank all the folks in the COMU group out there that have been helping us through all of the COVID operations and also with some of the civil unrest stuff. We still have COMU folks from the counties assisting us with some of the sites that we have out there as they've been preparing for winter. That has not gone away. And to be honest with you, without you guys, it would be very difficult for us to keep all this up and operational. So, number one, hats off to you guys.

Also, hats off to Mark. I know I picked on Mark an awful lot when he first went into this with this kind of freight train operation of training. I'm now very, very thankful he did, because that really got a lot of people through the pipeline before all this shut down.

So, without Mark's overeager attitude, we would still be way back where we were a couple years ago. So that's a really good thing.

And the last thing I'll do, I know that Jay touched on it and I know that, Mark, you're following it, the whole COML instructor recertification process. We are working our guys through that process and following it so that when they finally -- they just had the mandatory online training that we all had to take and then they will actually come up with the course and then the tasks that we're going to have to do. And I know, Mark, you've got some plans for that. I'll let you touch on that.

BALISTRERI: Yeah, thank you for bringing that up. The actual mandated training, all our COML instructors at the state attended one of the sessions. And they've gone through the process and what we have to do to keep our certifications.

There will be a test, but it's basically a test on the new COML program. There weren't too many changes to it, however, it increased today.

And Mike, what was the other thing you wanted me to touch on?

SPRAGUE: No, that's it right there.

BALISTRERI: Okay.

SPRAGUE: Okay. Any questions for Mark? Comments?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. We're going to try to move forward with that class and, if so, we'll be literally the first in the country to get that class off the ground. A lot of people are very interested in what we're doing, so we'll keep pushing the ball forward on that one.

Okay. Public Safety Broadband User. Matt Delaney.

DELANEY: Okay. Thank you, Mike. I'll mention a couple of things here. We've been holding some virtual sessions. We worked with AT&T/FirstNet to develop a series of virtual sessions to share more information on FirstNet. These are actually put on entirely by AT&T; however, we're helping discuss and develop the topics and the outreach for them. But AT&T/FirstNet has an opportunity to talk about some of the various interesting and unique features of FirstNet. Two sessions are held each month with identical topics for scheduling flexibility, so there's one sometime mid-month and one late month. They're identical. They just allow you to choose one or the other.

September topics included the Global Network Operations Center, the GNOC, network security and FirstNet deployables. It talked about some of the assets, the flying COWS and the cells on trucks and the FirstNet blimp and how to request

them and how to use at events.

Then, the October topics included the AT&T strategy, high power user equipment, which I'll talk about here in a moment, and FirstNet's mission critical services. It's not too late to register for the second October session. It's tomorrow afternoon.

If you have the invite and have not registered and are interested, get your registration in right away. If you don't have the invite or the link, please just send me an e-mail or in chat here and I'll get it right over to you, you can get registered.

The November and December topics and dates will be announced soon. Due to the holidays, we're going to do that as a combined two months in one with another set of topics to discuss. Each of these are about two to two and a half hours with multiple presentations and speakers.

So, I mentioned HPUE, or high-power user equipment. This is a unique option for Band 14. It's available on FirstNet. The FCC's rules for Band 14 allow high power subscriber units on Band 14, higher compared to normal cellular devices and bands.

So, 1.25 watts, or one and a quarter watts, maximum power which is several times a standard cellular device, it's two or three hundred milliwatts for a standard digital cellular device.

The cell site will tell the radio if it needs to increase transmit power up to that maximum. Your traditional cellular device does not transmit at maximum power all the time. This is a battery saving and an interference issue so that you don't create unnecessary interference or use the battery up faster in the device than is really needed.

But with the high-power user equipment, there's a lot more headroom, more room above the standard device's maximum that the cell site can keep increasing that power up to.

So if you have, for example, a mobile router with a vehicle-mounted antenna and the high-power user equipment where Band 14 is available, which is a significant amount of the AT&T network now, it can make a significant improvement in coverage, especially in the uplink, the talkback, because now that device in the vehicle is transmitting with a much higher power.

So, you've got both the external antenna plus you've got that higher transmit power. The device can stay attached further and have higher upload speeds.

During the October session, we saw some tests that were done in Tompkins County and they were very impressed with how much further they were able to carry along and we should see that same presentation again tomorrow. So, if you're

interested, please register and you can see the presentation.

