Full Body SIEC Meeting Notes- April 28, 2005

Members Present- Melinda Allen, EMS Project Manager, Neil Cameron, Appleton Fire Chief, David Collins, Superintendent- State Patrol, Thomas Czaja- Fox Point Chief of Police, Ann Hraychuck, Polk County Sheriff, Ben Schliesman, Kenosha County EM Director, Johnnie Smith, Director of Emergency Management, David Spenner, Racine Chief of Police, David Steingraber, Executive Director- Office of Justice Assistance, Randy Stark, Department of Natural Resources, Matt Miszewski, CIO, DET

Guests- Carl Guse, State of Wisconsin Frequency Coordinator, Gale Sorum, Office of Justice Assistance Interoperability Consultant, Lara Kenny, Office of Justice Assistance, Robbie Barton, Office of Justice Assistance

Committee Chair David Steingraber began meeting with introductions and review of committee goals, as discussed in the last meeting.

The State of Wisconsin is driving towards an acceptable level of interoperability. Our focus is one the three areas of interoperability- Tactical, Regional Interoperability and Disaster Interoperability. Focus should also be on addressing the operational policy and business side of interoperability.

A Tentative Proposal was put forth by David Steingraber to divide the Committee into three (3) subcommittee areas.

Operational & Business- Would deal with procedures, business and training requirements, focus would be on active duty personnel using equipment.
Technical- Would deal with the engineering specifications of systems and other technical issues regarding interoperability.
Outreach- Focus would be on keeping citizens of state informed about current level of interoperability and promoting understanding of the decisions of the SIEC. Will also develop a baseline of understanding that everyone should have for each one of these groups.

Open Discussion about the Proposal Followed. Chief Cameron voiced a concern over the possibility of too much segmentation by dividing the committee up. How will we deal with keeping a consistent message and ensuring that the appropriate information is conveyed? Committee consensus was that limiting the subcommittees to three in number would limit possibility of segmentation; Outreach committee will develop talking points for each committee and ensure that a consistent message is being delivered. Committee also decided by consensus that meeting regularly will aid in keeping the full body informed.

The proposal was passed, without objection, to create three advisory subcommittee bodies.

Subcommittee Members
Outreach- Johnnie Smith, Ann Hraychuck, Douglas Oitzinger, Robbie Barton

Technical- David Collins, Thomas Czaja, Matt Miszewski, Randy Stark, Gale Sorum Carl Guse

Operations- Sue Riesling, David Spenner, Ben Schliesman, Melinda Allen, Neil Cameron

TBD- Kurt Heuer

A question was raised about the availability of resources and timelines for the subcommittees. Chair Steingraber said that while it has not been budgeted for, some resources do exist for the committees should they need them. Matt Miszewski and Johnnie Smith offered a PIO for the outreach committee to use. Grant Funding is intended to be used for the funding of systems in response to the pre-engineered standards created by the committee.

Chief Cameron proposed creating a matrix of various interoperability groups operation within the state to understand what is already being addressed. The idea was well received but no formal vote was taken.

Subcommittees break into their respective groups. During breakout sessions they are to identify leadership, scope of their work, additional membership, and get an idea of a work plan.

Subcommittee Notes Follow This Document

Gale presented on Interim Standards
Used document created at NGA workshop in Atlanta Chairmen Steingraber passed out at introduction. Graph of range of possibilities for actions.

Basis for Interim Inter-Op Radio Standards Document
1.0 Standards based on Safecom, people are aware of these standards; they are not new.
2.0 Standards deal predominately with radios, per the governor's instructions.
3.01 Examples are mutual aid and marks.
3.02 State standard is P 25.
3.03 Safecom ACUI box should only be used as a last resort (Band-Aid); attempt to keep these boxes out of the process.
4.0 Gale can generate standard if council wants it. It is 300 pages of technical information so he did not think it would be useful.
4.011 Phase I standards were released, hardware is being built to these standards.
4.012 Clarifications made by SEC that may help get Phase II going.
4.013 Not an issue now. Gale can give some information or speak about MESA if committee so desires.

