

**STATE INTEROPERABLE & EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 20, 2019
DHSES - Building 7A - First Floor Training Room**

SPRAGUE: Good morning, everyone. Let's call the meeting to order, the State Interoperable Communications Board meeting to order. Thank you, everybody, for making the trip. We didn't have too bad of a day for travel compared to yesterday. I appreciate everybody making the trip and we've got some good presentations this morning. With that, I'll move on to the roll call.

Board Members Present:

Michael Sprague
Brett Chellis
Charles White
David Kislowski
Brian Gifford
James Voutour
Michael Volk
Allen Turner
A. Wesley Jones
Sarah Dean - via telephone
Anthony Tripp - via telephone

Board Members Absent:

Richard Andersen
Dominic Dagostino
Brian LaFlure
Bob Terry
Johanna Sullivan
Kimberly Beaty
Richard Tantalo
Ryan Greenberg

GUESTS:

Nicole Erickson
Carl Gary
Chris Tuttle
Matt Campbell
Steven Sharpe
Michael Davis
James Callahan

Frank McCarton
Peter Bojmal
Gerald Engstrom
David Cook
Phil McGeough
Joann Waidelich
Matt Beckwith
Joe Grube
Matthew Delaney
Jay Kopstein
Mark Grubb
Joe Galvin
Kevin Hughes
Chris Meyer
Jonathan Gable
Lana Cawrse
Eric Abramson

SPRAGUE: Who's on the phone?

DEAN: My name is Sarah Dean. I'm sorry, I came in late. I'm the representative for the Division of Criminal Justice Services.

TRIPP - Good morning.

SPRAGUE: Great. Thanks, Sarah and Tony. Very good. We'll move on to approve the minutes. Did everybody receive their minutes from the last meeting? And are there any comments or corrections?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Hearing none, I'll move for approval of the minutes.

VOUTOUR: Make a motion to approve the minutes.

JONES: Second.

SPRAGUE: Motion made and seconded. Any further discussion?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All those in favor.

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Motion carries. Okay, you have your agenda in front of you. Any comments or questions on the agenda? Otherwise, I'll entertain a motion to adopt the agenda.

JONES: So moved.

TURNER: Second.

SPRAGUE: Motion made and seconded. Any discussion?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: All those in favor?

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Very good, thank you. A couple things before we get into the heart of the meeting here. I appreciate it if everybody would put their phones on stun. I realize everybody here has got a role to play, and that's why you're on the Board. If you do need to take a call, please feel free to go out into the lobby and take the call. If there is an emergency, we will exit out the side door here behind us, go out through the lobby and up between the row of cars, up into the cars so that we don't block the entrance for approaching vehicles. We'll do accountability at that location out there. The restrooms are across the hall and, otherwise, we'll move on.

One of the first things I want to do before I get too far into the meeting is recognize somebody. If you haven't heard, Sheriff Voutour is retiring and, as such, he's also going to step away from the Board, which is a big loss for us. We're very fortunate to have had him on, and I can't even tell you how many years you've been on the Board.

VOUTOUR: I just found out nine. 2010

SPRAGUE: It seems like a lot longer.

VOUTOUR: I thought it was five.

SPRAGUE: Did you, really? I know it was more than that. Well, what I want to do just take a few minutes to thank and recognize you for your passion for public safety issues, and the years of dedication that you put in. We've all been benefitted from your service, and it's improved and enhanced communications on 9-1-1 issues in the state with your participation on this Board. And you've always been willing to step in and speak your mind and give us your guidance and we genuinely appreciate that. So, with that, I'd like to give you this Certificate of Appreciation.

VOUTOUR: Thank you.

(Applause.)

SPRAGUE: I also have one for Bill Bleyle. Bill retired and was going to stay on the Board and then found a third job, or occupation, so we have a similar one that we are going to give to Bill, because Bill has put a lot of time in on our board, as well. We thank him for that.

Okay. One of the things I wanted to do, we just went through an exercise this summer with a number of the states in the northeast on a project called The Markers, and what it's doing is looking at the communications

organizations within the different states and looking at different components of governance, communications, interoperability, and a number of other things that go along with that.

And the group, along with the National Governance Association and with ECD, Emergency Communications Division, which was under DHS, and now it is under CISA. They did a real nice job working with NCSWIC to put together what they call The Markers. And I thought it would be very entertaining and enlightening for this group to see where they fit in in the grand scheme of this whole thing. As you'll see, we did pretty well. But this group here is part of the reason why we did that.

I would like to introduce Mark Grubb from CISA and Emergency Communications Division. I asked Chris Tuttle if he could arrange to have them come in, and he did. And they have a short presentation to go over with us that will talk you through it but give you an idea of where you fit in.

GRUBB: Good morning, everyone. It is great to be here. If I talk too fast, I had one more cup of coffee than I should have, so I'll try to slow down but wanted to thank Michael for asking us to be here today. My name is Mark Grubb. I'm from the Department of Homeland Security and the Office of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency. We call ourselves CISA, although if there was an L in front of that, it would be Lisa, so I don't know.

Anyway, CISA again, is the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, and under CISA is the Emergency Communications Division, which we come from. I'm going to give you a very quick overview, and then we'll just get into The Markers segment of what Michael talked about.

CISA is broken up into three major components: Our Cybersecurity Division, which handles all cybersecurity, including the upcoming election security. They do all of the election security and cybersecurity in the country.

Our Infrastructure Security Division; that monitors the infrastructure and the security of infrastructure throughout the United States.

And the Emergency Communications Division, which is where we are housed, and we handle all emergency communications throughout the country. And what that means is that we work with every state and territory to help with policy, procedures, and help move states

through the ecosystem of interoperable communications. When I talk about the ecosystem, that's a term that we use, and the ecosystem means technologies and agencies that deal with emergency communications and bringing those agencies from what used to be a silo effect, everybody 9-1-1 operated separate from LMR, which operated separate from data. We're trying to bring those together at least in a room like this and talk about policy and what each agency is doing to improve interoperable communications within their state and, therefore, across the country.

What's impressive about New York is that you're all in this room today. We don't see that in a lot of states and territories where they come together under the governance body and they talk about emergency communications holistically. Congratulations to the State of New York and all of your efforts for doing that. That's very impressive.

This is just a real quick slide about what CISA does. And it's a little confusing, because we refer to ourselves as CISA, but this is an ECD slide, which is Emergency Communications Division. This talks about the six planes where ECD focuses. We focus on national and statewide planning and execution, which is driven through the SWIC. National governance, our national governance branch drives the SCIPs and the things that happen with SCIP planning throughout every state, helps SWICs move policy forward. That is the national governance branch.

Then, there's the Technical Assistance and Outreach branch which Chris Tuttle who you're familiar with, that's where Chris falls. We have Federal Grant Coordination. That office works with the SAFECOM grants and policy for the SAFECOM grants. Then, we have our Priority Services branch. They work on GETS and WPS. I'm sure you're familiar with that. And they drive participation in WPS and GETS. And then there's Assessment and Reports, which is where I fall, and that is; strategy, integration and performance.

Performance management is what we're going to talk about today and The Markers and how we got there. That's just a quick overview of that.

This is a slide, just dialing back just for a minute, my background is I was the SWIC in Delaware for almost 10 years. I still to this day sit on the 9-1-1 board for Delaware and when I came to the federal government a couple of years ago, the one thing I recognized is what our legislators thought emergency communications was and

what it truly is for all of us in the room. I went about with a good designer trying to help me get that message out of my brain and onto paper and this is what we came up with. And this is a slide that has gained some traction throughout the United States. This is what I call the iceberg graphic and it's what most people see, especially legislators, about 9-1-1 or about emergency communications is that it's 9-1-1. That's what they have in their mind about emergency communications. It's 9-1-1, it's critical, it's important, yes, it's extremely important. But what they don't see is what we drive to every day to support that effort, and that is LMR, radio communications, broadband, it's all those things that happen with broadband, alerts and warnings, the governance that it takes putting people in a room like this and talking about all of the issues that happen with emergency communications, and then all of the training, COMU programs, COML, radio, INTD, all of those things, and the cybersecurity that overlays all of that. And that costs a lot of money and it takes a lot of time and it takes a lot of people power to drive those things. And that's the message that I continually try to get across in Delaware, especially at the executive and legislative level, is that you see 9-1-1 and you see that that drives customers calling into 9-1-1 and as a board member of 9-1-1, it's critical. But what you don't see is all of this stuff a lot of times and that drives state budget. And that's why I thought it was important to get this slide out and just go from there. Any questions on this? All of these are available to you, of course, and you can use this at any time. So now we're going to talk about the reason that we're here and that's specifically markers. What the markers are, it's 25 indicators of interoperability held in any state and then, therefore, across the nation. We're diving in a new era of performance analytics, or data analytics. The data that we collect voluntarily from states helps us drive some data points that I think you'll find interesting. And just very quickly, from a resource analysis point of view, my team took about a year and a half to look at over 800 SCIPs that were submitted from all of the states, SCIP snapshots, after action reports, lessons learned from our NECP, from our NGA workshop that we did in 2018 where we collected high level folks and SWICs together in four workshops and drove them to write goals about interoperable communications.

And during those four workshops in 2018, 49 states put together 702 goals surrounding interoperable communications, helping drive together interoperable communications in their states. Some significant things happened there. We reviewed all of that. Then, we reviewed it internally within our branches.

And we came up with an idea that for each of the markers, a state is either initial based on the information that we put together, they're defined, or they're optimized in that particular marker. And I'll talk about a couple of the markers just to give you a sense of what that means.

You'll see how this ties into the initial defined and optimized scheme. Then, we brought in 14 SWICs into D.C. and we talked about these markers, what they were, what they meant, did it work for the states, was the language right, so on and so forth. We spent a considerable amount of development time in the markers to make sure that they said what the states wanted them to say and we think we got it right.