This is designed more for mobile or stationary uses. Portable devices, phones, really are tricky due to HPUE. Because of the higher power consumption, the battery life would be significantly, significantly reduced. And also RF exposure limits, the amount of additional energy transmitted versus the exposure close to -- like especially if you're holding your phone up to your head with a much higher power device kind of transmitting continuously would probably not meet the FCC's RF exposure limits.

But it could be used to create that coverage bubble for portable users. You could have it at a vehicle or a command post. It can get back to the network and then create a Wi-Fi bubble for attachment of devices when they walk away from that vehicle, transmit through the vehicle and back on HPUE back to the site. So even if you don't have coverage at your phone, you may have coverage through the vehicle.

COVID-19 support. Cellular carriers continue to support the COVID-19 sites. We have some deployable assets that are still out and in use where needed, less than we had early on because we've been able to work with the carriers to optimize the networks and uses so that they're not necessarily having to dedicate a deployable asset to an area that's a fixed site for many months.

But there still are numerous OIEC and State ITS Cradlepoint routers and other devices in use to provide connectivity. We have routers out, or ITS has routers out at basically every test site, state-run test site, that's providing connectivity for the operations that are at the sites as well as warehouses and other logistics purposes.

That's all I had on broadband. I don't know if there's any questions.

SPRAGUE: Questions or comments for Matt?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I will say that the HPUE demo that's being done by Bangs Ambulance down in Ithaca making a trip through Tioga County down to Sayre Pennsylvania is a pretty interesting demo, only from the fact that that is a real dead area down in there, terrain-limiting and not a lot of transmitters. So, what they're doing is pretty educational.

Matt.

DELANEY: Yes, we have two things. Jay Kopstein has a comment here in chat asking how FirstNet held up during Tropical Storm Isaias. Actually, we are aware of some outages, some issues. That is something we're working through to get some direction on that and we'll find out what we have in the future to share on that.

It may be a topic for possibly a future one of these virtual sessions to talk about network redundancy, so stay tuned. Also, it appears that Dave Cook has a question. If the Chair would like to recognize Dave Cook.

SPRAGUE: Yes, we can do that. Dave.

DELANEY: Dave, you're now unmuted.

Dave, can you hear us?

(No response.)

DELANEY: Dave, you can type your question into chat.

SPRAGUE: Apparently, we have some work to do on our unmuting.

DELANEY: Yeah, he shows unmuted. I don't know if you want to move on and we'll see if we get a chat message from him.

SPRAGUE: Okay, yeah, we'll catch up. Moving on, Channel Naming and Use Working Group. You're back on, Matt.

DELANEY: Thank you. I'll just mention real quickly here the national interoperability channels are still in use across the state supporting COVID-19. Virtually, every state-run test site is using a direct interoperability channel to support the multiagency operation there.

Preferred use for any use of the interoperable channel is the direct, or simplex, wherever possible. This keeps the footprint small and improves the re-use opportunity. You know, if you're operating a small campus-based operation or a small footprint operation, it makes sense to keep the coverage footprint small and be able to re-use those channels. They are a limited resource.

As always, notification to the Connecticut Listserv e-mail reflector is mandatory when activating the national interoperability channels regardless of use so whether it be training, whether it be testing, whether it be actual purposes. And we have to have you send that e-mail notification. You can contact our office, too, like Mike was saying, and we can help pre-coordinate that.

Also, repeaters off when not in use. I continue to say this and I think I've said this probably at every one of my presentations for years. But even just yesterday, we had a crew in the field doing some service work and they found two UTAC/UCALL repeaters that were in the Finger Lakes that were turned up and they drove to the sites and identified which sites they were that were active. So, we will get that taken care of with the county in question.

And you know, as Jay was saying, these channels are for interoperable use. They are not everyday channels. They are not to be used as a replacement for your agency channel or your fire-ground channel. I think part of that is it is easier, oh, look at these frequencies I can use. Why should I go through the trouble of licensing and paying a

coordinator for licensing?

I think the other problem is probably some lack of familiarity or training. People find channels in their radios and maybe weren't properly trained as to what those channels were. They think they are channels available for them to use. I think that's another thing to be careful about.

And also, it was mentioned to me by Jay before the meeting started that there was an issue with some programming during a couple of incidents. So again, just to make sure that you are following the proper NIFOG and guidelines on programming the channels, channel names, the CTCSS or PL codes.

And that's all I have on IO channel.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Thanks, Matt. Did anything pop up into the chat while we were talking?

