9-1-1 Coordinators' Association Meeting

February 7, 2024

Start Meeting time: 9:01 am CST

Introductions: Names and titles were provided by all attendees.

Old Business: Minutes from the prior meeting were given to all.
- Tim Bryant made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for September 6, 2023.
- Jon Streeb seconded the motion.
- Approved by all.

Treasurer Report
- Pete De La Cruz made a motion to approve the treasurer report.
- Beth Eggar seconded the motion.
- All passed.

Reports from Standing Committee:

I.   By-Laws
   a. No action at this time
II. Compliance
   a. Refer to PPS 038. The centerlines and the SSAP have updated error rates. Please ensure you are heading toward that/meeting compliance for your goals. Increases must be made annually. This is taking effect for this year and will be looked at again at the end of the year.
III. Database/GIS
   a. During last month's meeting, the move to GEODatahub 2 was a big topic. Half the RPC's have moved over. The other half will move over sometime in March, pending bug fixes amongst the Motorola cards. The feedback on datahub 2 is that there are various configuration issues. GEOCOMM is having problems uploading the data incorrectly. There are a lot of delays. Some RPC's didn't get the December load (it's required that an RPC upload at least once a month)
   b. Be aware that getting through the bugs may take some time for your GIS person.
   c. There is a general agreement that using the HUB helper caused more problems. HUB Helper was not helpful, and changes were made where it is largely irrelevant.
   d. It is generally agreed that the errors being reported back were larger to work with compared to Datahub 1. Some of the errors give a lot less detail. It would list this address as on the wrong side, vs. the same error that this point is on the wrong side. There are less details in the reports than there were before.
   e. There is a lack of unique ID for some features (less details) It may take a bit of changing and looking at your error reports.
   f. For those who were using the reference column, it is no longer populated in Datahub 2 and is now empty.

g. The summary PDF that gives you a list of all your errors is now gone. There is a dashboard and more detailed table in the web console that you can log in and see, but it does not email you a ready format. It's more of a very basic dashboard/detailed log. You have to make this yourself now.

h. Geodatahub is also moving polygons. It is believed that the reprojecting has been fixed. If you're not a GIS person/GIS person is not here, when you move over to GeoDatahub 2, ensure you're communicating with your GEOCOMM contacts because there may be some weird errors that are not your fault. Please pay attention to some of your errors and work through those when you have questions.

i. Hopefully you have worked through your errors in February as a report is coming out. One of the problems is that there are NO exception codes in this version. In Hub 1, you could report an issue as right, and it wouldn't count against your numbers with this exception code. There is no timeline for adding in the exception ode in Hub 2. Until then, you will have many errors you can't fix or get rid of.

j. There is no official response as to why, but there is more flexibility on GEOCOMM's end. Before, when you would upload, it would take 4+ hours, depending on the upload size. Now, it takes a shorter time (10 minutes) for this upload to process.

k. ARO/AT&T exception codes are not affected, and you have to keep them. Geocomm is still pulling those out and sending them separately.

l. NO documentation is specific to HUB 2. There have been few notes and presentations. There's no source of collective information; the errors that are being checked are noted as a big problem due to having no source to go back to.

m. ArcMAP is going away (the staple desktop GIS for 2 decades). ESRI is replacing this with ArcPro. ArcMap is in mature support, and there may be a few security patches. They will still take tech support but request you move to ArcPro. March of 2026 is the end date for support on ArcMap. Several RPC's are waiting for solutions. Others are looking at the data managing address solution. PRPC is using GEOCOMM Contributor. City of Laredo is using 1spatial and ArcPro. There are various options and paths that need to be discussed when moving forward. It's advisable to download ArcPro and COPY your data and play around with that so you can have some hands-on experience with the product.

   i. Some functionality is specific to arc pro that you can do simultaneously in both Pro and ArcMap but some are unique to Pro.

n. Coordination between us has a GIS User Group with GIS people from ECD's and RPC's. It was active before covid, but there has been more momentum coming back recently. Dora with the city of Laredo sent out a contact, but there are tentative dates in May that ESRI will offer a full-day workshop in San Antonio on the new ESRI addressing solution for ArcPro. There will be limited seats (possibly 1 person per agency). Look for emails coming for that. ESRI does have some recorded webinars on this, but the hands-on approach is being offered.