Here are the benefits for states to do the markers. It helps readers understand impacts of interoperability efforts, reduce workload by eliminating SCIP snapshots. It helps to justify grant funding when you see the data that you're about to see. We can present that data in a way that would help states justify grant funding. It's improved coordination with locals, which is critical, I think, to every state. Improve coordination and buy-in from lawmakers and executive staff. That's one thing that I've always driven to is to get to the lawmakers to help us with the decisions that we make for interoperable communications. Improves strategic planning and implementation aligns with ecosystem. Enhance the SCIP planning process. The markers that were done here in New York were applied to the SCIP that you all did, and it had an impact of driving strategic goals in your planning process. And enhances governance body participation and membership as you see today. The benefits for us for that is to understand state and territory interoperable capabilities and gaps. For the longest time, we would be driving programs to states and not clearly understanding the impact. Now, we can understand the impact, and how it moves states forward with emergency communications.

It improves alignment to the NECP. The National Emergency Communications Plan is a plan that we're required by federal law to put out every five years. That is the plan where we report emergency

communications across the nation and the impact that we're having.

It improves technical assistance. It improves how states view where they need to ask us for help. Which allows us to clearly identify, through data, where the gaps are in a state.

It justifies resource requirements to DHS leadership. We're required by law to report on emergency communications data and we are required to report to Congress and the President on the things that we offer and the things that we're making impact on. This is the same with congressional government accountability and OMD.

All right. I think I'm going to go out of order here for a minute. It's easier to see on that screen than this screen, it's a little bit brighter there, but these are the 25 markers. You start with marker number one on the very top, and its state level governing body established. Right?

Just to give you an idea of how the markers were established and the language of the marker, if you're initial in a state on that particular marker, you have no governance body like you have today.

If you're defined in that marker, our best practice that we wrote said that you have a governance body that is in formation by executive order.

And if you're optimized, you have the governance body the SIEC is formed by state law. Right? So that gives you a sense of how we went through and the language that we put through for each of the markers.

If you take a look at the top eight markers, they are aligned to -- all of the markers are aligned to the SAFECOM interoperable continuum, but the first eight all have to do with governance. As you can see, your results in New York is optimized for all of the governance markers, which is significant. I believe, if memory serves, New York is the first state that is optimized on the first eight markers, have optimized all of that. Let me just walk through them a little bit. SIGB and SIEC participation. Initial there is you have one or two agencies that attend the meetings, agencies that are 9-1-1, LMR, data, alerts and warnings and that's how that's defined.

If you are defined in that position, you have three or four of those agencies that participate. And if you're optimized, you have all of those five plus agencies who participate in your governance body, which you do. Then, there's the SWIC established and, again, the SWIC

is established through executive order, governance body. You guys are optimized in how your SWIC is established. So that's one of the markers, one of the measures that we look at.

SWIC duty performance. How much time does your SWIC spend on interoperable communications issues? There are states that have a SWIC in name only. They work on interoperable issues, but they're also the head of their LMR program, they have county duties, they have fire duties, they have all kinds of duties. Right? Here in New York, you have not only a SWIC, but you also have a team who focuses on emergency communications interoperability issues. That's fantastic. It puts New York in optimize. So, you get the idea of how those go. I just wanted to focus on those first eight, and just let you know that because of your participation in these meetings, and what you do every day, it drives governance in the State of New York from an emergency communications perspective.

Let me back up a little bit. Now, to the map. What we did is (Joe Galvin in the back of the room had the unfortunate honor of traveling with me across the United States) collecting marker data. We collected marker data from all 56 states and territories. It's probably the first time that we were able to do that sort of data collection and get a hundred percent participation across the United States. Pretty concerted effort. But what we came up with is what I call a key indicator of success numbers. My boss, nor my colleagues like my name choice for that, so the key indicator of success is also KIS. They didn't like that too much, but I like it. The key indicator of success number for New York, up until yesterday, was 2.08. You guys have made progress on a couple of the goals that we saw just a few minutes ago, a couple of the markers, and it raised you up to 2.17. This gives you an idea of the numbers across the entire United States.

I will tell you that at the highest level is New Hampshire. They're around 2.5. I can't see the number right there. The lowest participant right now is U.S. Virgin Islands. That's not great, or terrible.

What that tells us is that there are programs that we need to work on for states like -- or territories like U.S. Virgin Islands and drive some more participation along with more work through emergency communications with territories like the U.S. Virgin Islands. That shows us there's gaps there. And then New Hampshire, a small state, it's a bit easier to manage, bring people

together and drive, you know, the difference in what happens in emergency communications on a smaller scale. It's a little bit easier to accomplish some things. Right? But it just gives us an idea of where you fall as far as progress or what we call interoperability health.

VOU TOUR: Mark, what was the percentage on the map?

GRUBB: Say again.

VOU TOUR: What did the percentage represent, 72 percent? What did that represent again?

GRUBB: You mean on --

VOU TOUR: The U.S. map. That one. Where it says 2.17 and 72 percent.

GRUBB: 72 percent completion of the markers.

VOU TOUR: Okay, thank you.

GRUBB: So just to understand the numbers just a little bit, I skipped a little bit of a step here which is important is if a state was all initial, they'd be a one. Right? If they were all optimized, they would be a three. So, that just gives you an idea of how we outlined the numbers.

Therefore, if you're a one, you're all initial. If you're a three, three is the maximum score. You guys are in the 2.17, and we'll talk about that in a second. The national average is 1.87. That's the national average on that key indicator of success number. And you can see that New York is at 2.17, and that literally just changed yesterday as we were talking. We realized that you guys had moved from left to right into optimize on three markers, and that bumped your score up. We got that on the screen just last night. That's the number for New York.

That's a testament to the work that your SWIC office is doing and everyone in this room is doing. That's driving success in those markers as far as what it takes to get interoperable health from what we call left initial to right optimum.

Now, back to this just a second. I just want to give a very quick overview of what the markers entail. We talked about the SCIP refresh, right, and the SCIP strategic goal percentage. We talked about integrated emergency communications, the communications of COMU process. We talked about interagency communications, completion of your TIC-P, completion of your FOG, which you have them both updated and current; alerts and warnings, radio programming, cybersecurity assessment, NG 9-1-1 implementation, data operability and interoperability, communications exercise objectives, so

after-action reports, communication unit responders and what that process is; communications usage and best practices or lessons learned; WPS subscription rates. We're measuring how many first responders have WPS on their wireless device. It's low across the country. I think every single state and territory is in the initial phase except for Washington, D.C., which is at about 400 percent, because all of us have WPS right on our devices, so that skews the numbers pretty significantly. If we weren't there, they'd be probably in the initial phase as well.

Outreach. This is a direct measurement of what Michael and his office are doing, outreaching to the State of New York. Right? What are the programs for the SWIC office that they're bringing out and educating the emergency communications stakeholders about interoperability?

Sustainment assessment is about looking at the infrastructure equipment that you have, emergency communications equipment that you have in the state and looking to sustainment ideas. Like, are we planning to understand what we need to replace next, and what the life cycle is, and those types of things.

Risk identification is looking at that same equipment and analyzing risk. Do we have backup plans for those emergency communication infrastructures? Are we reviewing that? That's more in the COOP planning world. Then, we have cross border interstate or state-to-state emergency communications. Right? Are we talking to our states? Do we have MOAs in place with state partners with other states and driving communications across state the lines?

You can see that there's one other marker on here. It's the one marker that does not get assessed initial, defined and optimize, and that's marker 17. All that does is look at future technology. We just ask the state to say, hey, what future technology are you looking at? And that's a checkbox activity, so that doesn't fall into the initial, define and optimizing. There's 25 markers of interoperable health and it indicates health across, as you can see, many types of technologies and agencies.

Questions?

(No response.)

GRUBB: You good? Okay. This is my most favorite slide. This talks about state marker success stories. We started this program in the beginning of this year, the markers in the beginning of this year. And these

are the things that -- these are some of the highlights, and that is CISA has begun to incorporate the state markers into the SCIP planning process.

We take the markers baseline data that we have for every state and territory. We literally sit down as an office right up to the assistant director. And when the SCIP is going to happen in the state, we talk about all the markers in their state, and where there might be gaps. Where we can help best and provide suggestions to the state. That data has helped us focus in on where interoperability gaps are.

Kansas was the first to request us to come and we just did it about three weeks ago. It was the first snow of the season for me when I was in Kansas. We went to Kansas and we presented to their SIAC.

The interesting story about Kansas is; in 2018 when we did the NGA workshop, they walked away with one goal. Their goal was to create a governance body for emergency communications because they did not have one. They had the SWIC there, they had the CIO, and they had a legislator there.

Before they left that meeting, the legislator had written the legislation, had put it in and about three weeks later, the governor signed into law them having a governance body. That's how effective that meeting was. Then they followed up, asked us to come out a year later and talk to their newly formed SIAC about the marker. Virginia presented the markers on their own in this format and got a lot of buy-in from their locals especially, so that was successful for us. One of the things that we like to do, especially with the markers workshops that we did over the summer, is have states come together and talk about things like sharing their COMU plan with other states so they can drive participation not even in their state but across states. Alabama had a great TIC-P template that they shared, which worked out great.

After reviewing the marker data, on their WPS, they were initial, they were low on WPS participation rates, they contacted us and asked for a par to come out and sign up as many people as we could on WPS. It's free and it gives you interoperable end-to-end communication. Right? That was really important.

Louisiana leveraged state marker data to receive funding for a full-time SWIC. They took the data, they presented to legislation, and the marker data was enough to get them full-time funding for a SWIC in Louisiana. And then I'm proud to put on here being here today; this

is a success for us. Being able to come to a SIEC and present the marker data. We get the message out, along with the work that we're doing. Let me stop and see if there's any questions.

SPRAGUE: Mark, if you can go back to that national rating a second. When we went through this, there was a couple of things that I personally picked up out of it. One, it's a good way to see where we are, and to look back as I'm answering the questions, I can see where we were, and where we are today. It was a nice way of being able to give a measurement of making a difference here at some points.

