

## ASSOCIATION NEWS

# Looking Forward

## Executive Council Addresses Financial Outlook & Strategic Governance Implementation

“Today’s APCO cannot be the APCO five years from now,” Steve Proctor, a member of the SGI Task Force and an APCO past president, told the Executive Council in February. “It’s time for our association to become the next generation of APCO.”

APCO International’s Mid-Year Executive Council (EC) Meeting was held Feb. 14–15 in Orlando in advance of the Winter Summit. The two-day agenda was packed with financial reports and updates on association business, legislative policy and regulatory affairs. A report from the Strategic Governance Implementation (SGI) Task Force and subsequent discussions will have far-reaching implications for the association’s future.

### GET OUT THE VOTE

One of the first items on the agenda was a statement from Terry Hall, the Virginia Chapter EC representative and communications director for York County Public Safety Telecommunications. Hall is the sole candidate for the office of Second Vice President for the next Board term.

“The very first APCO meeting I went to, I heard Steve Souder stand up and talk, and I thought, ‘Someday ... I want to be one the leaders of this great organization,’” Hall told the EC. “I’m standing here today because I want to be. The timing is right for me to work for APCO International as I have for APCO Virginia. ... My goal is to give back some of what APCO has given me over the past 17 years.”

Check out May *Public Safety Communications* for an article detailing Hall’s public safety background, views on the issues facing the association and the industry, and the reasons why he wants to serve on the Board of Officers. Also visit [www.terryhall2009.org](http://www.terryhall2009.org).



### FINANCE & BUDGET

The FY 2009 Q2 Financial Update was presented by Budget and Finance Committee Chair Dave Saffel, West Virginia, and CPA Bob Johnson. Executive Director George Rice Jr. presented the 2010 budget.

According to Johnson, the association’s cash flow, net assets and overall financial position continue to be very strong. “It’s really easy to be Finance and Budget chair when times are good,” said Saffel, “and fortunately this year, times are pretty good. We were anticipating a hard year, [but] thanks to the Board and staff, we’re doing pretty well.”

“You’re able to react to circumstances much quicker than other organizations,” said Johnson, “and that’s something to be very proud of.”

A proposal to increase membership dues at a rate comparable to the change in the Consumer Price Index was on the agenda as required under the Policy

Manual. However, several EC members expressed concerns that in light of the current economic situation and the tight budgets many public safety communications are working under, members might not be able to renew their membership if the dues were increased. Thus, the Board recommended against an increase, and the EC voted not to increase membership dues for 2010.

### CHANGE AT THE TOP

The SGI effort is something *PSC* has reported on often over the past year and a half. It’s a major effort designed to streamline APCO’s processes and procedures through use of a smaller governing body. The goal is to allow the elected association leaders to be more proactive in today’s ever changing world, more responsive to opportunities and better able to compete with other associations. The new structure would include a Board of Directors and an Executive Commit-

## Association News & Notes

tee (see illustration, opposite). “Under the proposed structure, this new Board will meet and discuss issues more frequently, which will yield a more results-accountable, engaged and representative form of leadership,” said President Chris Fischer in the January President’s Channel column.

By way of introduction to the SGI report, Past President Willis Carter reminded the EC, “SGI started back last year, ... but it was Strategic Governance Initiative. And of course, last year in Kansas City, 63% of our members voted to adopt that plan,” just short of the two-thirds majority required to pass.

Carter commented that many of those who voted against the initiative believed in the concept of reform but had some concerns about the process. He recapped those concerns: the need for more time, more attention to the details and more dialogue.

As one of her first actions as president, Fischer reconstituted the SGI Task Force, which met for the first time in September.

Carter said the SGI Task Force got busy rather quickly. “We took a day and a half and reviewed the input we’d received. We found real early that there was a significant amount of outreach that needed to be done.”

The Task Force began its outreach efforts with the chapters and members who voted against the initiative in Kansas City so they could identify and address their concerns in the process. Other conference calls were convened along regional lines, and Carter reported they had great turnout on those calls, with about 85% of the EC membership participating.

“We wanted to be very, very sure that communications are improved by the process we are proposing,” said Task Force member Steve Souder. “Communications is our middle name.”