DELANEY: Nothing from Dave. Bob Terry does ask: "Will the results of the HPUE be available to anyone interested?" I would suggest to start with signing on to that AT&T virtual session tomorrow and see the presentation. And then from there, if you still have questions or like to see the results, I think contact through AT&T or through Bangs Ambulance, their testing.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Go ahead, Bob.

TERRY: That was fine. I just wanted to know about that high power user equipment test to see, because I'm quite interested in that.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Okay. I will add that I mentioned that we've sent out something to our interoperable communications group about the process for -- reminding the process for using repeaters.

We also copied in my counterpart in Massachusetts and she just sent back and said that she's going to share it to her neighbors and the rest of Region 1, which would be all the states to the north which, you know, obviously, that would include Vermont. They're going to follow the same process that we are.

It's good to have everybody on the same page. That's nice. People in the other states are picking up on it. Any other questions or comments for IO?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All right. With that, I'm going to move on to the State Agency Communications Working Group. And Matt, you can jump to the next slide.

We did have a virtual meeting. It's been a while since we've been able to get together with all the activity going on with the state. We hadn't really had a chance to meet.

We did on Friday, October 15th. We had a really good meeting, I thought. There was a lot of discussion, open

discussion, and it was an update on what the different agencies are doing.

A lot of activities have been going on. Parks has been working very hard on some of their radio COMS and their communications. They did mention that they really appreciate the interactions that we have when we have the symposium.

Obviously, we didn't have that this year but, they really enjoy the interaction with the counties and be able to monitor where they're going and try to keep up with that. DOT picked up a number of AM broadcasts. Bob Terry has become a real DJ there with his AM broadcast units and he's got several that he has available to loan out.

We're using those, that came up in the middle of the actual testing operations, to try to be able to talk to people in their cars with their windows up, especially when it's cold outside, and get the message across. I know a lot of places were trying to use bullhorns and it wasn't working out very well.

They're working on a low-band radio replacement, and pretty interesting integrated management pilot system they're looking at for Central New York that would integrate literally with all the responders and 911 centers. I'm really interested to see how that comes out.

ITS. Dave has been very busy supporting test sites, moving infrastructure. He and his group have been extremely busy through this whole process.

DEC is converting over to a new phone system. They're trying to update their version of RMS and they have used Motobridge for quite a while, but that's beyond support and needs to be replaced and they're looking at replacements for it.

We talked about our network IP guidance that we're working on, but it was, I thought, a very productive discussion. I know a couple of the guys are on here that were a part of that meeting. If you guys want to comment, feel free.

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: And I'll take that as a feeling not so free to comment. Anyway, I appreciate their participation.

So, the virtual meeting, some other things we discussed. We touched base on the 4.9 gigahertz, FCC ruling and proposals. And those are just rolled out and we're basically trying to get a handle on where those are going. We've done a lot more research on that and we'll continue to talk about that.

Went back to the rapid deployment plan that was delayed due to COVID, like anything else. So what we want to do is get back to making sure that gets out to all the agency emergency management people, get the training and then actually look at doing some exercises of that internally with the state

agency contacts first just to actually go through the process, make a few phone calls and see how the process goes. Probably the last and biggest thing, we all -- and this is nothing new to anybody on the phone, we're all dealing with budget impacts and where we're going in operations. That essentially was the State Agency Working Group. We've got a couple things we're going to follow up on and that's where that stands.

Any comments or questions from anybody?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I'll take silence as none. Moving on to Citizen Alerting Committee. We have not had a meeting. I was trying to put one together but just literally ran out of time. However, Matt, if you want to jump to a couple slides ahead there.

And go to the next one.

This is a map that was sent out by the IPAWS folks that basically shows the activity for IPAWS across the country. Literally, the green indicates where both WEA and EAS authority exists.

The yellow indicates where there's only one. So, you can see for the most part, New York State is well covered. They have started putting this out on a regular basis so that we can follow what's going on.

What amazes me is when you look at large chunks of the country that typically have a lot of problems and don't participate in the system. When you go right into the middle there, that to me looks like Tornado Alley and it's kind of surprising that there's not a lot of green in that section there.

Just a couple of developments on that side of the world. We had a notice that came out on a quarterly briefing that finally, during 2021, the Weather Service Offices are going to implement the new capability to be able to channel IPAWS directly into NOAA broadcasts. That's been kind of the missing component, we've talked about this for a few years, is that there was no connection between IPAWS and NOAA weather radio.