5.02 Gale showed the graph continuum document again and said that it is possible to do things that increase interoperability without spending a lot of money. He clarified that boundary jurisdiction means agencies.
6.02 Compliant means compliant. Compatible and Upgradeable means can be compliant if spend more money and add extra stuff to the system.
6.021 Gale warned council to be careful of spending money to buy basic system with intention of adding later because could run out of funds before add enough to be compliant. That happened to California and Arizona when they tried to do this. Ben Schliesman asked why not just make it mandatory compliant? The answer is that it is potentially very expensive to do that. It could be up to $500/piece for equipment, especially when Phase II is instituted.
6.03 A discussion ensued about wording: "should" v "must." Matt pointed out that the council can use the grant to clarify and create what the council wants. Gale said that if use must wording the result is potentially limiting vendors that can be used. The question was raised of who determines the standards and technical determinations of what fits must and what fits should. Chair Steingraber said can achieve consistency as grantor by using a review board for applications. He suggested using a matrix with the grants, if that is acceptable to the council. Matt pointed out that there are benefits for using relative grants. The council decided that they are comfortable with the document as is, if the process they create for awarding grants is defensible. Johnnie asked then if the council's interpretation of Safecom is defensible. Does this document meet Safecom standards? There was discussion about whether to use Safecom standards, since there are not, in Gales' opinion, major differences between Safecom and his document. The council ultimately decided to add an annotation to the document to clarify the council's intent. It is the council's intent to reflect Safecom standards and Safecom should be relied upon for clarification, definition of standards, and compliance. Neil Cameron made a motion to add annotation and therefore accept Gale's document with annotation as the standard the council will use. Ben Schliesman seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously. The annotation reads as follows, "Adopt Safecom Interoperability Standards and related documentation as appropriate. This document, created by SIEC provides Interim guidance for immediate implementation "Gale pointed out that Safecom is not a single thing; it is a bunch of websites.

General Question Section
Gale will get out an email with a snapshot of the environment in which SIEC is operating. Council members are looking for some more information such as technical difficulties they may encounter.

Johnnie referred the council to an article Robbie had sent out before the meeting that was about why interoperability has historically not worked. The article is Listen and Learn: Overcoming Human Barriers to Interoperability. He said he thinks it is important for the council to pass the message on to locals that they should work together to get what they want from vendors. It is important to be

proactive, not reactive to what the vendors want to sell them. The article highlighted the issue of locals buying from different vendors and getting what the vendors want to sell them, not what will allow the locals to work together most effectively.

Future Meeting

Sub-Committee Chairs will try to set up meetings/conference call for mid-May so they can meet before the next SIEC council meeting.
Sub-Committees should submit names of sub-committee additions and consultants to OJA so it can be part of the official records. OJA will send out a letter of appreciation to the consulting member for their efforts.
Sub-Committee leadership will meet before next SIEC council meeting. The next SIEC council meeting will be at the end of May or in early June.
The 6 meetings/listening sessions to be held around the state will be held after the next SIEC council meeting and will be finished by the end of June.
Johnnie will meet with Jeff Alston of DMA to discuss some issues regarding technology and the operations of the National Guard. He is a potential sub-committee member.

A new state map was handed out by Carl Guse with the different types of operating systems used in the state. The map is not completely comprehensive, but a good summary of where interoperability stands. The map primarily shows the county-wide systems but the individual circles on the map are municipalities. Carl Guse clarified the map for the council.

Robbie will send an email with potential dates for the next SIEC council meeting and see what response to possible meeting dates is. A date for the next meeting will be determined by the council members' responses.

Outreach Subcommittee Notes

Leadership- Johnnie Smith, Chair
Ann Hraychuck, Co-Chair

Scope-Who are we going to address, inside and outside of the council, necessity is to keep the entire state informed, what avenues do we need to pursue to do this?

Target a Top Audience-
1. Council
2. Users of program- public safety, first responders, EM, Fire, EMS Sheriff, etc.
3. Local Leadership, i.e. - Elected Officials, state (state heads), county (board members, county executives), local (townships, cities, villages), and tribal leadership.
4. Identify statewide organizations for EMS, Fire, etc. as sources for info and points of dissemination

Goal- Convince these individuals of the importance of Interoperability

Potential Additional Members- Tentative- Mayor Douglas Oitzinger
OJA Staff, clerical and logistics
PIOs- WEM, DET (Other Various)
Other entities that want to participate?
Representative for first responders?