Carter reported that the Task Force has fully and actively sought the participation of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee (C&B Committee) in its efforts to revise the governing documents over the past months. “Our hope was

that they would help us come up with a product that we could all be proud of,” said Carter.

Robin Tieman, who chairs the C&B Committee, told the EC, “Because of your concerns that we weren’t involved, we have become really involved.” She explained the committee started out meeting monthly, but since November, has met bimonthly. She says 10 members of the C&B Committee are actively involved and are comparing the documents side by side. “Our goal is to take the current C&B and ensure that the content and intent have been migrated from the C&B to the Policy Manual.”

“We listened, and we heard, and we reacted accordingly,” said Souder. “We’re currently at version 9 of the bylaws. You wanted to be very sure that as we transitioned from the C&B to the Policy Manual that nothing got dropped. There’s an excellent side-by-side comparison that will show you that we’ve been tracking this very closely. Another thing that we heard was that there needed to be checks and balances. That’s well documented.”

To ensure a system of checks and balances, the new structure sets up an Executive Council separate from the Board of Directors. When regional representatives are elected by fellow Council members to the Board, they must relinquish their Council seat. And the Chapter selects their replacement to serve on the Council.

The Task Force explained how the regional representatives will be selected, how vacancies will be filled, how removals will take place if necessary and what the expectations of service will be for the new representatives. They explained that the Expectations document is extremely important, saying, “That’s what it’s all about. This is the standard to which they will be held.”

The Task Force also clarified the EC’s future role. The EC will continue to “bring the vision, bring the direction.”

In subsequent discussion, EC members expressed concern that the Chapters and individual members would no longer have as great a voice in the running of the

association. “The Texas Chapter is very concerned about the loss of representation,” said Bill Keller.

Regional representative accountability was the other concern voiced by some EC members, including Past President Wanda McCarley, who asked, “How do you make sure that there’s accountability for getting the perspective of your entire region, not just from a single agency or chapter?”

“I expect that your representative would represent you, but there’s nothing to prevent you from lobbying the group. These modes of communication don’t need to change,” said Michael Mangini. He explained that the Expectations document requires the representatives to listen to the Chapters in their region and bring back information to those Chapters. (*Note:* Members can review the Expectations document on APCO’s Web site at [www.apcointl.org/governance](http://www.apcointl.org/governance).)

“I’m concerned that we’re going from five [the number of current Board officers] to three decision makers [the proposed voting membership of the new Executive Committee],” said Mary Messamore of Kansas.

Debbie Galbraith pointed out that the new Board of Directors would actually allow eight additional members to be involved in decision making and planning for the association.

After further discussion on Sunday, McCarley proposed that the Past President have a vote on the new Executive Committee. Messamore and Keller agreed with that suggestion. “This meets the criteria of checks and balances,” said Keller. “If this is there, I feel very comfortable in saying that Texas will come on board.”

The SGI Task Force members expressed their agreement. On the recommendation of the EC, Carter said the Task Force would modify the language of the governing documents to reflect the additional voting member of the Executive Committee and conduct further outreach to association members to inform them of the proposed changes and solicit additional input before the Quorum

## A 5-YEAR VIEW

Steve Proctor asked the EC to envision what APCO will look like five years from now. Below, you'll find some of the responses. APCO will:

- Have 20,000 members in the U.S.;
- Have a leadership role in NG9-1-1;
- Be #1 in addressing the issues facing public safety communications; and
- Be the single point of authority for all things PSAP related.

To accomplish these things, APCO will need to:

- Develop more training;
- Develop more standards;
- Recruit younger members; and
- Foster younger leadership.

meets in August at the 75th Annual APCO Conference & Exposition in Las Vegas.

Carter encourages all members to let the SGI Task Force know if they have questions or concerns. "Open and honest communications is appreciated," he said

~KERI LOSAVIO is editor of *Public Safety Communications*. Contact her at [losaviok@apcointl.org](mailto:losaviok@apcointl.org).