   i. A room has been secured on Sunday for TPSC for the 911 GIS group. All are welcome. They are seeing if there is an option for virtual attendance/streaming available for those who can't attend. This is seen as a pre-conference meeting, and you don't have to register for the conference to

attend. Please plan accordingly. The last day to register for early registration is February 17th.

    ii. There are some options for holding a separate meeting virtual meeting.

    iii. NENA hosts a LEAP conference on leap day (Feb 27th—29th). NENA members can attend.

    iv. Request to add Dale Boyett to the GIS Subcommittee. They are from Southeast Texas.

IV. <u>Legislative</u>

    a. The main topic was Prop 8 (this was passed at the general election)

        i. It set up a broadband infrastructure fund. It will allow the creation of 1.5 billion dollars to expand high-speed internet across Texas. The legislature has it expiring within ten years, but It can be extended another. There is 155 million dollars allocated for Next Gen 911 across the state. That is currently with the comptroller and will be distributed by population. The allocation has been published

            1. The 911 districts 150,962,868.93.

            2. The municipal 16

            3. Cogs received 22,268,965.17

V. <u>NextGen Committee</u>

    a. The big conversation is the OSP migrations. Two COGS have migrated with their transition, and by the end of February, the other two cogs will have fully migrated. CSEC is assisting with the OSP migration. The process is underway, and they are having weekly calls with AT&T.

VI. <u>PSAP Operations Committee</u>

    a. Looking into updating the compliance reports. They will wait to see if CSEC PSAP visits will add more information.

VII. <u>Strategic planning/Equipment Replacement</u>

    a. All the Motorola calls have migrated their OSP's (Motorola is done as of September 2022?) There will be a strategic plan workshop after the commission meeting on the 27th for stage 1. Stage 1 will be discussed then. Prior to that, it is advisable to start working on it if you can. Stage 1 will be released in Salesforce around March 18th. It will be due April 19th. Don't wait until the last minute.

        i. Email Anita if you wish to have a blank worksheet for Stage 1 or 2.

        ii. You have a place to start from stage 2 when you input your data previously. You want to match what Salesforce has online.

        iii. Use your old quotes, projects you may have, and any other bills so you can start building the data now. Then plug in your numbers when CSEC opens it up. (provided you have worked on your worksheet)

    b. Recorder replacement costs will be discussed soon.
It has been 19 years since the cap was last updated. It costs 12,000 for a server, 2000 for the software (SQL server); this still does not include the actual recorder, training etc. The channel software is 400-1200 dollars a channel. To buy 4 channels, it's "only" 1600. The estimate is to increase the cost to 20k for two positions.
Please send an email to Anita Pitt to discuss.

c. Contingency Routing
   i. What's your flow? Do you want to put in another change/change your last route?
   ii. Get with your selective router vendor.
   iii. Don't just assume. Ask your neighbor, especially if you're going any further. (Especially if paths take a while between AT&T and Motorola/vice versa)
   iv. Give your vendor plenty of time to do this
   v. Ask yourself questions; how will this call get back to the PSAP information programmed in? ETC.
      1. Check if your PSAP/area can transfer back if possible.

VIII. Training/Public Education
   a. Will be networking with other Public Safety agencies. They are going to promote the same message on the solar eclipse. The 2024 eclipse campaign will be working on multiple issues. If you wish to join the committee, contact Andrea Shepard.
   b. For the PET meeting they will be providing additional information (flyer was handed out) this information will be handed out. It's expected that 911 will be affected due to call volume and other services out (schools doing specific activities)
   c. For national telecommunicator week, all agencies are doing several things.
   d. HB 669 is working on providing/working with the school districts on…impact of the 911 system.
      i. Back to school events
      ii. Text to 911 campaign
      iii. Community events
      iv. National night out and other such activities
   e. Tarrant county is working on their curriculum.
   f. Solar eclipse call taking course (flyer handed out) CTCOG will be offering the solar eclipse call taking course 28th/29th
      i. There will be a virtual version on the 29th but there will not be credit for this
      ii. There is no charge on the virtual. If you do visit physically there will be a charge for that