The Weather Service puts stuff out on NOAA weather radio and you can pick it up on all kinds of devices, but it was not connected to the IPAWS system. This connection is going to fix that finally.

When there is an alert that goes out, it'll go out over all systems that are out there. They're disconnecting the HazCollect system. They plan to do some live testing with the IPAWS COGs in October-November, so literally right about now, and it's expected in the first half of 2021.

So needless to say, and we've talked about this a few times, Steve Delorenzo has been kind of passionate about getting

this thing done and it's just been a frustration for a number of years.

Once it's complete, they'll provide more information on which offices and exactly when it's going to happen. But I believe we're finally seeing the end of the tunnel. This notice came out on September 20th, so it's less than a month -- well, it's just about a month old now. Stay tuned, I think this is a big step forward on the alert and notification side of the world.

Any comments or questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. We will move on to PSAP, SICG and Targeted Grant updates. Larissa.

GUEDKO: Hello, everyone. Larissa Guedko, and I'll give you brief updates on the progress on those grants. Matt, would you please move to the next slide?

This is overall overview for the SICG program. This is SICG competitive and also the formula grant.

We have two grants right now that are still in red, should be Round 4 and 2016 SICG formula. Those grants, some of them have been extended since we see a lot of delays due to COVID pandemic.

And we're working with DOB and also with OSC to make sure that we have full understanding that the situation didn't just affect state agencies, it affects every single local government as well and as well as vendors who do the work for you guys.

We did expand 2018 SICG formula for multiple counties up to next year, end of next year. And we see more and more requests for extensions are coming through. We're trying to do any of them understanding the situation and we are hoping working with, again, the DOB and OSC to extend those grants. So far, we don't see any issues extending it. Next slide, please.

This is PSAP operations. Still, we -- this is one-year grant with very specific spending period. Right now, we have 2018-'19 PSAP Operations grant close, but we still accepting vouchers. There have been delay sending those vouchers to grant representative, which we understand, but please send all the vouchers and spending as soon as you can.

And we have '19 and '20 still open. Spending has been good. Even though we are in COVID pandemic, we still see quite a bit of spending on those grants. Next slide.

Targeted grant. This one is kind of stuck a little bit with \$8 million in spending since last year or, actually, a couple years before. And we are working with our control agencies to issue the award for the Phase 2 Targeted grant.

There's unfortunately no specific timeline for either next

PSAP RFA, next SICG grant or the Phase 2 Targeted awards. Our Director is very diligent in working with our control agencies to make sure that we get the funding to you guys. Next slide, please.

So, all RFA, we do have it ready, we have it reviewed by legal staff, by our agency. And right now, as I mentioned, they're working with control agencies to make sure that all those RFA goes through, there is a budget behind those RFAs and as soon as we know, you will all know.

Now, on expenses, even though right now, the RFA itself are delayed, the posting is delayed for the next one, we are still reimbursing for any current grants. Please submit all your expenses for current grants as soon as possible. We're still reimbursing it on a regular basis.

So far, we have \$538 million in grants. And I have to say during this pandemic, the fact that those grants are supporting implementation of interoperability channels, programming of all the interop channels and the subscriber equipment, in combination with COMU program, it played a huge positive impact on all our operations. We had availability of channels. We had repeater system if it has to be turned on. People on the field, they had the interop channels in their radios. We had caches. Everybody understood how interop channels -- well, almost everybody understood how interop channels work and what needs to be done and it worked wonderfully if I must say from the interoperability perspective. And next slide. Any questions to me?

DELANEY: Yes, Larissa. There's one in the chat. It's from Steve Sharpe. He says: "There are projects in progress that anticipate 2020 SICG funding. Are those projects permitted to proceed or will the performance periods be changed?"

GUEDKO: At this time, the performance period is -- if your performance period is, for example, the end of 2020 and you don't think that -- on existing grant, if you don't think you're going to make it through extension, on those that will be coming up, if we see that there is a delay and the contracts are not developed in time, we'll make sure to work with OSC to adjust the grant performance period to make sure that you do have enough time to spend the funding. This is all being considered.

SPRAGUE: Any questions for Larissa?
(No response.)

SPRAGUE: A couple of things. You know, we're trying to move this program along as fast as we can. I want to do a couple things. I want to recognize -- I'm sure most everybody knows that Shelly Wahrlich has retired and I want to reach out and thank Eric Abramson who's pitching in in

her stead right now for really working diligently with us to make sure that any of the expenses incurred are getting into the system and getting pushed through, making sure you guys get your reimbursements. He's also been a very active partner talking about some of the issues that we anticipate may pop up because of the delay in putting grants out, how we're going to have to anticipate some of the problems. Obviously, the current programs and projects that are out there may have been impacted by COVID and, you know, all the grants have an end date on them. We'll work as actively and cooperatively as possible to make sure we take that into account.

