

## **ATTENDEES**

- Cheryl Benjamin
- Bill Burgess
- Ivan Weichert
- Joy Paulus
- Gene Trobia
- Ian Von Essen (Co-Chair)
- Andy Rowan (Co-Chair)
- Charlie Hickman
- Martha Walls
- Laura Blastic

## **AGENDA**

- 1.) Review & Approve Minutes form Last Meeting
- 2.) Status of NG911WG Session at Midyear
- 3.) Review Questions for NG911 Questionnaire within the GIS Inventory
- 4.) Address WebEx Seminar – 1/31/2013
- 5.) New Items

## **DISCUSSION**

### **1) Review & Approve Minutes form Last Meeting**

- There were a number of technical issues described in the minutes
- If anyone has any corrections, please describe them
- Moved Burgess, second Rowan - approved by vote

### **2) Status of NG911WG Session at Midyear**

- Kathy Liljequist from NENA will speak at the Midyear Meeting
- Kenny Miller and others have provided information on relevant topics
- Are there any particular topics that we should ask her to cover during her presentation?
- Ask her to cover CLDXF (Civic Location Data Exchange Format) and Next Gen standards from NENA, status and overview
- What is NENA doing (or could be doing) to use their relationship with the PSAPs to help them embrace geospatial issues related to NG 9-1-1. This could just be asked as a question at the end of the session.
- One thing NENA did was to approach NSGIC and NAPSG about providing GIS sessions at their Long Beach Conference.
- Are they going to be doing Next Gen and geospatial integration pilots in localities that are advanced?

### **3) Review Questions for NG911 Questionnaire within the GIS Inventory**

- A comparison of the New York and Michigan surveys was done for today's call

- 
- NY experienced a problem with Survey Monkey. The state and county firewalls were set up to clear all cookies when they log off, and Survey Monkey loses track of where you are between sessions. This frustrated the users and they had to start over. NY changed to a different vehicle.
  - There is a workaround for that problem that Burgess will provide
  - The purpose of NSGIC's effort is to come up with an example survey that states could use to gather this information. It will be helpful to have some consistent information across the states. It will also help to move 911 organizations toward getting ready for Next Gen.
  - Review of Survey Sections was performed on WebEx with the following notes:
    - General ID info, contacts, who should the states go to for follow up
    - Dispatch software - what do they use? NY asked this question so they would know what they needed to be ready to deal with for their GIS data to be compatible. They could help the software vendors become aware of what was coming.
    - MI did not ask this because they were looking for where the PSAPs are with regard to using GIS (dispatch, AVL, etc.). The MI steering committee didn't want to focus too much on dispatch.
    - Map display, data layers. NY: Does CAD software do map display. If no, is that just because they weren't aware or didn't have resources? Which data sets from the state office were in use in 911, or where had they built their own local data. Details about point placement will help guide the State's data development project, and avoid having to redo it. There are also questions about sub-addresses (trailers in mobile home parks, apartments, etc.). Contractors were identified, because the state was doing an RFP. Info about quantity of existing data also helped in estimating costs to build the rest.
    - MI wanted a data inventory of what people had and were using. There are questions about what is available AND what is being currently used in the PSAPs. (This also helped get the PSAPs connected to their local GIS coordination offices) Landmark layer is named places to ID location without address, usually retail stores, restaurants, but also parks. These are the types of locations that people frequently call from for assistance.
    - MI explored issues and concerns about GIS data, and update frequency. They were planning to centralize this data maintenance, wanted to know what they were facing. Also scoping to know how often people would need to refresh downloaded data, for system load/sizing. Participants aren't uploading just the change data. They are sending full data sets up on each refresh.
    - Structures and address data. NY: wanted to know the relationship between the 911 entities and the telecoms carrying their 911 calls. What is lay of the land for existing data maintenance processes, data sharing between 911 centers and telecoms.
    - The MI data inventory looked at what type of address locations, structures, update frequency, how updated, how often. Do they have ordinances about addressing, how and by whom are addresses assigned?

- 
- Data sharing. NY: how many PSAPs in the county, do they share info with each other. MI: what is climate around data sharing in 911 world. How many have concerns that the data are sensitive. MI law allows govs to sell GIS data, this could be an obstacle to interagency sharing. Practice is for state to direct requestors to the locals to buy data, or if not the state would charge the same as the local plus 10% admin fee and put the money into supporting the centralized app. Locals also wanted not to have liability if the data they put in the central repository turned out wrong or outdated.
  - MI had some other data inventory, wish list and priority questions. Wanted to find what baseline was for where people were, and which ones needed to be brought up to par.
  - In MI, some locals who got federal DHS grant money to build the data were worried that if they released the data for non-emergency management purposes, it would jeopardize their ability to get further grant money. Also general wariness about state government because there was some push in the legislature to get 911 consolidation.
  - MI also had the familiar issues with reluctance to share. The 'haves' and 'have nots,' where the 'haves' don't need anyone else's help and don't want to get into sharing situations. There were also some political situations about whether or not they liked the state's plan for NG and consolidation.
  - What did MI do about edge matching/normalizing the data?
    - Had to do this work to fulfill grant requirements. Ended up using the statewide PSAP layer to snap road endpoints so they met the boundaries, and snapped line endpoints together across boundaries. Roads running on the boundaries were duplicated and had coincident features - sometimes with different attributes.
  - This would be a good panel presentation for annual conference: 'What are states doing to handle issues of data integration for 911?'

#### 4) Address WebEx Seminar – 1/31/2013

- This is the same set of presentations that we arranged for the NENA Annual Conference
- It will be for NSGIC members only, because of limit on the WebEx and phone lines, but the presentations will be recorded and shared with all.

#### 5) New Items

- None