What I picked up on, and I think I mentioned it when we went to Philadelphia, we were surprised at the number of states that didn't have Boards. That didn't have Boards that were -- they had a Board, but it was not formal. They have Boards, but their SWIC wasn't even a member of the Board, which was surprising.

So right off the bat, when we got the results of this, the first eight things are governance, and that gives us a huge basis to build our communications program from. Part of that is recognizing your role, because you guys are here, you are part of this process. And, one, it's a big thank you, but secondly, it's also, this is where you guys fit in.

I think when you go through the other markers where we didn't score so well, it gives us a roadmap of how to improve it, which is the other thing I like about it. If you look at some of the things that we're working on or that we need help with, a lot of them fit our standing committees that are already part of this group. It all comes back to here, in the end result of how our program moves forward.

I know sometimes it's like you come to meetings and sit here and wonder why you're sitting here. This is a perfect example of why you're here, and how you guys fit into this whole process. From my perspective, this is a big value. Add to where you are and what your role is in this whole process. Thank you for coming, one, and secondly, for being part of this.

We definitely have some work to do on alerts and warnings. We have a citizens alerting group as part of this group here. We're in good shape on some of our interoperable stuff, but we have a working group that's part of this, NG 9-1-1. We have a way to go, but we have two working groups that are part of this, an advisory committee and a working group.

As it went through, it was tailor made for what we're

doing. And I wanted you guys to see this, and I appreciate Mark and Joe for coming up and spending the time to interact with you guys. It's a neat process. It takes a while to go through. We had a C3 meeting yesterday afternoon. The chairs are here, I'll recognize the chairs from our C3 group from our consortium, and they went through this exercise. And I think they got some value out of it as well. One of the things we picked up right off the bat is we just finished our SCIP which has been an online process we've been working on all summer. A couple of those sessions when we were working on them, we had over 60 people on the phone. I don't know anybody that gets that many people to work on their SCIP. So again, thanks to all you guys and how this all fits together. Comments or questions for Mark?

KOPSTEIN: Mike.

SPRAGUE: Go ahead.

KOPSTEIN: Mark, one thing I don't see on here is a loading factor, a weighting factor. You mentioned earlier that New Hampshire is at the top of the heap. You also said New Hampshire is a smaller state. So when you get into the larger population states, states that have more incidents and events, if you added a loading factor in like they do in the private sector, that rating system will change and you'll see that a state may be further down, maybe in the 13th position, but all of a sudden now be in the 1st or 2nd position when you add that loading factor in. Because even though they're down on these markers in some cases, their utilization and the like are way above and it would change the perspective. Do you follow what I'm saying?

GRUBB: Yes, I totally understand what you're saying. The way that we think about this, and you're exactly right, Jay, the way that we think about it is these were designed not to be a ranking of states. We don't view it that way although we just show optimization. Because in the SWIC community, they're competitive right, so they're like, oh, that state is, you know, and so that's one of the reasons we did that. But the real thing is this is a specific state view for states to look at these 25 factors and move their state forward, not in ranking with the other states. I hear what you're saying, but it wasn't designed to be more of a ranking system for states. This is just to help New York, or any other state or territory, drive progress individually within their state. Does that make sense?

KOPSTEIN: It does. I don't necessarily agree with it, only because you mentioned the other states and you mentioned where they were. So that does create, at least with human beings, a competitive environment. And when I worked in the private sector, you always used loading factors to try to equal; or in New York State with property taxes, you've got equalization rates to try to put people on the same level where you can do comparisons that make sense

GRUBB: Yeah, we just didn't want to focus on that. What we wanted to focus on are the 25 markers as it is in line with each individual state. I see exactly where you're going there. There are many loading factors that could be put in there that we didn't want to skew our purpose of moving states individually from initial to optimize.

I think it's important at that point to say, look, this is not a grade, right? We're not saying, hey, because you're initial, it's not a good thing. What it means is there might be a gap, or I have probably done this exercise individually, we go through all 25 markers with every single territory and I've been a part of every one of those or most of those conversations. I have states that say on a particular marker, hey, we're initial here because that's the way we operate in the state. We're always going to be initial there, we're never going to change, that's how we are. And that's okay. That's how they operate and it's not a bad thing. It's a recognition of, okay, that's not a gap for that state, that's how they operate.

When you look at initial, defined and optimize, those are suggested best practices based on the research that we did, right. It doesn't mean -- it's not -- there's a reason that this is light green, medium green and dark green.

It's not red, yellow and green for a purpose. We didn't want to use red, because that means that's a bad thing. It's not a bad thing. It just means that's how states operate sometimes. Or it could mean the opposite of, hey, this is not where we spend a lot of time and maybe we should. Maybe that's where we ask Chris Tuttle to give us a TA in that area to improve.

It's just an idea of, is this the best practice that we like and we want to operate in in that particular marker?

WHITE: You know what I think I see here, though, is proof that New York State is structurally prepared to move forward.

So now to your point, Jay, I think we've got to be able to then direct our focus on the time, people, money to move into those programmatic areas to implement them. I think what we'll have to do here, to that point about loading, is within the State of New York, we identify the nuance, why are we different than New Hampshire? You know, is our governance in New York State different than the governance of New Hampshire? Is the population, all the different items and configurations, I think that's where we can make our case where, on paper, we may be behind them. But when you look at it from a mosaic, you know, broad scale, we are in line and possibly maybe a little bit ahead, in spite of, some of the challenges we may have from our urban areas to our rural areas in New York City.

I would say that might be our suggested path forward to draw from this data and leverage it to move our programs forward.

GRUBB: Yeah, I mean, I think that's exactly right. You look at where you're initial and say, hey, we're initial here. Is that one that we want to tackle? And I think Michael's already analyzed that and would present that to you in a way that makes sense for this board. What I can tell you from looking at all states and territories is New York is pretty progressive with what you're doing in emergency communications.

Is there work to do? Absolutely. But there is across the nation. We have a lot of work to do federally, too. So, yes, that's exactly right. Yes, sir.

TURNER: Does your data take into consideration how the states are working with federal partners and in the case of New York and the other international border states, how we're working across international borders?

GRUBB: This set of data does not. However, in my group of performance management, one of the next marker programs -- so what we've done is started with state markers. We wanted to start with this and prove this theory and our research.

Joe is now in the middle of working on tribal markers, a set of markers similar to this specific for tribes, and I'm starting to work on a set of federal markers that will address that.

TUTTLE: Marker 25.

GRUBB: Yeah, marker 25 does take into account working across state lines and if you have an international border, it does address that to a degree but maybe not to the specifics that you're looking at.

SPRAGUE: And to that point, if you think back to the

last couple of symposiums, we've been focusing on cross border issues to develop that we've got the ECD is assisting us with the quad states down there, trying to figure out that four-region border. And the next symposium, we're going to look at the cross border into Canada type stuff.

We are looking at it but, again, we're still initial, but we've had some activity in that area. We've got a long way to go, because that's a really big, really tough one to handle, but we are talking about it. It's interesting to look at some of these. And some of these, some states don't even participate. The emergency alerting, some states, that's in another department or something.

We're partners in that and so, we have a long way to go to get where I think we need to be, but we have it on the radar. We have a process in place to your point that we can address some of these. I like it, because it's a way to give us a roadmap to improve on certain things.

The other thing it does is it makes me feel better, because misery loves company and I know there's a lot of other states out there doing the same thing. There's a way to learn from them as well, and you guys are pointing that out, which is helpful. I wanted you guys to see this, because this conversation we're having right here is important.

VOU TOUR: It's a great checklist for us in New York State to compare the direction, there's a roadmap for us. But is the federal end looking at this and saying -- the least effective marker on here is WPS, obviously, 51 percent, the initial phase, 51 percent. That appears to be the strongest issue, maybe not the most important but...

GRUBB: WPS and cybersecurity are the two lowest, yes.

VOU TOUR: Does the federal government also take this and say, hey, we need to help the states because this is where we're most deficient?

GRUBB: That's specifically why we built this tool, yes, and is internally, not just to help states drive that. If it helps you drive that, it helps nationwide. But yes, we're taking a look at it. Specifically, with WPS. We have a new branch chief in our wireless priority services area, and his main goal is to drive that number north. So yes, absolutely.

We take these markers pretty seriously; I think Chris can attest to that. It's helping now drive most of the activity within ECD. We take a look at these and drive

change within ourselves.

That's why we built it in the first place, but we couldn't drive change without getting the data collected. What's pretty exciting, and Chris will see this tomorrow, is we are taking this a step further and we've put together a whole data analytics program that will drive real-time data.

When you guys make changes in your markers, we're not going to wait a year to assess that and say, oh, okay, New York has made some changes. We want Michael to report that to Chris or myself real-time. So, if Michael needs updated fresh information, he'll be able to look at our new dashboards, which aren't quite ready yet. Chris is going to see them tomorrow, and we can pull all kinds of different types of data on what's happening with this marker, what states are low in this marker, who's doing better in that marker.

Because Michael will call Chris and say, hey, what states are doing well in cyber assessment? Because I want to call them and ask what they're doing. And we now can readily give him that information.

TUTTLE: Sheriff, also to your question, there's a groundswell of activity in the federal government over the last two years as it pertains to cybersecurity systems, whether it be planning or assessments.

And while there's more clarity as to who has leads on that and where those programs lie, there's still some confusion as to where the focus needs to be. A tool like this to bring back to Washington, and show leadership within CISA that these states need assistance in this area of cybersecurity. It helps to not only bolster those programs, but also provide some targeted opportunities to the states as well as moving forward.

GRUBB: What I will also tell you is that we're now required to take components of this total number and report it to CISA, to the executive level. They're taking a look at it, not just in ECD but CISA-wide. We just met with the deputy director on Monday and he was extremely interested on the markers, what the numbers meant, what's happening. He talked state-specific. So yes, it's driving a lot of change.

TURNER: Is the federal perspective to legislation to, in effect, force states to correct where there are problems or more help with financial?

GRUBB: Yeah, it's driving us to provide technical assistance, which is what ECD is responsible for. I would be reticent to say that there's going to be any federal law that forces a state to do anything.