### STANDARDS

## Alarm Monitoring Companies & PSAPs

### Part 2, the Holy Grail: Implementation Recommendations for a New Data Exchange

Last month, part 1 of this article introduced the new External Alarm Interface Exchange American National Standard (ANS)—which was officially adopted on Jan. 26—and addressed the benefits of and background and reasoning behind this new standard. APCO International's announcement of the adoption was followed by a flurry of media releases, articles and interviews of subject matter experts by magazines and Web sites focused on public safety. A few sites gave readers the opportunity to provide feedback, and some interesting comments have been posted about this standard. Although the majority of comments are supportive, a few concluded that the standard is not for them. Coming to such a conclusion is perfectly OK because the standard is voluntary, but

this conclusion is premature if you have not read the standard. Everyone can, and should, read it at [www.apcointl.org/new/commcenter911/APCOstandards.php](http://www.apcointl.org/new/commcenter911/APCOstandards.php).

**Why the hype?** When APCO and the Central Station Alarm Association (CSAA) first announced their partnership in 2005, CSAA Executive Director Steve Doyle said, "This is truly a historic agreement that will very positively affect the alarm industry for decades to come; it is truly the 'Holy Grail' of communications between the alarm industry and the PSAPs."

Doyle emphasized this project's importance, and the new standard itself is a milestone in achieving what the alarm industry and PSAPs have wanted for a long time. During 2005, Doyle also said that he expects the standard to reduce the amount of time it takes emergency operators to receive alarm information and the possibility of the wrong information being shared. He estimated that it takes from three to five minutes for an operator to read alarm information to a calltaker. Now, under this standard, it will take seconds to transmit information.

*A non-technical summary:*

1. This standard will decrease the cost of implementing exchanges because all CAD software providers should use the standard to build the software as an additional module to their CAD system. PSAPs would only purchase software that provides this function-

ality as an enhancement for their current system. This will increase interoperability and decrease the need to have a dozen different interfaces to communicate with a dozen different alarm companies. It will also help PSAPs realize that if the software complies with the standard, it is more efficient for their operation and interoperable, and can easily be updated.

2. The standard will allow calltakers to answer calls faster and not worry about alarm calls because events will now appear in the radio operator's CAD system.
3. The standard is a result of what many PSAPs have been requesting for years. It creates technology to meet PSAP needs and understands how PSAPs will be positively affected. This standard is being proactive with an innovative idea and directly involved PSAPs in the development.

**Implementation recommendations & advisories:** Many of these recommendations or advisories are taken from the published standard. Further clarification and commentary have been provided when necessary.

1) *Rules and procedures by which alarm monitoring companies may be required either by policy or local ordinance(s) to attempt contact with someone at the alarm site prior to the delivery of an electronic alarm exchange to the PSAP will not change and the process is unaffected by this standard.* The alarm monitoring company will continue to abide by its own standard operating procedures and policies and procedures established by local or state law. *Example:* The alarm monitoring company receives a notice of a burglar alarm, and the operator realizes that the alarm's address is in Virginia, which requires alarm companies to attempt to contact someone at the site before notifying the PSAP. This procedure, which has been instrumental in reducing the number of false alarms, will not change because of the new ANS. In August 2008, Vector Security received 64,000 signals from alarm holders' equipment

in Richmond, Va., that required action by the alarm operator. After verifying each alarm's validity, only 215 alarm notifications were sent to the PSAP.

2) *Implementation sites should consider including the following performance measures to focus project goals and to measure implementation success:*

- a. *Number of telephone calls from alarm monitoring companies to the PSAP (Is there a reduction?)*
- b. *Overall processing time for alarm-based calls-for-service (Is there a reduction?)*
- c. *Number of errors in delivery and processing of alarm and calls-for-service by eliminating voice delivery and PSAP calltaker CAD re-entry (Has the number decreased?)*
- d. *Progress toward a standard for interfaces between alarm monitoring companies and PSAPs to reduce cross-agency and cross-provider data exchange development time and cost (Any measurable savings of time and cost?)*

These goals and measures are self explanatory. The Virginia pilot sites experienced a positive reduction in every category.

