

# Next Generation 911 Work Group Meeting Notes April 12, 2012

---

## ATTENDEES

- Bill Burgess
- Bill Johnson
- Patrick Melancon
- Joe Sewash
- Ian Von Essen (Chair)
- Laura Blastic – MI
- Jeff Smith – OH
- Dan Miller – WA – E911 GIS Manager for State
- Charlie Hickman
- Max Armstrong – Blount County, GA

## AGENDA

1. Review & Approve Minutes form Last Meeting
2. Review NY CAD System & Address survey. Discuss revisions and options from a national perspective. - Cheryl Benjamin --NYS Office of Cyber Security
3. What has NY learned and how has it been applied to: (Cheryl Benjamin)
  - a. supporting the PSAP's in general and
  - b. in finding and collecting address data in particular?
4. Discuss what GIS Coordinators can expect to learn from the survey and how to apply that knowledge. (Group Discussion)
5. Peer review of draft survey: Select State 911 Boards, Local PSAP's and GIS Coordinators already tied to their PSAP community; NENA, NAPSG, others? (Group Discussion)
6. Discuss elements of the marketing and roll-out plan. (Group Discussion)  
Two phased approach.
  - a. Phase I – Develop National Address Survey Peer Review Group.
    - i. Reach out to state GIS and 911 Coordinators, local PSAP directors (large & small) and national associations.
    - ii. Enlist their support for Peer-Review group. Outline responsibilities. Get associations as partners if possible and include logo's on survey instrument.
  - b. Phase II – Deploy National Address Survey - need
    - i. Survey Monkey instrument
    - ii. Opening statement for survey instrument
    - iii. Instructions

## Next Generation 911 Work Group Meeting Notes April 12, 2012

---

- iv. Email addresses
    1. NENA members [do we really want all PSAP's surveyed? NY? MD? Other states where outreach is already underway?
    2. NASNA members
    3. NSGIC GIS Coordinators
  - v. Readiness to evaluate the results
  - vi. Post/distribute to state GIS coordinators
7. Schedule (Group Discussion)
  8. Your items

### DISCUSSION

1. Review & Approve Minutes form Last Meeting
  - Notes approved for 1/12/12 meeting
2. Review NY CAD System & Address survey. Discuss revisions and options from a national perspective. – Bill Johnson --NYS Office of Cyber Security
  - The Committee has been talking about doing a survey that would support E911 Coordinators and NSGIC State Reps
  - Kenny Miller went through the NY State survey and modified it a little. He also made some notes. That document was sent out.
  - The WORD version we saw was put into Survey Monkey for use in NY State
  - NY is trying to get a clear picture of what exists in each of the counties
  - NY wants to bring on some contractor support and need this information to provide the contractors appropriate guidance
  - NY is coordinating with the NY State E911 Association which is divided in 4 regions
  - They have met with each of the regions to discuss the background of their project
  - Asking the counties to provide this information and trying to establish a relationship with them
  - This is a very pragmatic approach
  - Need to know the environment for the PSAPs so that NY State can create the data for them
  - They are determining their contacts in each jurisdiction (send out sheets to them) and how the counties want them to work with them
  - They are not getting a lot of requests for site visits
  - 62 Counties and 5 Boroughs in NYC - They are not doing a point data set for NYC
  - 46 Counties returned the contact sheets
  - 35 have responded to the questionnaires

## Next Generation 911 Work Group Meeting Notes April 12, 2012

---

- The surprise for them is that more counties have Address Point files than they thought existed
- County 911 staff are not typically working with the county GIS offices and not taking advantage of their data
- 23 counties of 57 have address points so far
- The files represent a mixture of locations such as entry points, roof tops, parcel centroids, etc.
- None of them are using the FGDC or NENA standard
- NY State is getting questions about 'sub-addressing'
- Question – are the people that normally work with their own data (e.g. roof top) willing to use some other type of point (front door, driveway, etc.)?
- NY State will use anything that is located on the building, but will move parcel centroids to the buildings
- Q – How diverse are the CAD Systems?
- There are about 6 common types, but they are working with different versions
- Comment – Hard when 911 Centers make edits in their CAD system to move data back to GIS
- The work being done in NY might not be useable by the counties for 18 to 24 months as they convert things over
- NY State staff were invited to a Contractor Session at the State 911 Conference to talk about the issues
- Q - What source of funds is being used by NY to do this work?
- Broadband Grant funds are being used for Address Data Development – that is the seed money to get through their RFP process – these funds are finished in 2014
- The NY State GIS Office is a 'sister agency' to the 911 Board
- They are in discussions with the Board about making Address Points an eligible activity for funding from the State 911 funds
- Q – In the NY RFP how will they serve out the data?
- It won't be a live data editing environment
- They are scoping out an application now for editing
- Counties want to work in-house and feed-up the data to the state
- A one-size fits all solution will not work for all the counties
- Michigan is putting up a state portal for a road network that the PSAPs can use to ETL over the data
- Used the NENA model and customized it for Michigan Needs
- Q – When asking the counties to complete the survey are they asking how the address point data is being created and verified?
- Cheryl Benjamin is contacting each of the counties for missing information – but Bill is not familiar with all the details
- Q – Is there any capture of 'match and error' statistics in the existing CAD systems?
- Q – Is there a one-to-many relationship between primary points and supplemental points?

## Next Generation 911 Work Group Meeting Notes April 12, 2012

---

- No model yet, but expect a one-to-many relationship, but this is NENA's call and they are working on it now.
- Q - Is NY working with them on this effort?
- NY submitted an 'Issue Identification' form to get NENA started on this and NENA adopted the issue
- It has been assigned to the right workgroups – Cheryl Benjamin should be involved
- Agenda for upcoming NENA Conference is on their web site
- It would be good for NSGIC to put together a 'best practices' document to discuss use of 911 funds for mapping data
- Q – Are there any plans for maintenance of the proposed NY Address Point file?
- Yes – There is in-house capacity to do this maintenance work, but they need to convert to the NENA standard – just can't do the initial build without contractor support
- Michigan did a similar survey to PSAP administrators and GIS Coordinators and about 80% responded
- Characterized local governments by their capacity to do this work
- Michigan is using a grant from the National Highway Safety Traffic Administration (NHTSA - <http://www.nhtsa.gov/>) \$1.7 million grant that had to be matched with 911 funds
- They had already done a feasibility study
- Q – How long did it take the respondents to answer the NY survey?
- Not sure, Cheryl might know
- Q – Should a survey be done by each individual state or will a national effort work?
- This was done after a lot of advance work and frequent contact
- A national survey will probably result in a low response rate
- We could role this into the GIS Inventory as opposed to the GMA since we are standing up a Public Safety Interface

Meeting was ended at this point due to the Virtual State Caucus Meeting.