TURNER: Okay.

GRUBB: And quite honestly, states are looking at this data and they're driving change themselves. It's been interesting in the short amount of time with what we're hearing from states. I have brand-new SWICs who are coming on board and looking at this and saying here's my job description right here, it's right in front of me. These 25 things are the things that I must work on, and this is what's going to be my job description for the next several years. That's been an interesting comment as well.

SPRAGUE: Any more questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Mark, thank you very much.

GRUBB: Thank you very much. It's been an honor to be here. I really appreciate it. Here's my information. Please reach out at any time. Chris is your main point of contact, but if I can help marker-specific, happy to do that and, again, I really appreciate being here today. Thank you.

SPRAGUE: Moving right along. You have a treat today, Larissa is not presenting, I am. I should say right up front, I apologize for the eye-test on that end of the room. We're having problems with that particular projector and our presentation stuff is having some problems. It's all slated to be removed and replaced. This is the better view. We'll just work around with that at this point.

Anyway, just an overview. This is all the grants we have out here at this point, the numbers for the dollars reimbursed. The '18, you can see we're just getting underway with that, but we need to start moving that one forward. '17, there's still quite a bit out that needs to be done. We're getting there on Round 4 and '16, but we need to get those things cleaned up and done.

And I don't know if you guys from the grant shop want to say anything about it, but you're welcome to.

ERICKSON: In terms of spend-down?

SPRAGUE: Yes.

ERICKSON: Yeah, so I mean, we're continuously monitoring. We're reaching out to the county level to try to help to navigate that process for them. There are some changes to requirements. It's just always a process, but we are continuing our field work and making those phone calls on our end.

SPRAGUE: And we thank you for doing that. This is where we are right now in PSAP. I will tell you that this year's PSAP, we've got a ways to go yet to get that

cleared up by the end of the year. I know that's one of the things that's of importance for everybody. With the SICG, we hope to have an announcement shortly. That is in the process right now. I know that's been a question mark for this year; when is that coming out? Any time.

This is where we stand. We will be over half a billion dollars here, hopefully, within the next couple of days. The results are being evaluated. We're looking for the press release to come out at any time.

I realize it's late this year and we had some issues staffing-wise to work through. We will get this fixed so that it comes out earlier next year. We started out on the right track, but then it got delayed. It seems like that's always the answer, but we're going to fix it.

I just want to put this in real quick. We've been tracking the interoperability channels, and there's been a lot of activity on them. People leaving their repeaters on, and it's been causing a lot of issues. Our staff, and the FCC along with Chris and I working on this, we have started to push this.

During the United Nations General Assembly, I think we found 21 repeaters on the air in the New York City area. They are now off, so they can use the region and use the repeaters. I just wanted to highlight what we've been working on. We have had the FCC up from D.C. During Woodstock, we brought the guy up from Maryland. He was the only one that was on duty and I guess that maybe got their attention a little bit. There are a couple of reasons we did that, but we got him up here, and spoiled his weekend along with everybody else. Interoperability repeaters must be off when not in use. Larissa didn't put in the cool slide that has what it sounds like when it's on the air. But that's the point of this piece of the presentation.

Any questions on the grant?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: I realize it's a lot faster than Larissa usually goes over, but that's okay. We'll keep that in mind.

Standing committees. 9-1-1 Advisory Committee.

JONES: Good morning. So, the 9-1-1 Advisory Committee has been very active since our last meeting, since this last meeting. We've been working on the 9-1-1 standards for -- updating the 9-1-1 standards for the state. We have around the third week of October finished our draft of the standards. They were submitted to the director

and deputy director and forwarded on to legal. We were all not sure of exactly what the process is and we've been working with that over the last few weeks. And I know Jim and the director will speak to that here shortly.

But in essence, the committee has done a couple of in-person meetings here in the last couple months and, in essence, what we've tried to do is do not a rewrite of the standards but a significant update to change them from what was 10- or 20-, 30-year technology to what it is today but also trying to look forward.

Some of the things that we've done, the document is completely vendor-agnostic. That was one of our goals. There are some standards in there in terms of what people need to achieve in a PSAP for training purposes. We list some suggested or approved courses, if you will, but outside of that, there's nothing vendor-wise. An example, specifically, would be like Rapid SOS. There's a value to Rapid SOS, probably every PSAP should have that. But five years ago, it didn't exist, or at least didn't exist in the form that it does now. And who knows, five years from now what that will be. Whether it will still be them or somebody else doing something similar, or whether there will be 10 companies trying to compete in that market. So, that was a good example of where we just left vendors out of it and focused on technology in general.

Another thing that we changed and it was more a lot of language updates, we took out that -- you know, PSAPs handle calls now, they handle events, they handle data coming in. That is where 9-1-1 is driving in the future.

The big piece that we worked on was training standards. The training standards currently are only for telecommunicators. There was nothing above that. We had some considerable debate on how we tackle that. There was a draft of some standards previously where the goal was to essentially -- if you wanted to went to a supervisor and then director level, things were cumulative. And New York is a very broad and diverse state, as we know, from mine and Allen's small to midsize Erie, Monroe, Syracuse, Onondaga to New York City. Trying to fit a shoe onto a varying size foot. But we quickly realized that we couldn't make them cumulative. For instance, you have directors and PSAP managers who are political appointees. They have never come up through the ranks, they haven't done EMD, things like that. Making them cumulative just wasn't going to

work. What we did was we made a variety of suggestions and requirements in terms of supervisor level, and then director level. Director doesn't have to be one person. It can be a director, deputy director, operations manager of a PSAP, it can relate to several different people.

One piece of this is that we did have some recommendations in there that weren't requirements as a question to whether we can put that in a governance document, and the legal will address that shortly. We will go from there. But we're pleased, I think, with the work that's been accomplished so far. Just in talking to Mike in the last couple days, I think we've got some more work to do to go back and tackle some issues. Nothing extraordinary; just writing it in such a way that it can be used as an actual governance document and move on from there.

Again, as I believe most of you know, the standards currently only apply to what are considered wireless PSAPs in New York State. Our goal, and our hope, is that we get to a point with the state 9-1-1 plan where the standards apply to every PSAP, anybody that is considered a PSAP and is taking 9-1-1 calls. That is where we're at now. I did a presentation to the State 9-1-1 Coordinators Conference about three weeks ago; overall, fairly well received. There's nothing in there that we were trying to -- the one big thing that we did ultimately was to make sure that we're meeting a standard, but we're not creating more unfunded mandates. And we think that that's very important.

We think that there should be a certain professional standard that would be in a 9-1-1 center, obviously, to show their level of proficiency. We do that on the police side, we do that on the fire side. We don't just throw cops in cars and tell them to do things. We have training. So, very similar to that.

We want to have a standard that says somebody is competent in order to take a call in New York State or handle a situation. There was tremendous input from all the different members of the committee and they all had ideas. And again, it's such a diverse state that it's sometimes very difficult to meld all those together. But I think overall, we came to a very good agreement on what we think should be the idea of where we're at and then we'll now, I guess, massage it and get into something that isn't totally---

SPRAGUE: I want to thank Wes and his committee for working on this. It's just something that's been

dormant for a long time and we're moving this forward. And one of the things we talked about when he first sent it to me is, okay, now we get into the learning part because we've talked about this for a long time. But what's the actual process for making this happen, and how do we bring it to the board? What is our process for public comment, and all that stuff. We are all going to learn this process together. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to Jim, because Jim is looking into the structure and the process that we have to go through. That will lay it out for us for the next meeting, or two, or three, or whatever it takes to make this happen. So, Jim.

CALLAHAN: Sure thing. There are two sort of stages that we're trying to accomplish here. I'll quickly describe the first one, and how we develop the proposal. Then the process that goes into adopting the proposal. So, the means of developing the proposal as was described, we received a draft version of the standards, and I think we're pretty well through our legal program review. We'll come back to the advisory committee to try to work through our suggestions, concerns, any potential issues. We'll create a revised version of the standards and it will probably come back to us for a second round just to make sure everything's still looking all right. No lingering concerns. Once we have a version we all agree on, it will come to the SIEC Board, and it will be up to a committee vote to adopt this as the proposed new standards. That will start the process of the formal adoption. Now, the standards implemented by this board are exempt from the State Administrative Procedure Act under the county law that created this board. There is a mini process to go through. What we will have to do after we adopt the proposal, is get that proposal published both on DHSES website, and in the Federal Register. That will open up a comment period of at least 45 days; it could be longer if we want that. During that 45-day period, we will receive and consider public comment on the proposed standards before adopting the final standards. Once that's worked out, that 45-day period closes, we'll have to look at the comments, see if there's anything that needs to be addressed, potentially put together a response to those; or if everything's looking all right, then at the following board meeting, we'll be able to have a vote to formally adopt the final standards. Once those standards are listed again on the State Register, an

amendment to the New York Code, Rules and Regulations, then they will come into effect. That is the overall process. If you have any questions, or if that is good enough for now, I'll give it back to Mike.

SPRAGUE: He told this to me yesterday and I said, okay, I'm going to give it to you to talk about because I don't think I can repeat it. And I still don't think I can repeat it, and I've heard it twice.

Anyway, the good part is we're at a point where we're starting to look at how are we going to implement these things? That in itself, is progress. I think we're in a good place. It's going to take a little back and forth with the committee to get it figured out as to what our final version is going to look like and then we'll start moving it forward.

There's plenty of time between now, and the next meeting to work on this, so we'll see if we can't get it to that point. Obviously, the next month, or so, is going to be tough to do, but once we get into the frigid January month when there's nothing else to do, we can probably get it hammered out. I'm hoping that we're in a good place. Any questions or comments from anybody on it?

VOU TOUR: What's would the enforcement be on someone who doesn't comply with the standards? If you look at a small PSAP now, a city police department, cops with zero training, they're not receiving funding, so you can't take that away from them. So, I guess, have we considered the enforcement arm of this?