3) *Alarms and requests for service will be transmitted to PSAPs per normal procedures, even when a catastrophic event (e.g., hurricane) or mass alarming event (e.g., wind or electrical storm) makes a PSAP choose not to respond. This places the PSAP in control of filtering requests and provides for historical information in its CAD or front-end processing engine.* The PSAP must be in control at all times. Some PSAPs have procedures that negate dispatching responders to specific alarm types when the locality is experiencing catastrophic weather or a large-scale emergency. CAD providers could supply a feature that could be activated by the 9-1-1 supervisor to reject specific alarm types until a situation passes. When this feature is activated, the alarm company operator would automatically receive a response saying that the PSAP is not accepting these alarm calls for a specific reason. This is no different than when an alarm company operator calls and is told this by a calltaker. *Remember:* Using this feature and the decision to have it in the CAD system is up to the PSAP director or manager.

4) *The Alarm Interface Exchange includes three primary message types:*

- a. *New Alarm event.* The alarm company's transmission of a new alarm to the PSAP.
- b. *PSAP's response to a new alarm event.* This is the CAD's acknowledgement to the alarm company telling the operator that the new alarm event has been turned into a call for service and includes the CAD or incident number, or that the new alarm event is being rejected and why.
- c. *Update messages initiated by either entity to the other that provide additional information about the alarm event.* This feature allows the alarm company operator and PSAP to send updates. The operator may have additional information about a key-holder response, someone on the premises who doesn't know the code or other valuable information first responders need. This information will appear as call-for-service updates for the PSAP radio operator.

The PSAP can likewise send the alarm company operators updates. The CAD system can be modified to send updates automatically to first responders. Update examples

## SILENT KEY

### Remembering APCO's 47th President



On Feb. 7, 2009, Henry Lee Crutcher passed away at age 82. A native of Missouri, Crutcher moved to Sacramento, Calif., in 1953, and his involvement with APCO began in 1962. For more than 40 years, he worked on public safety communications issues on both local and national levels, gaining professional experience in federal and local governments, as well as private companies. He was communications director for Yolo County, Calif., for eight years before joining the State of California Department of Parks and Recreation to work on its communications system.

According to friend and colleague Art McDole, "[Crutcher] was one of the first to put in low-band radio systems in the parks way back when. It worked, and he got the parks interested in having a good radio system."

Crutcher served as president of the Northern California APCO Chapter for two terms, in 1966 and 1975. "He was very dedicated [to APCO] as you can imagine," says McDole. "I liked him right

off. He was always ready to take on a new job and work and do what he needed to do to get things done. He was well liked by his peers and respected nationally."

On Aug. 21, 1980, Crutcher was sworn in as association president. In his very first presidential APCO BULLETIN column, he addressed the changing industry, a topic that still resonates with APCO members. "To be elected President of APCO is a great honor," he said, "I believe APCO is an ... extremely necessary organization. ... With continued support and dedicated activity by you, the members of APCO, we can continue to upgrade our respective positions and have a positive effect in the profession of public safety communications. Individually and collectively, we can meet the challenge to change and continue to look for new horizons."

"Other than the professional things," says McDole, "what I remember the most was what a fun time we had at APCO meetings when he would sit down at the piano. ... He was good at sitting down and whacking out a tune. [He was] one of those kind of guys that you just enjoyed. He will be missed by those who knew him intimately."

Crutcher is survived by his daughter, three sons, eight grandchildren and eight great-grandchildren.

from the PSAP include “units 123 and 456 dispatched at 1952 hours,” “unit 123 arrived on the scene at 1955 hours” and “units have cleared from the event and could find nothing wrong” etc.

*This standard does not include any other message type within the scope of this project. For example, alarm operators and PSAP members cannot send each other a message unless there is an active event. All messages that reference an active event must be formulated using the Update message type.* This means the standard is not designed to support useless chatter between an alarm company and a PSAP. There must be an active event that should be referenced via an update message.

5) *Alarm monitoring companies will not take ownership of indicating high-risk or target locations since no standard criteria of what constitutes a high-risk or target property currently exists. It is believed that most PSAPs and CAD systems will provide such functionality and ownership. Asking alarm monitoring companies to add this information could cause a conflict of interest and would likely create confusion.* Simply put, information about a high-risk or target location should be tracked by the PSAP. *Example:* If there’s a retirement community that houses 100 patients in the jurisdiction, the fact that the location is a high life hazard should be in the PSAP’s CAD system.