Also, as we move forward, the -- and Steve, you bring up a really good comment about contract date. Be very cautious of contract dates. Talk to your grant representatives if there's an issue. The grant representatives will bring it up to Eric and myself and our team. And we'll work with you as best we can to try to address all those issues.

This is an interesting time we're in right now and it's going to take some creative approaches to be able to handle it. Again, my thanks to Eric and his team for everything they're doing.

Any other comments or questions on the grant programs?

GUEDKO: There was a question in chat if the 2020 SICG RFA performance period will begin at 1/1/2021. We're going to see if we can leave the performance period start date at that point, because this is a formula grant which is designed not to only improve your improvements but also pay for your ongoing expenses, such as leases and so forth.

So I hope we can leave that period start date as 1/1/2021 depending when the RFA will come out, but we might have to extend it depending how fast we are going to be able to develop the contract and approve those contracts to all the counties and our control agency.

SPRAGUE: All right. Thanks, Larissa.

Okay. Moving on to new business. The Interoperability Network IP Address Plan. This was presented last Board meeting. We had one of our member agencies ask to delay so that they could take another look at it. Hopefully, that has been done and the questions have been answered. Matt, do you want to briefly run through it and then we'll do the vote?

DELANEY: Sure. I'll just -- we covered it last time, so I won't go into too much detail. But basically, this would provide guidelines for IP addressing for public safety communication systems to promote and support the interoperability and system-of-systems approach. The idea here is to address IP address conflicts at the system

level, at the interoperable and edge level. We're not talking about addressing for individual devices, subscriber units within the system. We're not talking about issues related to your computers in your county.

This is specifically for where your networks would connect to other counties or to other consortiums. This originally goes back probably 2013-2014. There was an original document. Over time, we found based on comments that there were some revisions needed.

So, a little summary of the revisions. Easy-to-read format and reorganization. Clarified the details for WAN addressing. Provided guidelines for external connections. We added some stuff on cybersecurity considerations. As I mentioned, reflects IP addressing at the edge or just off the network and does not impact subscribers, MDTs, county PCs or anything along those lines. And it would designate OIEC as the central coordinating agency.

So, if there were specific items that were out of plan, maybe county or two counties or something that wasn't considered at a particular shared site or something, this would allow OIEC just to say does this probably make sense to go this way, and everyone agrees and set this as sort of an aside to the actual detailed plan.

The IP address scheme here is not inherently any different than was defined originally six or so years ago, so we're not talking about a complete change.

It just makes it in a little clearer and a little easier to understand format. And some of the details that were missing from the original plan are clarified here.

As I mentioned, centralized coordination. In addition to the actual plan, OIEC would provide the coordination for use by those systems as part of the Librarian Project, which is where we're collecting and storing information on networks in the state.

As I mentioned, this prevents the IP address conflict to promote easier system-to-system operability. And administers the IP plan and maintains a centralized database.

We have a guideline document that Joann had distributed. Basically, the guideline just says that there is a separate plan maintained by OIEC to refer to. That plan is not distributed here because it is not a public document. For security reasons, it's kept -- there's a public safety sensitivity. It certainly is provided to any county or to your authorized vendor, your network or microwave vendor upon request and authorization of the county, but it's not a publicly posted document.

The guideline is and will be posted on our website and,

basically, we just make everyone aware that there is a plan and to consider the plan and if you're not sure about what that plan is, contact OIEC.

So basically, we're looking for, approval of that guideline that says OIEC will be responsible for maintaining this and coordinating these documents.

Mike.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Thanks, Matt. So, like I said, we had this on the agenda last month. We postponed it, tabled it until the next meeting and we just went through it.

Any comments, questions on this item?

MORRIS: Tim Morris with the State Police. I do have one question.

SPRAGUE: Sure.

MORRIS: On the document that Matt's referring to, it talks about the management, coordination of the IP addressing. How will the state agency relay to the communications network asset? Is that something we'll do through the county or will we have direct access to that?

SPRAGUE: Matt, I'll let you handle that.

DELANEY: I had a little trouble understanding what you were saying, Tim. Did you say a communications asset or can you just repeat that part of your question?