JONES: We had talked about it as a committee whether, ultimately, it drives consolidation, ultimately. But that is probably up to Mike's group to see how that is. But certainly, we had that discussion that obviously, the first part is money and then after that, how do you do the enforcement?

And there's no technical enforcement in the standards, there wasn't to begin with, and I'm sure we can add that. And that does come down also to where we go with the state 9-1-1 plan and making this a broader piece that is not just wireless. As you alluded to, it goes to every PSAP, including a police department that's taking 9-1-1 calls.

SPRAGUE: Yeah, I mean, to answer your question, I'd have to research it with Jim. I don't know if, Jim, you have an answer right off the top of your head or not but...

CALLAHAN: In terms of the current enforcement power within the statute for this board, there's a formal process involving this board where we can make PSAPs

aware. If we become aware of PSAPs not in compliance, we can tell them we believe you're not in compliance, and then they have to come back to us with a plan for how they're going to come into compliance, currently, there's no money we can take away.

SPRAGUE: I think to the other side of that though is publicly making it aware does it by itself. That's part of the issue. As we move this forward, there are some things we're not going to be able to enact in legislation, however, you can make some sort of a standard or guidance document of some sort that people can be evaluated against. That, in itself, puts them into a corner where they need to come up with some sort of compliance, or identify why they're not, which, in some cases, is more beneficial.

We don't have to be the bad guy. They end up making themselves the bad guy in the long run. There is a couple of pieces that we're looking at. Jay.

KOPSTEIN: Mike, this issue came up when we were in Miami, and a number of states have gone from an SOP to an SOG, from a procedure to a guideline, to avoid some of these issues. With a procedure, you have a greater chance of reliability than you do with a guideline. And a number of states have gone that way, or are in the process, as far as interoperability goes, and communications to try to limit their liability, you know, a smaller state or smaller agency not having the funding to meet the SOP but fall within the general guideline, and that may be something that you may want to look at here, the legal issue. And I'm not a lawyer, and I don't know how the lawyers look at it, but I know this was a topic of discussion in Miami.

SPRAGUE: Yeah, it's an interesting topic of discussion. Let me liken it to the fact that we're working through the process of figuring out how to enact it, and we also have to work through the process of what happens if somebody does something that doesn't comply.

VOU TOUR: Just a couple sort of quick long-term suggestions would be, one, I know there's accreditation for 9-1-1 centers. That certainly could be a standard. You could also make the telecommunications portion of the police accreditation a standard. You could have an accredited police department right now who's flying by the seat of their pants dispatching, and I think you can do that. So, that could be a suggestion. I think the third would be, you know, as a police officer, I have to get certified, and I have documentation with DCJS. Why can't the same be done for a dispatcher,

telecommunicator, whatever title you give them. That could be some possibilities in the future.

SPRAGUE: All right, thank you. The Chair would like to recognize Steve from Genesee County. Any objection? (No response.)

STEVE: I don't see any objection to that. I did have one question for the SIEC Board. Would it be okay if we had Jim assigned to the 9-1-1 Advisory Committee so, that way, he or someone from legal can be a part of those discussions as we go through the process? So that way, we're making sure it says the things that it should say as we are drafting the legislation.

SPRAGUE: That's a good point. We've already discussed the whole process already. Once we're ready with our reviews, which Jim's working on right now, we plan to, as a group, come out and meet with the committee. It serves no purpose to try to put it in writing or an e-mail. It's a drive-by shooting. I would rather that we came up, sat down, and had the dialogue so that you hear exactly what his problems and questions are, and we get exactly what your problems and questions are, so we meet together. We are going to definitely do that.

STEVE: That would be great. I think sometimes we just don't know what we don't know. I think that would be very beneficial.

One of the things, going to Sheriff Voutour's point, is I think every one of us, when we apply for that PSAP operations grant, we have to check that box that says do you comply with the minimum standards? The answer is either yes or no.

SPRAGUE: Well, that's -- (Multiple people speaking at the same time.)

STEVE: That's true. But at least at the county, you got the SWIC for the county.

SPRAGUE: Very good. Thank you. We greatly appreciate your efforts and we're moving, we're going to get some stuff done here.

All right. NG 9-1-1 Working Group.

CHELLIS: NG 9-1-1 Working Group has been very busy the last several months working on the draft plan. I want to just overview the process of where we started. Just for those of you that are new to the process here, or attending and are not familiar with it. This board established the NG 9-1-1 Working Group to develop a 9-1-1 plan for the state and help try to develop a roadmap to bring NG 9-1-1 forward. We developed a federal partnership with DHS and we've had technical assistance. I want to thank Chris for processing those

requests, and they've been very, very helpful in giving us guidance from a national perspective on how to move the ball forward in NG 9-1-1.

We've been attending, representatives have been at different NG 9-1-1 conferences, both NASNA, NENA, and you see some of the different groups over there represented on the slide. We've had multiple in-person working group sessions right here where the group has worked on multi-day putting together, getting ideas, and some training on NG 9-1-1, and so on, To get everybody on the same plane. We have had a lot of working group calls. And we've now got a framework developed for the draft plan, the stakeholder input, and review process. And all throughout the planning process, we've had stakeholders involved.

The working group alone has representatives of 16 counties. 9-1-1 coordinators from 16 counties or their designee that volunteer to be on the working group. We have five state agencies now from this office, ITS, GIS program office. State Police have been involved, very active, and IPCGS (phonetic) joined the group recently as well as Department of Public Service. So. with those agencies, also, New York City has been a very good partner in the planning process, representatives from NYPD and DO-IT regularly at table.

Now, we're in the process, an executive review process of the draft plan that the committee has come up with. Similar to the minimum 9-1-1 standards, the executive review both legal and administrative. We take a look at it, make suggestions.

Now, again, the stakeholders involve all these departments. It also involves New York State 9-1-1 coordinators, and moving out and moving forward, how we are going to continue this process and get the material and knowledge necessary to fill in the parts.

This is a dynamic document. Just because we are at this stage, that's not the end state for the document. We expect this document to continually be amended throughout the process of implementing NG 9-1-1 in New York. As we complete research, and make decisions on the particular elements, this needs to be updated.

Under executive review, we have these sections of the plan. And this is how the plan is structured. It's usually the 9-1-1 plan model made up by the national 9-1-1 program office. A number of states came together and put together a new model plan for states, and that's what the working group chose early on, to have the most -- what do I want to say? Most updated plan in the

country when we get it completed. So, basically, it starts out with the NG 9-1-1 roadmap portion. There's a whole section on program and operations, a section on technical systems, data development, maintenance and support, and then analysis planning.

How we go through the process in New York is as we move forward, the plan is going to be impacted by many factors, including agency feedback and direction received from different agencies, decisions on funding, decision on established and forthcoming national, 9-1-1 standards as they are developed. Again, this is a moving ball. NENA has been very active in developing and leading the course of developing 9-1-1 standards for NG, like the I3 standard, for example. APCO also has been involved as well as other major players.

As those standards continue, we'll continue to look at them, and apply them to our program. The technology itself is evolving. Almost every week or two, the 9-1-1 community is learning about a new app that's out there or a new -- something like what was mentioned, Rapid SOS. There are other factors that may, or may not be, involved in the end product. But as this is coming together and being implemented around the country, the vendors, as well, are developing systems and so far, related to the core services, ESInets, and so on. More and more options are being made available for states to take a look at.

Most important is the stakeholder outreach and feedback to this process. Again, continual, so this is not a top-down plan of just us writing it, saying okay, this is what we're going to do. We want to have people run the PSAPs, take the calls, and all the other major users of the system to have feedback on what it should look like in the end.

As we move forward, we need the PSAP managers, 9-1-1 authority managers and elected officials at every level to come to an understanding of how NG 9-1-1 needs to be created, and what the end stage should look like throughout the country, state and regional levels.

Basically, we want to plan ahead and evolve this in a very organized and coordinated way in New York, and not have it just be a reactionary thing as things start to get implemented, and then we're trying to -- I want to say band aid a bunch of little individual systems and make them work as one statewide system. We want this to be planned and implemented so right up-front as it's implemented, it works, it's interoperable and improves 9-1-1 in the state.

AMF REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

518-982-1341

WWW.AMFREPORTING.COM

We're going to use the 9-1-1 readiness scorecard and we'll move into that. IT is similar to what was just presented from the federal folks, a total communications ecosystem. There has been developed a readiness scorecard for states to look at statewide. It involves all the PSAPs in providing input on their own readiness, so we can develop a snapshot of what the entire state's readiness is, and what steps have to be made to implement NG 9-1-1.

It was created by the task force, set up by the FCC, called the Task Force of Optimal PSAP Architecture. They had two different phases of that committee. In their supplemental report, they presented this readiness scorecard at the end of 2016. With this understanding, we are able to better plan, budget, and execute the whole transition.

And we plan to move into the phase, not just a plan, but this is a draft. We feel that the working group working with the PSAPs, supporting the process around the state, collecting information and figure out exactly where we sit. The implementation model consists of, basically, we will move from legacy to foundational to transitional to intermediate to jurisdictional, then national end state. More than three steps or three categories like the last program you heard.

Essential elements which are necessary to be present within each NG 9-1-1 implementation maturity state, we have all of these things we looked at: The governance, routing and location, our GIS data, our core service elements, ESInet itself, PSAP call handling systems and applications, security of the system. Cybersecurity is always a big issue and in the IT world, it's even a bigger issue than in the legacy system.

The actual operational aspects of the transition to NG and how it's going to affect the operation and workflow and PSAPs. Then, what optional interfaces need to be considered to work with the 9-1-1 system to make it more helpful and productive to the community, and the citizens it serves.

In New York, what we're going to do is; we're going to have a template available to the PSAPs and the state 9-1-1 programs to utilize and complete this scorecard. They'll be asked to complete the template and forward it to our program for compilation, in order for us to complete a statewide assessment for New York, and help the working group for planning purposes. That's our plan to move forward.