IX. Wireless Services
   a. Group got together by email. There has been some movement on the AT&T Mobile Migration off of the LSRs. This is statewide. You should/will need to update your network diagram when this happens. Put this on your strategic plan NOT your quarterly reports.
   b. If you have any questions, you can reach out to the committee (or AT&T)
   c. Several providers are waiting for the FCC ruling for migration on wireline/wireless side.
   d. LBR in SE Texas for Verizon

X. Emergency Communications Advisory Council Update
   a. ECAC meets once a month (First Friday of the Month
   b. Three topics discussed
      i. Solar Eclipse (briefing)
      ii. Senate Bill 8

1. There have been three rounds of funding. They're trying to use the last of the three million to reach agencies that have not participated.
2. 29% of the funds have been expended so far. But this must be expended by 12/31/2026

iii. Tracking Proposition 8 funds and how they will be distributed

1. Opinion on the money that was approved they would get the money like they get the monthly wireless money (this was the districts) and be as usual
2. The Commission has stated that this money is tax money, not fee money. This is not traditional and has to be reported back to the legislature, and they (the commission) are requesting some reporting to make sure it's being spent appropriately. "How far has it gone towards getting the state to the next-gen?" All COGS are at the intermediate state of getting to next gen. Some of the cities/districts are trying to get going.
   a. There have been meetings to discuss the agreement on this.
   b. There needs to be some reporting...CSEC would like to operate the money like how RPCs currently operate, i.e., a reimbursement
3. If you spend the money on something other than a next-gen activity, you have to pay it back.
   a. There has been some good progress. A call is scheduled for 2/16 to discuss the activity and move forward on resolving it.

Request to amend the agenda to allow John to do his presentation.

Break for 15 minutes (10:24 am)

Resume 10:41 am

John Streeb Presentation

- Preventing Errors with Map settings
  o Several examples were shown. Screenshots are done in Arcpro as it's assumed that most are moving. ArcMap can still be done, but managing within your data layers is easier in ArcPro. (you can turn off several features in the layer in Pro vs. Map)
  o Fields can be read only
    ▪ You can turn off several settings (turning off your country)
      • You may still need to see other information, such as the Unique ID. But you can have it read-only (so you won't be manually editing this)
      • Tell the software not to edit this information manually.
  o Highlight Fields
  o Use Snapping settings and topology editing.
  o In ArcPro, editable layers are managed carefully.
- You cannot manage field-specific permissions.

- o If you get into enterprise through various version use, there are ways to manage permissions on different layers. But it gets very convoluted very quickly. You could have some areas that you're seeing in one area, but you aren't in another.
- In Arc Pro, you can turn on editing for specific layers/features and turn off information in your map. You can still see them, but you won't accidentally select something.
- Preventing Errors with Database Settings
  - o Make sure you're reading up on the information and practice in your database
  - o Assigning domains to fields is a huge recommendation for everything possible.
    - ▪ When editing your county feature, there should be a drop-down list.
    - ▪ Another example is road parity, it should be O(dd), E(ven), (B)oth or Z(ero)
  - o You can set permissions on the user level for individual data sets.
    - ▪ If you have staff that does day-to-day addressing that doesn't do polygons, you can set your database permissions not to have them access this information.
  - o Versioning lets you review/approve edits before it becomes live into your data
    - ▪ There are two different versions of Arcpro. One is branch versioning, which is exclusive to ArcPro, and the other is traditional versioning, which is in ArcMap. You could have a default version (base level) and a QA/QC version, and then every user edits their version of QA/QC. The admin should review the QA/QC version and review all those edits, spot-check things, and carefully review and inspect that information before logging into default.
    - ▪ It is inevitable you will still have errors
  - o Archiving tracks your edits for every edit you make in your data.
    - ▪ You can go back to before an edit and restore for huge edits/issues.
  - o In Arc Pro there are some new capabilities to explore that are specific to them
    - ▪ Doing this would mean it would NOT be accessible in ArcMap anymore.
  - o There are tasks that help you through editing. You can document/read up on those.
    - ▪ It's built into the ESRI management solution, and you can customize the default ESRI solution a lot.
    - ▪ Several fields should be critical and need to be populated.
      - • A PSAP should always have a service URI and thus would prevent the error from going in
      - • This would be dependent on your workflows
- Geodatahub 2
  - o In addition to the error report, there will be transformation validation tasks.
    - ▪ These do not count towards your error percentage but can still be valuable.
    - ▪ On initial go-live schema changes, it would be advisable to go through and check that. "This is the data I'm uploading" shows what you're uploading and what GEOCOMM is expecting you to upload, which don't match.
  - o You will get errors back..they usually come in a spreadsheet.
    - ▪ For all of your SSAP QC errors, they will all come back saying SSAP to RCl synchronization.
    - ▪ In the extended information field, this will have the detail
      - • Specific type of error