MORRIS: Sure. On page 2, 2.2, Management and Coordination of Your Documents, the second paragraph, it refers to the IP addressing scheme for the interop communications and it will be done through statewide communications network. As a state agency with the IP addresses, will we be doing that through the County or will that be something we'll do directly through you or directly into that communications asset?

DELANEY: Okay. It really depends on who's building that piece of the network. If a County is building it, it would be the County, if a State agency -- so the plan is designed around geography and not the ownership of it. So if your asset is within a particular county, it would be defined based on that geographic county in the IP scheme.

And if there are questions or conflicts, it would come through OIEC to coordinate. Certainly, any of the data that was collected or out there or existed today will be collected into the Librarian Project. If there are specific state assets that are not being collected in that, that's something we want to get added to that Librarian Project.

I know, for example, in the north country, that information is being collected from all the counties and shared network. But if there are specific things, certainly, OIEC would coordinate that and resolve any conflicts in the plan that, you know, if there was a conflict between what, for example,

a state was putting in and a county was putting in the same geographic area.

MORRIS: No, that's understood, and I do see that laid out in the plan and that all makes sense. It's more of a question of if a state agency, regardless of whether it's us or DOT or whoever, installs a microwave link anywhere -- and we do have microwave links in the north country with different state agencies and different counties.

But if, and I'll give an example, the State Police were to put up a new microwave link and we go through the IP addressing, and the location, it goes by the county's IP address, how do we make sure that you know that that link is up, that is, the IP address? Do we file that through the county or file it directly through OIEC?

DELANEY: You would let OIEC know. We're the coordinating entity.

MORRIS: All right. Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Any other questions or comments?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All right. Based on we were entertaining this at the last meeting, I'm just going to move that we call the roll and ask Joann to call the roll.

WAIDELICH: Michael Sprague.

SPRAGUE: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Brett Chellis. Brett Chellis.

(No response.)

DELANEY: It appears Brett's dropped off.

SPRAGUE: Okay. We'll move on.

WAIDELICH: Timothy Morris.

MORRIS: Yes.

WAIDELICH: David Kislowski.

KISLOWSKI: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Brian LaFlure.

LAFLURE: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Brian Gifford. Brian Gifford.

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay, move on.

WAIDELICH: Bob Terry.

TERRY: Yes.

GIFFORD: Apologies. This is Brian Gifford. The answer's yes. I was muted in two places. Apologies.

SPRAGUE: Thank you.

WAIDELICH: Thank you, Brian.

Todd Murray.

MURRAY: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Kimberly Beatty.

BEATTY: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Michael Volk.

VOLK: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Allen Turner.

TURNER: Yes.

WAIDELICH: Wes Jones.

JONES: Yes.

WAIDELICH: And Ryan Greenberg.

GREENBERG: Yes.

WAIDELICH: And Brett Chellis.

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. The motion carries. Thanks, everybody, appreciate this.

All right. We can hear Brett's vote, but you guys can't, so we won't count it. He's in the other room yelling at us. Okay. The next order on the agenda is dates of the SIEC Board meeting for next year. With that, if you step on to the next slide there, these are pretty much a continuation of what we did last year. It would be February 3rd, May 5th, August 4th and October 27th.

Comments, questions, feedback?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I'm going to take no objection as basically being good dates. Obviously, if something pops up, we'll have to adjust them. I think we're getting really good at being able to adjust things these days.

With that, I guess we'll take those dates and move with it. So, next slide.

The other discussion that I wanted to put out there, the 2021 Symposium. Normally, by this time, we would have started working with the hotel and the contracts and all the things that go along with trying to put together a symposium. However, there's a lot of things working against us. Obviously, we don't know where we're going to be next March; hopefully, in a much different place, but as things are moving right now, the idea of bringing that number of people together is pretty much unconceivable. The other piece that goes along with it is as everybody out there, I know in all the counties and the state agencies, the idea of trying to go to budget and asking for money to support a large-scale get-together of everybody in March is not something that would be very popularly received right now. Probably not a great idea from that perspective. So those are two big things against us right off the bat.

What we are considering at this point is a virtual symposium. What that means and what it looks like, I'm not too sure. This is just my thought is that we would schedule like a two- to three-hour block of programs. We would do it as a webinar type thing and see if we could do that along maybe a couple of days on one week, a couple of days on the next

week or spread it out a little bit.