6) *Some PSAPs may phase in functionality associated with automated alarm monitoring company exchanges into their CAD or front-end interface. For instance, the PSAP may initially wish to review every exchange and require calltaker ‘acceptance’ before CAD downloading and then begin to support automatic acceptance for certain types of alarms over time as trust and comfort builds.* Note: *The process of calltaker acceptance was bypassed at both of the Virginia pilot sites and optimized to reduce response times to the maximum degree possible. The bypassing of the calltaker action during this pilot proved highly successful while meeting the requirements of both PSAPs.* This means

that the PSAP is in control and will decide how new alarm events appear in its operation.

The two Virginia PSAPs in the pilot program decided that all alarm calls would appear in the CAD’s pending call queue in front of the affected radio operator(s). Other PSAPs may want new alarm events to be reviewed by a calltaker and have the calltaker accept the event before it is sent to the radio operator. These are options that CAD providers must build into their systems, and a PSAP should make their desired operational method known to the provider during system design.

7) *NENA standards will be utilized for addressing since these standards are typically utilized by PSAPs and CADs.* Most PSAPs will find themselves in good shape regarding addressing standards after consideration of the level of effort that has gone into coordinating the build of the Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) with the LEC. But this will be a challenge for most alarm companies, which will need a PSAP representative’s assistance to understand the acceptable abbreviations.

8) *General implementation guidelines and suggestions:*

a. *Each participating alarm monitoring company should assign a liaison to coordinate implementation both internally and externally with the PSAP and the alarm monitoring software provider.*

Alarm companies will face a learning curve when massaging the data in their databases to conform to the new standard. There’s no getting around this requirement. This liaison will work with the PSAP liaison, the software provider and their company to provide training and guidance.

b. *Each participating PSAP should assign a liaison to coordinate implementation both internally and externally with the alarm monitoring company and the PSAP’s CAD system provider.*

Typically, this may be someone, such as the E9-1-1 coordinator or the CAD administrator, who

regularly works with LECs.

c. *Response plans that dictate which emergency services will respond to an event and how many first responders will respond to an event are business decisions of the PSAP and not within the scope of this standard.*

*Example:* Richmond, Va., dispatches a minimum fire assignment of four quints, one rescue and a battalion chief to all general fire alarms. York County, Va., sends one engine. Different response plans are decided by each PSAP and are not mandated by the standard.

d. *Once an exchange has been developed end to end by the CAD provider and the alarm monitoring software provider and is ready for testing, it is recommended that the alarm monitoring company trigger an address validation request for each alarm address within the PSAP’s jurisdiction. This will facilitate the identification of problem addresses that need to be massaged or reassigned to a different PSAP.* Problem addresses must be identified before implementation, not after. The alarm monitoring company’s software provider will supply a means for the operator to transmit an address-validation-only request to the PSAP CAD system for all alarm sites in that jurisdiction.

For the two Virginia PSAPs, roughly 95% of all alarm site addresses validated on the first attempt. The remaining 5% were rejected by the CAD. After follow-up by both liaisons, the issue surrounding the 5% failure was resolved by having the PSAP’s coordinator identify the problem with an address and report those findings back to the alarm monitoring company for correction.

e. *Alarm monitoring companies should implement a procedure in which the address for a new alarm subscriber is passed through the address validation process with the PSAP at the time that the alarm*

subscription is added to the alarm monitoring company's database. The alarm monitoring company's software provider must provide this capability. As new alarm subscribers are signed up, this step will help the company verify the alarm location or if further investigation is needed from the PSAP liaison.