- Street it is on
- MSAG community
- Other details
- Add in a new field/calc instruction to add in this field. (Reach out to John Streeb for a calc line, model builder, etc.)
  - You could split this description to allow for symbolism, color coding, etc.
- There are differences in how the validation run
  - Anomalies may be included. 999 Exception code still works.
  - Placement can affect a lot of things.
    - Location-based routing is being enabled slowly, so placement is something to consider going forward.
    - LBR is based on the polygon
- Addressing:
  - GIS data model does make alliances if there are wrong side issues (evens on odd side, and vice versa.
    - There is a field called parity to mark which on which side of the road
    - B can be used for both..BUT
      - What other uses your GIS data; it may not be the best solution
        - If they're putting it into their CAD system, it may not be built to handle it.
  - Sub addressing:
    - Individual address points for units. When GEOCOMM takes your ALI data, they don't look at the ALI data when doing the comparison.
    - They ignore the location field. They include the unit field in your data. If you have sub-addresses, it compares them against Ali data, which does not have that data.
- ALI Errors:
  - Telecommunicators should be sending ALI reports. A lot of people use parcel data. A non-traditional source. Get with your voter registrars in your county. This is a well-maintained/official government address, unlike the parcel data.
- Check Data with SQL Expressions
  - Field Name Upper
  - Field Name TRM/Both
  - Position
  - CHAR Length
  - Combining Fields

Break for lunch 11:34 am (all in agreement) Return at 1:00 pm

Reconvene at 1:05 pm

<u>Federal Compliance Training & Updates</u>

- Noah is now a director.
- All information/slides will be posted to the website
- Federal Requirements
    - CSEC must ensure that the subrecipient is in compliance with the same requirements as the recipient of federal funding.
- CSEC Monitoring Plan
    - CSEC has been doing some reporting on a quarterly and annual basis on our behalf. This is due to the relationship through state funds and are offsetting the costs through federal funds.
    - Everything will be looked at through the files that have been submitted.
    - RPC Side: Just like you do the monitoring through the programs, this will be more or less the same process.
    - RPCs will be randomly selected each year until the end of the project period (6-7 will be notified)
        - This will be the first year that it will be conducted.
        - A follow-up review will be provided based on the analysis of the resource documents. If anything additional may be needed, there will be contact.
- Monitoring Reviews
    - CSEC will be initiating the reviews via email. You will have been notified prior.
    - Any observations or findings will be completed within 7 business days of receipt.
        - Again, this is business days, not calendar days.
        - There will be an allowable amount of time from management before it goes out
        - Before anything is finalized, program staff will be coordinated so that any observations or findings will be included in the annual compliance with the program via the strategic planning process so it's not an entirely separate process
    - There are certain remedies if not in compliance
        - There will be time and other ways to assist to fix non-compliance issues.
        - This is a very open communication process. Please don't take it as sending this information and being closed off. If you have any questions during this, please reach out to Noah and his team.
        - After coordination, all information will be included in the final report and be provided at the following commission meeting
    - Information looked at:
        - Federal Compliance Standards & Policies
        - Certain reports are required
        - Funding requests
        - Equipment included in inventory
            - You don't have to keep a separate inventory, but certain information has been to be included.