The idea of us all sitting in front of our computers for four days or three days staring at the screen really does not win my heart over. It's very difficult, as you know, to get -- if you're not leaving your office, it's very difficult to get that block of time without being interrupted, pulled away or otherwise not participating. We still want to do the participation piece of it. I think it's a big piece of our program.

However, the idea of trying to put together something, as much as I'd love to be able to put together something for us to go to Niagara Falls, it would be wonderful, we still have that venue sitting out there. We had actually postponed for a year. You know, if we don't actually get together or do something along those lines this coming year, I certainly would entertain it for the following year. The venue would be great. If we can ever get there, I think it would be a wonderful thing. But the logistics of making this happen right now are just not in our favor, unfortunately.

So that's what we're looking at, and I'd certainly open it up for any comments, questions. You know, this is where we kind of showcase some of the members of the board meeting or the board. I would definitely love to get your feedback.

JONES: Mike, this is Wes Jones.

SPRAGUE: Yes, Wes.

JONES: A month earlier than that is the scheduled New York State Emergency Management Association conference and for exactly the same reason, they do it online. We had also postponed our conference, because it's not feasible.

I do like the idea that you're mentioning of doing smaller blocks as opposed to trying to get people to sit in front of a computer for all day long. I've been a part of a few conferences now and it's just not possible, you know, when you're in the office as opposed to, you know, obviously offsite.

So, if you can manage something where you're doing it in blocks where people can block out part of their day but still be available, I think that that would work in a much better situation.

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Wes. I appreciate the commentary.

That's been kind of my observation on a couple of these things.

Anybody else?

GREENBERG: Mike, this is Ryan.

SPRAGUE: Yes.

GREENBERG: So, we were in a similar boat. We do our EMS conference every year. It normally brings anywhere from a

thousand to fifteen hundred providers from around the state and, actually, this Friday and Saturday is our virtual conference, because we did move it to virtual.

We also actually went to a virtual ongoing symposium kind of, what we call our academy, where we offer content in one-hour blocks on a weekly basis.

So, I do think there are some other things. But from a virtual conference point of view, if you do the virtual, I think you should, I think it's important, I think people sometimes get used to a conference and look forward it. I think even in just keeping some sense of norm, that having that virtual conference still brings that expertise around and has that collaboration point of view.

And I'd be happy to help share any of our experience in us going virtual and the different things and help with that, you know, if you need it or if you go that route.

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Ryan, I appreciate that. And your idea of an academy throws an idea to my mind that probably should make Mark worried, but that's okay, that's another story.

BALISTRERI: I am worried.

GREENBERG: I didn't do it. It's not my fault.

SPRAGUE: It's an interesting concept. We're hoping right now to what it is we're going to do. I delayed really getting us as a group to sit down and start to plan this thing out too much until we brought this up here and had some commentary. So, I appreciate all the feedback that you guys are giving us. Anybody else?

GREENBERG: I will also just lead on that one that the virtual conference does give another benefit. We find equally as many people watch the video or do the education after the event as the people who attend live and participate in the question and answer portion. So that could be something that's another additional value of people who maybe wouldn't have been able to come to the conference but now all of a sudden will be able to participate.

SPRAGUE: Yeah, good point. Yeah, if you can share any of your statistics of how it goes and what the follow-up is, that would be wonderful. It'll give us some guidelines to go by and then we'll just work to that end.

Any other comments?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. Okay. With that, we'll move on to the next slide which is one everybody's been waiting for, the summary and closing remarks.

We've gone over quite a bit here. I appreciate everybody participating in our virtual format. I appreciate the folks that tried to talk and we, for some reason, could not manage to make that work. But I'm glad we could get your chat

comments in and address them.

You know, we definitely want you guys to beat right along and get your participation and feedback, so that's important to us.

Other than that, our next meeting is going to be February 3rd. So, we'll look forward to getting information -- we'll put a lot of feedback out in between now and the meeting so that we can have you prepped for the next meeting and we'll still keep heading that direction. I guess from closing remarks, everybody, be safe. I'll use Jay Kopstein's notes here: Wear a mask and wash your hands. Hope everybody's well and thank you all for participating.

TURNER: Mike, can I ask one question before we end? This is Allen Turner.

SPRAGUE: Sure.

TURNER: This is actually geared towards Brett. Back in June, he sent out a NENA statement on possibly a statewide phone MOU situation where if one county had problems with their phones in their dispatch center, they could work with another county. But at that point, it would be county-to-county MOUs, that type of thing. And he sent a --

CHELLIS: This is Brett. Can you hear me okay? I got knocked off the air. By the way, Mr. Chair, I did vote positive on the last item there. The network threw me off for some reason, but I could hear you from the neighboring office.