- f. *Alarm monitoring companies must implement a procedure to call the PSAP if an acknowledgement is not returned from the PSAP within "x" number of seconds. This is a policy decision that should be established prior to the implementation of any new exchanges between an alarm monitoring company and a PSAP. This procedure is a safeguard should a transmission failure occur between the alarm company and the PSAP. Many events could cause such a failure, including a CAD malfunction or a network outage. The procedure will alert the alarm company operator that the PSAP's CAD hasn't responded and that the operator should call the PSAP to deliver the alarm notification.*
- g. *Whenever possible, alarm monitoring companies should include the latitude and longitude of the alarm site address in their alarm customer database so that the geo-coordinates are included in the electronic exchange delivery. CAD providers should configure the CAD systems to validate an address based on the following order:*
- i. *By street address if a street address is present*
  - ii. *By geo-coordinates if geo-coordinates are present, and if no street address is present or if the street address cannot be validated*
  - iii. *By intersection if two cross-streets are provided, and if no street address is present and no geo-coordinates are present. This should be a rare situation. A CAD system may reject an address transmitted by the alarm company if it finds multiple possi-*

ble matches. If accurate geo-coordinates are transmitted with the alarm event data, the CAD should be able to lock in the address.

- h. *The PSAP and the alarm monitoring company will decide on the event types that will be transmitted. A standard list of event types is provided in the ANS.*

Because the pilot alarm monitoring company was also a representative of CSAA, the alarm types identified within the standard should suffice for any exchange implemented based on the standard. The PSAP and the alarm company must agree that they will use those alarm types. It's recognized that a new alarm type may evolve, in which case the alarm company and the PSAP must mutually agree on its use.

The standard allows the use of additional alarm types. However, it is requested that any alarm type used beyond those listed in the enumeration list be reported to the APCO Data Transfer Committee Chair for inclusion in the standard's next release.

- i. *The PSAP will work with the CAD system provider to decide how each data element sent by the alarm company will be mapped to the call-for-service record. The alarm company will transmit large amounts of data about the new alarm event. There are separate fields for building name or number, room number, directions to the location, organization name, etc. During the design phase, the PSAP representative who is authorized to make decisions will need to work with the CAD provider to decide where each piece of information fits into the call-for-service record so that the radio operator can easily read and broadcast the information.*

9) *The following alarm or request-for-service exchange rejection reasons are recommended: If the CAD system rejects a new alarm event, the reason sent back to the alarm company should fall*

under one of the following:

- a. *Closed in CAD (for supplemental exchanges)*
- b. *Invalid address (address data and/or geographic coordinates do not reconcile between systems)*
- c. *Invalid data (exchange contains erroneous data and/or does not contain required field elements). Reject responses from the PSAP should include the specific data element in error and the reason in detail why that data element is being rejected as invalid. Examples may include but are not limited to the following:*
  - i. *The alarm event type text is missing or not a valid type of alarm. Obviously, a PSAP cannot dispatch a call using a proper response plan if the type of call is unknown.*
  - ii. *The call to premises text field is missing and is a mandatory field. The PSAP should decide if this information is required and to reject a call if the information is not present.*
  - iii. *The monitoring alarm company event number is missing and is a mandatory field. For the standard to work, this field is the common reference point during exchanges and additional exchanges between the alarm company and the PSAP, and must be present.*
  - iv. *The activity category text field is missing or not valid. The category should specify alarm type, address validation request, etc. The PSAP cannot make assumptions.*
  - v. *The alarm monitoring company organization name is missing and is a mandatory field.*
  - vi. *The alarm monitoring company call back telephone number is missing or not 10 digits and it is a mandatory field.*
- d. *Incorrect jurisdiction (customer/location not covered by receiving PSAP). It is not the responsibility of the PSAP to identify the correct jurisdiction.*

- e. *Unauthorized customer—Exceeded (for situations when business rules apply where the event location has exceeded the number of false alarms).* If the PSAP tracks alarm history for each address and all premises associated with each address, the PSAP may choose to reject the alarm event when the number of false alarms has exceeded the threshold described by local ordinance.
- f. *Unauthorized customer—No permit (for situations when business rules apply where the jurisdiction maintains an alarm permit registry, but no alarm permit can be found in the registry for the event location).* It is up to the PSAP whether to respond to an alarm event if no permit for the alarm location is found.
- g. *Diverted (where PSAP is not accepting certain alarm types, and/or responding to certain locations, due to a catastrophic event or other PSAP-driven reason).*

10) *Alarms triggered based on radio frequency identifier data (RFID) elements will require additional definition and research. These types of alarms are not considered within the scope of the Information Exchange Package (IEP) and ANS.*

11) *Critical note for software developers: Once the initial new alarm record is sent by the alarm monitoring company, all subsequent update transmissions to the PSAP must utilize the element name <StatusDescriptionText>.*