Now, how do we get this plan? At the NASNA conference

in Minneapolis a few weeks ago, Flaherty (phonetic) from the National Program Office reported that they have taken this to the FCC and are going to handle, as far as presenting, the scorecard nationwide for states and PSAPs to utilize. They're going to have an actual online version available. It's an actual form you can complete. It's not a data collection tool for the federal government, they assured us.

They're just going to save this for every PSAP in the country. It's just a tool for us to use to complete and to look at. She said it would be available very soon at the conference. I e-mailed her yesterday to find out an ETA on that, because I keep checking online for it. She said they are waiting for the okay to release it any day now. It's a grant, right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Probably the second week in December. That's our next conference call for it.

CHELLIS: They said by the end of September. So we will see. Anyways, that's how we plan on moving forward with that. We think that will be a very helpful tool working with NYSTEC to support us in that whole effort. That will help the working group move forward in making decisions on what we're going to recommend, and what needs to be done, what areas need to be addressed. Are there any questions so far? Jay.

KOPSTEIN: From the law enforcement side of the house, the new criminal justice reform program that was mandated, they're going to require the accessibility of data a lot faster and in a lot more comprehensive fashion. That's different from the national model, and it is going to have to be built in early on or we are going to have a personnel cost to develop it and gather that information greater than what it would be if we can build it into the program in its inception

CHELLIS: You are talking about the whole discovery review requirements in the Criminal Procedure Law, right? Yes, that is a huge impact on all the PSAPs.

KOPSTEIN: People are going to be texting, perhaps, sending in stills and videos. All of that is going to have to be coordinated. It is going to be a huge personnel cost and if we don't try to automate some of that upfront, that personnel cost is going to grow exponentially.

CHELLIS: I think it is a great point that, due to that change in law and the impact in the PSAPs, the 9-1-1 coordinators have been talking about it a lot. There's PSAPs that have already gotten permission to hire staff to try to accomplish this type of a review and

submission within 15 days that they're working under. It's a big impact on law enforcement and PSAPs. And I agree with you that as we move forward, to keep these type of requirements in mind so that anything that can be done in the process. Basically, you got the initial NG 9-1-1 is the ESInet, core services that provide and deliver the calls to the PSAP, needs the GIS to steer PSAP routing and doing other major functions, the cybersecurity. All of that is to get to NG 9-1-1. But you also have a lot of when you get into the operational side and dispatch side, you know, post NG receiving the call is when you get your CAD-to-CAD interoperability. So, if other PSAP calls get routed to, they can send jobs, how that is all stored and recorded, whether you are using a cloud-based system, whether many PSAPs are utilizing the same software, more readily available possibly to get that whole incident put together. These are all considerations. That is just one example how it might help.

I agree with you that we have to first get NG 911, but while we're doing that, we have to keep all those things in mind in moving forward. The working group has had a lot of discussion along those lines, because there's a lot of factors involved.

TANTALO: This is Rich Tantalo, Chief from Irondequoit PD on the line. Can you hear me?

CHELLIS: Yes, sir.

TANTALO: Thank you. Sorry to interrupt, but you brought up a great topic associated with criminal justice reform and the discovery issues that basically within 45 days, we're going to be contending with. And I don't disagree with the fact that you're going to have to increase staffing, and the ability and capacity to handle all of these requests.

So just one question, if I could get a sense of, is 45 days from now a reasonable expectation to be able to do this?

JONES: We have to deliver to our DA's office in three days. So that's not even forty-five days; it's seventy-two hours for us.

VOUTOUR: Discovery requires 45 days from arraignment.

TANTALO: I'm saying in 45 days, the law takes effect. So, within 45 days, PSAPs won't have additional staffing trained and ready to go, the infrastructure to be able to deal with all the, if you will, FOILs and things of that nature associated with discovery, et cetera. I don't wish to tie into this other piece, but those of us in law enforcement, Sheriffs, Chiefs Association, et

cetera, are saying you've got to give us more time. And I don't know if this is an appropriate conversation to have, but it seems as though we're not going to be ready in 45 days. Is that a fair assessment?

SPRAGUE: I would think that would be a fair assessment across the board. I don't think anybody's going to be ready in 45 days.

TANTALO: Okay. I'm just looking for that validation, because I don't want to speak for PSAPs across the state. I know the State Chiefs Association is going to be involved in this conversation. We're very disappointed and, again, without getting on the political side of things, disappointed that we didn't have any conversation about being ready to roll this out on the 1st of January. So, I was just looking for a little bit of validation with that. Thank you.

CHELLIS: It is a huge concern across the state with the PSAPs, I can validate that.

TANTALO: Okay.

CHELLIS: And they're all scrambling to try to figure out how they're going to comply with it and some of them are moving ahead towards staffing.

TANTALO: All right. Well, thank you very much for that.

CHELLIS: You're welcome, Chief. Any other questions?

LAFLURE: Hey, Brett. Brian LaFlure.

CHELLIS: Hi, Brian.

LAFLURE: One of the things I see that the gentleman just brought up, in all of the budget negotiations that I've gone through with the same committee with the sheriff and PSAPs and everybody, everybody's budget right now at this point, at least in our area, is a January 1/December 31. So, the monies available, even if they are approved right now, they wouldn't be able to hire those people until after January 1.

And even though the DA has come and asked for his people, communications has asked for them saying, sheriff, it's going to be a bad scenario, because how are you going to train these people? What are you going to do with them if you can't even go through your hiring process even if you do testing, or what are the tests going to be? I see it as being a real issue, especially for agencies that don't have money in their budget right now to do it.

CHELLIS: Yeah, I understand a couple of the counties have attempted to get emergency appropriations from the county general budget type things like that, just scrambling to try to meet the end that you're talking

about, but there's still the whole issue of hiring and training. And it may have to be provisional until civil service determines it's a civil service position. So, all of that is true fact. Thank you, Brian.

SPRAGUE: Yeah, it's just reinforcing exactly what Rich just said; timing-wise, there isn't enough timing to get all this stuff in. There's no question about that. Thanks, Brian.

CHELLIS: Okay. I'd like to ask the Chair to recognize Gerry Engstrom from the GIS subcommittee to give a report update.

SPRAGUE: Okay. Gerry.

ENGSTROM: Just a real quick update. Previously, we were working toward giving additional information to the statewide plan. That has been completed as it is now a draft with executive. We had a little bit of a lull in that time. With discussions with the board, we received new direction to start working on PSAP boundaries. So that is what the subcommittee is up to at this point. We're putting together the best interpretation of the PSAP boundaries that we can. That will be the first step. The PSAP boundaries will determine where a call from a particular area gets sent. We're starting out with city, town and village boundaries. They will all need to be edge-matched so that we don't have any gaps or overshoots. Obviously, that would be a problem. Overshoots just confuse the system as to where to direct a call. We will work through that issue. We're going to use the combination of the cities, towns and villages and parcels.

We have statewide parcels at this point that we can work with, so we're going to use those to attempt to edge-match as best we can. And once we get a work product for that, we're more than likely going to start moving in the direction of emergency service zones after that. But the PSAP boundaries will be enough of a list as it is.

We have pretty good participation in the subcommittee. We're expanding slightly. We have a couple new members. A couple counties have taken interest in joining the subcommittee which is great, especially we've got a couple up in the northern tier. Madison just joined. I think it's going to be a big help. Some of the folks are well experienced with GIS and I think they're going to be a significant asset to the subcommittee to move forward with the GIS layers.

CHELLIS: Thank you. I've been sitting in on the last couple meetings with Gerry and the crew there.

(Unintelligible) from New York City has been chairing and it's been quite a feat alone since Alex there from Monroe County went to work for one of the vendors about six months ago.

So, the guys, of course, and Gerry here have done a great job in keeping that committee moving forward. And the whole committee just seems very -- they have a lot of energy and interest in moving it forward and helping. And we're even inching up peers in bordering counties to help get them energized to be part of the process and at least get their data in and get it updated so it can be utilized. I really appreciate your committee's work, it's exciting work.

ENGSTROM: Great, thanks.

JONES: Quick question. Not to get too technical, but isn't one of the problems with matching borders projection levels, people using different projections?

ENGSTROM: It is.

JONES: So, is there going to be recommended tandards?

ENGSTROM: Yeah.

JONES: Because I mean, the helpful part of that is when you get done matching all that up, is you turn it around, and return that corrected data to the county and there's more value.

ENGSTROM: Correct. And you're right, different counties use different projection systems. One of the things that we will work on is more than likely trying to come up with one standard projection. Even in New York State, right off the top of my head, I can think of four, five, six different projections. Everybody uses a different one.

I think PSAP layers and something will probably have to get standardized at some point. Most modern GIS software has the capability of, we call it, projecting on the fly. It should be able to work with all of the existing CAD systems that are out there.

I know well what you're speaking of. I coordinate on the county CAD systems as well, so there are a myriad of different systems in use out there. But I think we'll be able to, as a group, work on a single layer in a single projection and then, if need be, if a particular CAD system can't interpret that, I know we'll be able to back that data -- not back the data out, but change the projection so that it does work with the particular municipality's software that they have. But yes, we'll need to use one to build it all and then on the back end, then we can adjust it so that it works with everybody.

CHELLIS: And as it works with everybody else, it also has to work with the core services. They have to poll the GIS statewide, the border states, so that they can route calls. There's the call router function. There are several other elements to the core services. That's the primary, get one statewide set of templates -- set of layers that the core services can use and then also make it functional back at the PSAP and the CAD. And a lot of states are struggling, and that's one thing I really feel confident in sitting in meetings with other state 9-1-1 Coordinators, is a lot of them are struggling on the GIS. They don't have, I don't think, at the state level a GIS section or some just hire a contractor to try to make sense of it. And I'm happy, thanks to ITS and Cheryl Benjamin, who retired last year, and all the vision of them to move that ball forward and get New York ready. It helped, because we're a long ways down the road compared to other states.

There are states that have the ESInet and core services but they're still running on legacy routing, because they're nowhere near on the GIS side. I'm confident and I hope we'll be ready. Questions, comments in general? (No response.)

SPRAGUE: Jay, you're up.