Allen, are you talking about the Rapid SOS that we were exploring during the COVID in terms of counties being able to back up and receive the location information, wireless calls?

TURNER: No, not so much that but -- I'm looking at the memorandum, the intrastate mutual aid program or --

CHELLIS: Are you talking about TERT?

TURNER: Yeah, kind of like an in-state TERT.

CHELLIS: Oh, okay. I think what you're saying, we did put a guidance that if during the situation -- we've been watching PSAPs very closely and we still are across the state as some PSAPs continue to be affected with personnel, you know, with this more recent rise in cases. So in the event that mutual aid is needed between counties, we've done this before in the state, but there was an intrastate mutual aid part added to Article 2b, which allows municipalities, the counties and state agencies to share resources without having to draw up agreements between lawyers for a lot of things besides the typical police, fire and EMS and public works type sharing that goes on as already set in other mutual aid plans.

The Article 2b just addresses a lot of resources and

emergency dispatchers can be and have been moved around the state under those provisions. I think that's what I was doing was just reiterating that that is possible and, if needed, we're more than happy to support fielding out to the counties what personnel are available and willing and helping support a PSAP should they need that.

TURNER: Is that something -- the way I read it, do each county individually have to do an MOU with a neighboring county or --

CHELLIS: No. The purpose of that is to take care of that so you don't have to. This started in 2006 with the floods of June. I happened to be supervisor in Broome County and we reached out for help, because we had a number of dispatchers affected and we were getting slammed with calls at the same time.

We were able to field personnel from around the state. But SEMO at the time helped us very much. But the issue was the legal end. County attorneys had to scratch their heads and write up a lot of MOUs and agreements to make sure everybody was covered. And that's what SEMO didn't want to have happen again.

And back when Greg Burnell was Deputy Director, one of his charges was to see that through and he worked with NYSEMA. I think Director Sprague was a part of that effort and they wrote amendments to Article 2b to take care of sharing resources between governments that aren't on the normal police, fire and EMS list.

ALLEN: Okay. So, everything is already established then; correct?

CHELLIS: From my understanding, yes. Certainly, you know, we could have the Director and Jim answer that more, but from my understanding, yes.

SPRAGUE: So, Allen, IMAP was created so that if there weren't any agreements in place, it could help to cover those. It does not replace any agreements if you should choose you want to do so. But that's totally elective, up to you guys.

It doesn't replace it, but in lack of, in lieu of one if there is none, then the IMAP process basically covers that.

TURNER: Okay, very good. Thank you.

CHELLIS: If I might add, Allen, one of the purposes of my guidance was just from lessons learned from the times we have moved dispatchers, the counties that have the same CAD system, if you can identify them ahead of time in your regional meetings and even in our statewide inventory, it's very helpful to have that at your fingertips, because that tends to be the easiest way to handle it is have counties with the same CAD support you first if what you need is

call-takers, because then you don't have a big learning curve.

TURNER: Okay, thank you very much.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Thanks, Allen. I had a text from Dave Cook from FirstNet authority. I think he's trying to get back in.

David, are you there?

DELANEY: I'll try unmuting him again and see. Okay, David? (No response.)

DELANEY: I do have his comments here from chat if you want me to read them.

SPRAGUE: That'd be fine, sure.

DELANEY: He says, quote, "I wanted to express The First Responder Network Authority in Washington's gratitude for your work during the COVID response and civil unrest and advise how the Director, Matt and Larissa were all called out individually for their commendable efforts to ensure broadband was available", unquote.

SPRAGUE: Thank you, David. Appreciate the recognition. Yeah, we did a lot of work in that aspect. I've actually been asked to do a review of that for FirstNet's public safety broadband -- public safety working group in November which I plan to do. So yeah, we did some pretty interesting things over the last few months.

Any other comments or questions? Anything for the good of the order before I close the meeting?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good. Hearing nothing, I'll take a motion for adjournment.

MEMBER: So moved.

MEMBER: Second.

SPRAGUE: Okay, I have a motion and a second. All in favor. (Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed, you can just stay on the call. All right. Thanks, everybody.

* * * * *

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

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

of same, to the best of my ability and belief.

Theresa L. Ardia

Theresa L. Ardia, CSR, CRR, RPR, RMR

Dated: October 29, 2020.