- Cybersecurity Training Certifications
- Inventory and Maintenance Records
  - For today, any components of your call handling or routers must be entered into the maintenance worksheet.
  - Columns In there will be provided.
- Cybersecurity Training
  - Notification that this is completed on a yearly basis (may be done by your other departments)
  - Same information as usual. This will just be rolled into your program compliance
- Timeline:
  - Webinar is today.
  - Next deployment monitoring is in early May
  - Performing Monitoring Reviews: Late May – July
  - Complete Follow-up - August
  - Report to Commission – September
- Resource Links:
    - Provided on slide ((can't do hyperlinks))
  - CSEC SB8
  - Quarterly/Annual Report
  - Quarterly Financial Completion Progress Report
  - Annual Performance Progress Report
  - Federal Inventory Requirements
  - Inventory and Maintenance Records Worksheet
  - Several other webinars were done in September
- If you have any questions, please contact
  - Noah Gilliam (Noahg@csec.texas.gov)
  - Kely Moore (Keleym@csec.texas.gov)
  - Frank Rivera (FrankR@csec.texas.gov)

<u>Commission on State Emergency Communications Updates</u>

- No additional updates since the last 911 Workshop on the program workbook for training
    - Requests are still being made regarding what should be added/needed.
        - This is not limited to just veterans. New ones can be included or added as well.
        - It's not necessarily new information; it's just refreshing things and the level of involvement.
    - A request for two versions (the red line and the other version) was made to see the changes. The last version was updated in 2013.
        - 2013 version has no SB8 funding information, NG911, etc.
        - It has good basic program information and performance reporting. (how to do reports, etc.)
    - Update the budget adjustment request to have additional detail
        - It would be a good idea to have a planned amendment shift.
            - Maybe a working group can assist in compiling this information.
    - Technical for the network diagram and clear and concise information
    - Would a workgroup help? (Yes)
        - Rea will receive assistance and feedback to create a regular schedule with CSEC on assistance.
        - If there is a workgroup of 5-6, it would be manageable
        - If there's a several lower number, they would wish there could be representation around the state
        - There is a larger detailed list of what is needed
- Workgroup Volunteers:
    - Rea Allen
    - Anita Pitt
    - Ashley Hernandez (Southeast Texas)
    - Marcella Medina
    - Helen Hill CTCOG
    - Charlesetta Malone
    - Amanda Tienda
- Request to do an annual review
- It is important to have a document with your circuit IDs, numbers, etc.. This is good practice.
    - Make sure to have an extra copy also somewhere else. (back up to the backup)

Regarding the CSEC visits:

    - How should we be prepared/for visitations, monitoring visits
        - This is just a monitoring visit. This used to happen back then. ("in the day")
        - This is just the CSEC monitoring checklist being used from their end
        - "extra" people are not needed (Sherrif, elected official)
        - There will be stuff that needs to be addressed

- - CSEC will be giving a heads-up on giving a visit a week or two in advance.
      - All that is needed is at least one employee from the RPC
- Question on the TTY machines
  - There are emerging technologies coming that are making this obsolete
  - ADA has had several technology changes that would impact. But there is no good impact on it nationwide. Currently, there are no state conversations. There have been talks with the DoJ, but the TTYs remain. Video relay is still being discussed/discussed in talks, but there is nothing to remove the TTY machines anytime soon.
  - A standalone TTY is still required for each PSAP.
  - TTY is reliant on analog lines. When the lines are all converted, there may be additional talks.

Regional Roundtable: Best Practices for Tracking Program and Expenditures Against Strategic Plans

- What is allowed?
- Cost verification sheets are used with some people.
- A sheet did go out to all RPCs on what hasn't or has been charged
  - The reason they are doing this is due to internal audits on needing to do finance reviews
- Don't leave it up to finance. Always check your information and keep track.
- This would be a good idea to have in the coordinator handbook

Hilda Arredondo-Garibay made a motion to adjourn.
Pete De La Cruz seconded the motion. All passed.
The meeting ended at 2:43 pm.