KOPSTEIN: I'll go as quickly as we can. We had a meeting in Miami earlier this month. The SAFECOM Executive Committee is no longer. It's now a board, much smaller, 11 people. Two new people were added to SAFECOM: Scott Wright of Connecticut and Cindy Cist of Florida.

The Incident Communications Task Force met, and we reviewed the recommendations of the advisory committee. We're looking to do an update of the NQS on aux comm and the PTB. We're still **looking** with FEMA at moving communications up to a branch level and having ITSL and subordinate positions defined. National Wildfire Coordinating Group is still in opposition to the ITS changes.

There's a new brochure on the SAFECOM website, ICAM 101. It's a briefing for public safety officials, and that's on Credentialing and Access Management.

We had a discussion on what we discussed here before on third-party vendors and our dependence upon them, and the fact that we don't review their continuity of operations plan. There is a document that we're discussing, it's in draft form, emergency communication dependency on nongovernmental infrastructure. That

should be out shortly.

ECD is trying to create a form to capture communications unit utilization at incidents and events. The question came up what's the difference between an incident and an event? The way I described it was it's an event when the Patriots go into the Superbowl and an incident when the Steelers do.

All right. As we move along, we're looking at the strategic priorities for the year coming up.

Implementing the ICAM recommendations, working with FEMA NIC on communications branch, consistent recruitment, training, retention and support for all-hazards incidents personnel, national standards for credentialing, qualifications and certifications, updating the COML course to clarify COMU positions, definitions and descriptions and including within the IT unit.

In governance, we're looking to develop and revisit national guidance to formalize public safety communications in multi-jurisdictional governance, including policy, documentation and funding. Within SAFECOM to assess the current composition of what we have and identifying the gaps in those representatives. This past year, we brought in more tribal representatives. One of the issues that happened in Connecticut, one of the GOA items was not enough county representation, but Connecticut doesn't have counties. We will work to avoid it anyway.

We are looking at legislative and regulatory issues, emerging technologies, capabilities and risks, and that includes the legislative item on T-band. We now have more sponsors and, hopefully, we will go into the budget bill which would only require 51 percent, rather than playing with the possibility of needing 60 votes in the senate. So, we're looking at that.

We're looking to support the development of cooperative cross-jurisdictional, multistate and multi-organizational agreements, MOUs, MOAs, et cetera. And of course, cybersecurity, and that's always in our discussions.

In technology, in addition to what I've already discussed, the AWN document's been approved now. It's going up to ECD legal for publication. We're setting up an NECP implementation committee. There are working groups on P25, ISSI and CSSI. The best practices Volume 2 is in development and that should be out this coming year and, again, third-party dependencies.

We're updating the interoperability continuum. I'm the

chair of that committee and, hopefully, that will be done by the end of this year and be published early next year. There were other documents reviewed. There was a blanket, or an example, of an ESF-2 communications tabletop exercise involving catastrophic earthquakes. We can make that available if we want to send it out. There was a package on EMAC and what it means. We can send that also out, I can forward that to Joann. There was a public safety messaging brochure put out by Texas Public Safety, as an example, to make that available. There are brochures out now on joint training and exercise portal for emergency communications on COMM-X joint training.

And CISA put out a programs and services booklet. I have an example I can show it to you, but it's my only one so I'm not giving that up so quickly. S&T is working on 5G issues. Something that we spoke about at the ICC meeting, they are not working on EMP issues regarding LMR, but would entertain requests to do so. That's something I think we're going to have to do.

TUTTLE: Who from S&T said that?

KOPSTEIN: Sanderhall (phonetic). S&T is working on denial of service issues. They're working a project with 13 gas meters. They're doing that with JPL. They're looking at the LMR-LTE interfaces, along with NIST. And they're doing some testing on ISSI and CSSI with a report to be released in the first quarter. Other issues that we discussed were the use of social media in public safety. S&T is looking at inundation sensors for alerting, and traffic management, other than coastal communities. When we have flooding upstate and the like, they are looking at sensors to do that as well, and do computerized traffic reroute and traffic management, et cetera.

They're looking to create a task force to define how you receive and interpret that information, and that's part of the SMART City Interoperable Reference Architecture. They're looking at push-to-talk applications on Smartphones that gateway into LMR and LTE interfacing. CISA came out with a community bulletin on cyber essentials, and there's a brochure on that. Additionally, there's a guide to infrastructure security and resilience that's out. I can make those available to Joann and anybody who wants them can contact Joann and she'll send them out. Questions?

(No response.)

KOPSTEIN: Back to you, Director.

SPRAGUE: Okay. That was a very, very busy week. And

several of the things that Jay just mentioned, we're looking at bringing some of those in for our symposium. We will have some presentations on some of the issues, and some of the exercise information that we're looking at. That is already in place, but there was a lot of activity that was discussed last week. Jay did a good job summarizing the whole week almost in total. There were some parts he left out, which is best left out.

KOPSTEIN: Yes.

SPRAGUE: Anyway, inside joke. Also, on our COMU side of things, this is Mark's update for his projections for COML, COMT, et cetera. You can see where we're at in 2019. We have a COML course going on. Our first one that we're delivering ourselves with our own instructors is going on right now. That's why there's several people that aren't here, they're in the class. We've got a COMT coming up in a couple weeks, so we'll be adding more to that list. He's projecting 30 for next year, so we're going to grade and see how he does, but we have a year to figure that out.

Anyway, this is what we have requested from ECD. Chris is diligently working on filling the list out, and this is only for 2020. He's already got one figured out for '20 and '21 and onward. One of the things that we are looking to do, in particular, we're going to have an exercise design course that's going to be going on early March. And we're looking to try to get two individuals from each one of the nine consortiums to take this so that they can have some people that have some experience in, and some education in doing exercises.

You're going to see this is going to be a theme that we're going to be starting to work on going down the road is to start doing com exercises and after-action reports. It's going to take us a while to get this institutionalized, it's not going to happen overnight. But it's something we're looking out over the next couple years trying to get into the general process of our operation. He is working diligently on getting to that point. That's a quick update of where we are on that program. Mark continues to push the envelope there, and I look forward to seeing some good things out of that.

Public Safety Broadband. Matt.

DELANEY: I just have a couple slides here, real quick update today. We continue to monitor and hold discussions with the carriers. We meet regularly with the various carriers and have discussions, FirstNet and Verizon as well. Just as a reminder, if you have a need

for deployable or other coverage/capacity requirements at events, please work with us. It's not too early to plan for next summer. It may seem like a long way out, but the earlier you get in that planning process, the better, because the answer may be deployable, or it may be network changes, and there's plenty of time for carriers to make those network changes to accommodate that.

Another thing is, you may have seen it in the news, T-Mobile has announced a surprise, they've announced if their Sprint/T-Mobile merger occurs and they get all their approvals, they will offer free services to public safety.

We don't have all the details yet, but we are tracking it for more information, and we'll try and update if we hear anything. It's interesting, because it's unclear whether it was not messaged well, or they're unsure what they're going to do. But if you look at various reports of it, everything from free unlimited unthrottled priority data to public safety to the terms and conditions indicate that you'll get one gig of unthrottled data and then the remainder at 3G speed. So, whether it's just not being communicated well or whether they're still trying to determine what they're going to offer, and again, they're saying it's dependent on their merger getting approved. There are connotations of trying to get states pursuing this to approve it. But that's something that's interesting, we're going track that and as we get more information, we'll pass it along.

There's more interest occurring in LMR to LTE push-to-talk integration, so we're going to be having discussions about that in the user group, consider the possible end result, best practice document. We have a list of members of the host broadband user group. If you have any specific interest, knowledge or experience with LMR over cellular or integration or FirstNet and other applications, carrier-based push to talk, manufacturer base or beyond, please let us know. We'd love some input and your experiences and how it works for you or how it isn't working for you. That's all I have on Broadband today. Any questions?

SPRAGUE: Thank you, Matt. From the State Agency Working Group, we did have a meeting last week. A little bit of where we're at with that, the rapid deployment plan we've been working on, we finalized the document at that meeting. We also reviewed a document that Chuck brought to us from State Police on radio

frequency authorization, a document. There was some discussion on it, a few suggested edits. Chuck, I assume you'll take that back to your council and refresh that with us, then we'll redistribute it to the state, the basic context for that. Once we get to that point, we're going to have to do some agency training, familiarization with the points of contact that are going to be part of that response from the state agency, and then we'll work on doing some exercising of it. We talked a little bit about what region, what some attempts have been to do that and, obviously, when you do that, you're going to end up with some revisions. We did some discussion on consolidation of radio requests. We're trying to pass that to the state agency to put that together. And then we went through just a series of agency reports, and what's going on in the different agencies.

Does anybody who was there want to add anything?

Chuck, do you want to add anything?

WHITE: No, I think, Mike, that's a pretty good overview. I think that covers just about the topics that we were most focused on during that meeting.

SPRAGUE: We've got some work, we've got a plan ahead as to how to move forward and we're going to work on getting some more done.

Anything from the Channel Naming and Use Working Group?

DELANEY: Yes. Mike mentioned this earlier during the grant update, but so as we mentioned many times before, the national interoperability channels must be left off the air when they're not in use, repeaters. Coordinated activation of them continues to be a problem. For example, given UTAC41 was left online, but dormant; when an agency needs to activate UTAC41, different agency needs to activate for an incident, they receive interference from the other repeaters. It wasn't planned, it wasn't coordinated, nobody knew it was on the air.

They are definitely a great asset. We find them to be very helpful, very useful, but they have to be properly coordinated. There is a process in place, we have a guideline on our website. There's good northeast interoperability Listserv for those activations and they need to be used.

If you're installing an NIO repeater, you need to have some way to control the repeater mode, DTMF, a console button, site telemetry, repeater on/off, repeater telemetry.