Tasks-

Initial Public Relations Announcement.
Announcement would coincide with the funding announcement. Would include who the State Interoperability Executive Committee is, committee structure, tasks, what we have identified as important goals, current standing of the committee. The announcement be limited to one-two pages.

Review "Strategic Plan."
Adapt plan to fit our need and decide what information is to be published in a more comprehensive document to be distributed to the 'Top Audience' as identified above.

Develop Website
Website would be patterned after existing SIEC websites, ideally would link off existing OJA webpage.

Regional Meetings
Informational listening sessions to let people throughout the state what the plan is (strategy, mission). Post-June? Add another northern area gap between Superior and Wausau (based on document from national level)

Timeline-

Get Information out to users before grants. Before a website is created announce to groups we are doing this: layout mission, timeline for funding, etc.

Website

Read Through/adjust information/bulletin (*Wisconsin's Public Safety Community is Working to Improve Wireless Communication*)

Announce Grants

Full SIEC Body Discussion about Outreach Subcommittee

The creation of a SIEC website would include a public portion but also an area just for council members. This area could include resource material etc. DET agreed to provide a web developer

Discussion was held about meetings around the state.

Meetings could potentially be held late summer. Chair Steingraber asked for criteria; how do we know when we are ready for state meetings?

Question of listening sessions to gather information versus meetings with detailed information regarding what the SIEC is doing.

How many meetings do we need to have to show that we reached out to everyone to listen? Group Consensus was six (6) meetings

Who do we target for these meetings; potential grantees, WEM regions, etc.?

Tom Czaja said he would try and get the South MATC lecture hall in Oak Creek to hold a listening session. The hall holds 150 people.

Timeline for Meetings

June, finish listening session by end of June, OJA will be responsible for locating places for these meetings.

Committee Members will try to locate electronic lists for audience, ex. Chiefs list, mayors, EM Directors

Email will be sent to get meeting information out on time.

Operations Subcommittee Notes, reported by Chief David Spenner

Leadership- Neil Cameron, Co-Chair (Fire)
Sue Riesling, Co-Chair (Law Enforcement)

Purpose: Foster Interoperability among jurisdictions thru standards for use and operations.

Leadership: -Neil Cameron and Sue Riesling to be the meeting Co-Chair planners
-Rotate Meeting Moderators who will be responsible for minutes.
-Consulting members not to chair
-Sustaining consulting member participation.
Additional Members: -NENA/APCO representative from Foxcom
-Volunteer Fire, Paul Gilbert
-National Guard, for operational purpose.

Scope of Work: -Training and Exercise will be defined by committee.
-SOPs are not limited to but include; 1)plain English in voice commands 2)consistency in unit identification and 3)dispatch centers need to come into standards.
-NIMS is driven in standards development.
-Need to think about data price, sending records, operational plans, etc in addition to voice. Presently, will look primarily at RF voice.
-Our standards must address Federal agency involvement.

Work Plan: -SIEC and regional committees that include locals for law enforcement, fire, ems, and dispatch centers.
-LESB and UTAE
-when grantees get funding-there will be training and standard expectations associated with funding.
-standards reach to funding for all local efforts in the other programs besides Homeland Security funding. (i.e. 911 grants, transportation grants, etc)

Next Steps:-Pull in the consulting members.
-Neil and Sue to call next meeting.
-12 month work plan to build effort by 5/1/06
-Need to here from WIJIS to see how it relates to SIEC
-Need to hear from technology committee if there are other solutions besides voice RF that should be.

Technology Subcommittee Notes

Leadership- David Collins, Chair

Mission-

Set inclusive process that allows technical standards to be set and also charged to address future needs and available technology.

NIMS, standards need to take those into account

Fire and EMS, Federal Agencies

Need an Ad-hoc committee for more technical people, bounce standards off them.

Work Plan-

Look at other states technical plans.

(Matt Miszewski has opportunity to do this in the near future). This could turn out to be difficult because sometimes states hold this information close to their vests.

Reach out Activity.

Continuation Concept

What is top concept so we can build from bottom to the top: put ideas on paper of what top is

Subcommittee Conference Call to be held Thursday, May 05, 2005 at 230pm