Most PSAPs do not want certain fields, such as the address field, updated automatically by an external source. Automatic address updates could trigger a different response plan. The standard has provided a single thread for all updates sent to the CAD system. It is expected that the CAD system will add the update to the call for service as an additional comment or note that will be seen by the radio operator. It is the radio operator's responsibility to review these comments and process the update accordingly. Examples of an update include:

- a. *A request to cancel the event;*
- b. *An estimated time of arrival (ETA) for the key holder;*
- c. *An individual on the premises of the alarm site who has been contacted, but does not know the proper pass code;*
- d. *A change to one or more data elements originally sent as a component within the new call event; and*
- e. *Other noteworthy information that may be important to the first responders.*

Upon receipt of any update, the action(s) taken by the PSAP is a PSAP decision. *Example:* Some PSAPs have a policy to not cancel a response depending on the alarm type; whereas, the first responders may be cancelled for other alarm types.

12) *The PSAP may also use the update feature to notify the alarm company of note worthy information relevant to the alarm event. Examples include:*

- a. *Notification that units have been dispatched.* This notification may contain first responders' actual unit numbers.
- b. *Notification that first responders have arrived on scene.*
- c. *Notification of the situation found by the first responders, such as an open door.*
- d. *Notification that the first responders have cleared from the scene and the disposition of the event such as "actual incident," "no problem found," "alarm triggered by high winds," etc.*

The information updated by the PSAP to the alarm company is a PSAP decision.

13) *Although telematics data transmission is not a primary purpose of this exchange, the exchange can support some basic telematics data.* The technical field mapping contained within the standard supports many of the fields used by telematics providers. However, the primary focus of the new standard is the information exchange between alarm monitoring companies and PSAPs. Telematics data exchanges will be examined and considered for a future revision to the standard.

**Next steps & agency involvement:**

APCO is presently engaged in an outreach program to make PSAPs, CAD providers and alarm monitoring companies and their software providers aware of the standard. APCO cannot do this alone and depends on its partnership with the IJIS Institute, the CSAA and other organizations to spread the word. The Security Industry Advisory Coalition has also been helpful.

Papers have been submitted to discuss this project in detail at the 2009 APCO conference in Las Vegas. APCO staff members are also available to attend chapter and regional meetings to discuss the standard. Agencies do not need to rush to adhere to the new standard.

There will be a period of several months during which the interest level of each participating segment needs to be identified and assessed. At least 15 PSAPs, four CAD providers, two alarm monitoring company software providers and three alarm monitoring companies had already expressed their interest before the standard was even adopted. Among the PSAPs, a few are very large, and the remaining are medium in size. The four CAD providers support hundreds of PSAPs each, and the two alarm monitoring company software providers are two of the six primary providers. Finally, the three alarm monitoring companies are three of the largest. This is a positive sign that all of these future participants understand the new standard and the benefits of its implementation.

APCO's Data Transfer Committee will track the overall interest of each domain and can help facilitate discussions. Interested agencies should e-mail APCO's Data Transfer Committee chair at [bill.hobgood@richmondgov.com](mailto:bill.hobgood@richmondgov.com) and copy APCO staff at [apcostandards@apco911.org](mailto:apcostandards@apco911.org).

Finally, it's important to note that the Virginia pilot and the new standard's development would never have taken place without a collaborative effort. The team consisted of the two Virginia PSAPs, the CSAA representative alarm company, the software company that wrote the alarm monitoring software and two

CAD providers. This team was focused on achieving an efficient and effective success for both public safety and the alarm industry by using communication, cooperation and collaboration. Their participation as a team has completed a historic milestone for both sectors.

~**BILL HOBGOOD** is the public safety team project manager and interim application solutions division manager for the City of Richmond Department of Information Technology. He serves on several APCO committees and chairs the Data Transfer Committee. He was the recipient of APCO's 2007 Technologist of the Year Award. Contact him at [bill.hobgood@richmondgov.com](mailto:bill.hobgood@richmondgov.com).