I want to talk about a few recent examples of some

issues to really bring home and describe what we're seeing. The Bethel Woods festival, Sullivan County, back in August, the Woodstock 50-year anniversary festival they had at Bethel Woods, there was a command repeater set up at UTAC43, but it was receiving interference from another repeater that was left on. With the FCC's help, which was on a weekend, Friday night into the weekend, it was tracked to an out-of-state location. That out-of-state location did not even know they had a repeater online. They believed it had been off for years; they never used it. The repeater was shut off and the interference went away. Orange County Airshow, also in August, we had a backup channel on UTAC42. Console control stations were able to key a distant repeater on top of our repeater. Luckily, the backup channel was not needed, but it was later tracked down during the UNGA mission. We had issue at the State Training Center in Oriskany with UCALL40 heterodyning from multiple repeaters. It was determined to be a Central New York county with three sites. They had all their repeaters turned on and were not simulcast, so even within their county, they would have been interfering with each other. Fortunately, they had a Morse Code, a CWID, so it was very easy to determine who had those repeaters. We contacted the county, and they contacted their vendor. Their vendor did not understand the issue, could not understand that they weren't transmitting all the time so, therefore, what was wrong, how were they broken? Anyway, it was explained to them. They did disable them. They showed the county how to enable and disable them. But this is an important reminder that, counties and agencies, if you hold a license, you are the licensee and are ultimately responsible. You may contract with a vendor to do your work, but if your name is on the license, you are county X on the license, you are the one that is ultimately responsible for the operation of that equipment. VTAC34 in the Adirondacks, we discovered this during routine testing. A dispatch center answered the test and was identified. Follow-up through the county resulted in the repeater being turned off when not in use. It was discovered the repeater is regularly used for interop, which is good, that's what it's there for, but it was also left online 24/7 without any coordination. So, nobody outside of that little area knew it was online and it was tying up the frequency. This is important on VHS, because the VTAC repeaters,

initial repeaters, are built out of pairs of the VTAC simplex channel. Every one of the repeaters ties up two of the direct tactical channels. OIEC is working with DHS and the FCC has begun tracking down these uncoordinated repeaters. The first planning mission was during the U.N. General Assembly, or UNGA. DHSES, along with the FCC, DHS, FDNY and NYPD, worked as a team to track multiple repeaters in the New York City area. I want to thank Chris Tuttle for helping coordinate getting everyone together.

Over the course of a week, multiple repeaters were found online, many interfering with each other making the channel totally unusable if needed.

Some of these causes were repeater controller programmed to default repeater-on when the power comes back in the site, and that particular rack was on UTS. So, every time they lost power and it came back on, the repeater defaulted to being back on the air.

DAS testing in Manhattan, they forgot to turn off the stuff when they finish their testing.

A grandfathered non-interoperability license. There are a few licensees that are grandfathered from before these were interoperability channels. They cannot interfere with interoperable use and they are secondary, but they are still licensed. They had a repeater that was transmitting bursts of static and there was no valid reason for that. There was something technically wrong with the repeater, but they were interfering with a UHF interop channel.

Another one, where the county indicated their console said the repeater was turned off, drove up to the sites and the repeater was definitely on. They had to send a tech out to turn the repeater off, and determine why their console showed one thing, and the equipment showed another.

Another one, an installation where the person in charge had retired and nobody else in the county was aware that these repeaters even existed. They were able to get a tech out to a site and find the rack and turn them off. Another instance where a fire department tried to take a 2W grandfathered mobile license fire ground and make it a high power fixed repeater on top of a water tank on high terrain. I know the FCC was on their way back to talk to them about that.

So as a result, at the end of that week, it was all quiet on the national interoperability channels in the New York City area. They were all quiet, no interfering repeaters. If they needed to be activated and used,

AMF REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

518-982-1341

WWW.AMFREPORTING.COM

people knew what repeaters were around, and could turn them on, and use them without worrying about them being interfered with.

Additional work is still to be done. There are others in the state. We will be visiting all areas in the state with equipment, so please check your repeaters now before we visit your area. It certainly makes finding any others that aren't known easier. And don't assume they're off. I can mention we've had other instances where well-intentioned people thought their repeaters were off, and it turned out for one technical reason or another, they were on. So, verify, make it part of your site checks, and part of your routine testing to verify they really are off.

And if notification has not been made to the Listserv, it must be disabled until that notification is made. Remember, all fixed repeater licenses and fixed direct channel licenses, fixed sites, must have an FCC license. The license by rule that applies to the interoperability channels only applies to mobiles and portables. If you put up a fixed site, if you put 10 on a tower with a repeater or a direct channel, that has to have an FCC license. Any questions?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Thanks, Matt. When Woodstock came around, Chris and I made the decision that we weren't going to mess around. Leading up to UNGA, I think Chris was buying Tums by the case. He was frustrated over the whole thing. It just was very difficult. We are going to continue to push the issue. We're putting a lot of money, and a lot of effort, to get the national interoperability channels out there so they work, and we're getting good examples of where they are.

There was just one the other day we came across the reflector where Wayne County turned on their national interoperability channel and bridged it into Ontario county fire groundso that their units could deliver mutual aid and be able to talk to us. That's exactly what it's there for. That's the way we want to use it and try to document some of the cases of where these things are.

I don't think we focus on that enough when you start to focus on all the bad stuff, and I think we need to show that as well. I appreciate everybody's assistance with that.

Citizens Alerting Committee, we have not had a meeting, however, just a couple of things. OEM was able to successfully conduct a test of WEA on Monday, November

AMF REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

518-982-1341

WWW.AMFREPORTING.COM

18th, just the other day, we had it. We've been trying to get to that point. It sounds like a pretty easy thing; not an easy thing. We tried to do one in October and had to cancel it, or September, because IPAWS wasn't ready and we couldn't do it. They are in the process of switching their systems over, and their system was offline. We did manage to go through that.

It's interesting; you're getting conflicting guidance. IPAWS puts out that they're not going to critique anybody's test message, however, the test message should include test, test, test and a bunch of other stuff which comes out to exactly 90 characters, which is what the size of the message needs to be. They are not going to critique it, but they're going to give you the message. That came out last Thursday in a notice publication that came out by e-mail. It is not something that everybody is getting, or that anybody even knows about. There is a lot to be worked on in this.

So, a reminder that effective this month, all COGs are required to conduct monthly tests. I don't think a whole lot of people know this, and so, I'm just putting it out there and we will keep reiterating it, because it was starting this month. When, I don't even know but I would assume that they're ready to go in IPAWS to handle the load, but I'm not going to make any assumptions for IPAWS at this point. So, just a quick mention of where we're at with that. Any questions on that?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay, new business. I've got a couple things under new business. I want to remind everybody about the symposium, save the dates, March 23rd through 26. It's going to be in Niagara Falls. We have the hotel already set up, and we'll be sending out information shortly, but be sure to hold those dates. That's number one.

Also, next year's meetings for this group, February 5th, April 29th, August 5th, and October 28th. Those are the four dates we picked for next year.

With that, anything else for new business or the good of the order?

TURNER: I have a question. About a week ago, in the Acadia Daily News, there was an editorial. I'm not sure if it possibly originated from the Watertown area, or not, but it spoke of a proposed emergency services tower to be installed in Inlet in Hamilton County. And apparently, the Adirondack Park Agency is opposed to it. And I was just wondering if this body, or your office,

was aware of it and if we had any ability to try to work with the APA. I realize they're very powerful up north. But the article basically iterated that emergency services up there are being hamstrung by this tower not being able to be installed.

SPRAGUE: Yes, there's a number of issues we're aware of in Hamilton County. There is also an upstate Cellular Task Force group that myself and Matt have been -- as a matter of fact, there's one this afternoon that Matt's going to be going to that's looking at this very same issue. They've had a number of offline meetings and online meetings with the Adirondack Park Agency to try to sort through this issue.

Siting of towers in the Adirondacks is an issue. They have a process that they go through, and one of the things that the Cellular Task Force is doing is to illuminate what that process is. I think some of the lead-up to that process to determine what's the provider, for lack of a better term, what's the vendor going to build, and the design and the type, and the structure type. And when I say that, it's all the way from a standard tower to some of these other things that look more like pine trees, and a few other things. And the height above trees and terrain. There is a bunch of things that come into that. The interesting thing is that -- and that tower I think you're talking about at inlet, the fire department was doing a tower, the community raised funds to build the tower to try to get people to come and land on the tower from the cellular companies.

So, that's a little different process. How familiar and how far into the process they got before they visited with the APA is a question mark in my mind, because they're not typical folks that would build a tower. How that whole process worked out, I don't know.

I would imagine it will probably come up in the meeting this afternoon, and that's a good place for this discussion to go into. I think we should follow it and see what happens at the meeting this afternoon. Also, what the eventual outcome is of this tower structure, or whatever the situation is with APA. We need to keep an eye on it.

But yes, we've been working with the county government up there for the last three years, four years. We've been in part of it to try to do some cooperative things. It's an issue. There's no easy way around it, but I think they've tried to make the APA be more transparent. I think through this Cellular Task Force and what the

end result is going to be --

LAFLURE: They're a tough group to work with, Mike.

SPRAGUE: Yeah, yeah. So, it's being looked at. There's some visibility in a couple different areas. The task force is evaluating development, and that was called for by the Governor's office, so they're getting a look at what the end result is going to be. They're supposed to have a report shortly on that as well, evaluation of what this means, citing and review process.

Yes, that's a good question and we'll be following for sure.

Anything else for the good of the order?

(No response.)

SPRAGUE: Okay, very good. I thank everybody for coming. I'm glad that the folks were able to come ECD and talk about that, because I think it helps tie in a lot of what we do and why we're sitting here and so I appreciate everybody coming and all your efforts. Thank you very much. Move for adjournment?

VOU TOUR: Make a motion.

SPRAGUE: I see a motion.

TURNER: Second.

SPRAGUE: All in favor?

(Affirmative responses.)

SPRAGUE: Everybody else can stay.

* * * * *

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

I, **THERESA L. ARDIA**, Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of New York, do hereby CERTIFY that the foregoing record taken by me at

AMF REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

518-982-1341

WWW.AMFREPORTING.COM

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, RPR, RMR

Dated: November 30, 2019.