## MEMBERSHIP SERVICES

### Your Chapter's Future

APCO International's chapters are critical to its success. They were chartered to continue our mission at state and regional levels and grow membership. Depending on how long you've been an APCO member, you may have witnessed your chapter grow from a few people meeting twice a year into a strong organization that works to enact state legislation. What will your chapter look like in five or 10 years? *Some thoughts for future growth:*

**Provide valuable opportunities:** What types of activities will your chapter offer its members regionally and the industry in the future? Through outreach at training sessions and conferences, your chapter's impact could be immense. What type of networking will be happening? Is this where you'll find your next great employee or boss? Will your chapter march on the steps of your state's capitol to improve laws affecting public safety communications? Will your chapter's influence increase the esteem of public safety communications professionals and career opportunities and benefits? Can you imagine your local chapter being so busy that your leadership has to hire a paid staff to manage it?

**Run it like a business:** Develop a business plan. Running your chapter like a business may sound offensive at first, but many chapters can take the funds they receive and reinvest them in the industry through scholarships and training for members, and effecting legisla-

## DEADLINE APPROACHING FOR SCHOLARSHIP OPS

**Applications are currently being accepted for the Silent Key and Commercial Advisory Committee Scholarship Award programs. The deadline is May 1, and award notifications will be made by July 1.**

~**DOWNLOAD** an application at [www.apcointl.com/institute/forms\\_information.htm](http://www.apcointl.com/institute/forms_information.htm) or contact the APCO Institute at 888/272-6911.

tion. It takes planning to cover the costs of activities and the organization's philanthropic goals. The U.S. Small Business Administration's Web site ([www.sba.gov/smallbusinessplanner](http://www.sba.gov/smallbusinessplanner)) is a good resource for chapters. Chapter leaders should take advantage of tools and free training to enhance their knowledge and skills for managing the business side.

**Review leadership roles:** When planning for the future, carefully consider the chapter's leadership positions. Are the traditional titles (e.g., president, vice president, secretary and treasurer) working? What time commitment comes with these positions—four, five, six years? Consider changing the titles to Director of Membership, Director of Finance & Budget, Director of Training or Director of Whatever-Is-Important-to-Your-Chapter.

What if the time commitment was a two-year term with the opportunity to re-up or spend the second year mentoring a replacement? As with most volunteer organizations, you don't have to worry about mentoring yourself out of a job. There's always a need.

As chapters grow and become stronger and more diverse, imagine the possibilities.

~**ANN RUSSO**, Member Services Manager

## HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

### FCC History

The FCC, which is the government agency that regulates radio, television, wire, satellite and cable communications, was established by the passing of the 1934 Communications Act. This act charged the FCC with regulating interstate and international wireless transmissions. Today, it has an impact on every communications medium used by public safety. But what led up to this historic legislation?

We all know that Marconi is considered the father of radio. In the 19th cen-

tury, he was a leading player, beginning his endeavors with wireless aboard ships. Early radio stations broadcast across the bandwidth available at the time, and because there weren't many wireless stations, regulation wasn't important. There weren't many instruments designed to measure the variables, let alone a system to regulate.

In the 10 years after the Marconi wireless apparatus's installation, many ships were outfitted with the equipment, including the ill-fated Titanic. After the Titanic sank, an international commission decreed that all ships at sea should have two wireless operators, so one could be on duty at all times. The U.S. followed this course with the passage of the 1912 Radio Act. All regulations concerning wireless were administered by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

It was another 10 years before radio began providing entertainment. Station KDKA began operation in Pittsburgh in 1921, followed by other major radio stations across the nation. They offered music, news and sports, all sponsored by companies. On July 3, 1926, the U.S. attorney general decided there was no authorization under the 1912 radio act to regulate these broadcast stations. This led to the formation of the Federal Radio Commission on Feb. 3, 1927. W.H.G. Bullard was its first commissioner, and the commission spent most of its time sorting out broadcaster frequencies. Until 1934, the Commerce Department regulated radio communications.

During this time, police radio was in its infancy. Imagine trying to obtain a station license when the radio commission was regulating radio broadcasts.

This history and much more can be found on [www.fcc.gov/omd/history](http://www.fcc.gov/omd/history).

~**RICHARD RYBICKI**, Historical Committee Chair

**||PSC||**