February 28, 2006
SIEC Full Council Meeting Report
11am-3pm – Office of Justice Assistance

Members Present- David Spenner, David Steingraber, Mindy Allen, Doug Oitzinger, Sue
Riseling, David Collins, Brian Rahn, Tom Czaja, Neil Cameron

Observers- Lara Kenny, Robbie Barton, Carl Guse, Randy Meier

11:00- Meeting began with a quorum present. Copies of the minutes from the last
meeting were unavailable and will be sent out to the Council for review at a later date.

11:05- Office of Justice Assistance's Greg Engle gave a presentation on the 2006
Funding Investment Plan and Funding Justifications.

In previous years, Homeland Security money was dispersed on a formula. Once the
allocation was announced, a plan was built around the allocation. However, in 2006
Homeland Security money will be distributed based on a plan that will be submitted prior
to the allocation being announced. The plan for each state will then be reviewed by the
federal government in a semi-competitive process. The plan is now submitted but it is
unknown how the review process will take place. A funding decision is expected in June
of 2006

Wisconsin's plan involved a 16 member planning group, consisting of 8 subgroups. Each
group was responsible for identifying strengths and weaknesses in Wisconsin's
Homeland Security Effort and developing a high level planning document in the specialty
of each subgroup.

A total request of 34 million dollars has been submitted to the federal government

Carl Guse, Randy Meier and Gale Sorum were all heavily involved in the Interoperability
initiative

→ Specific Proposals for Interoperability in 2006
- Total request for 2006- 12 million dollars
- Major short term goal is ensuring that the entire state has access to mutual aid
  channels. A total of 6.5 million for 2006 has been requested for this purpose.
  This money will, in general, be used for the software and hardware necessary
  for the MARC channels.
- Reasonable estimate of the total cost of the MARC channels is approximately
  14 million.
- 7.5 million dollars remain in unallocated interoperability funds from 2005,
  these remaining funds will go towards getting these channels up and running.
- Remainder of interoperability funds- 5 million for planning and enhancing of
  the statewide VHF trunking system. Roughly 500k remaining for
  interoperability training and exercising.

A current estimate of the radios in Wisconsin- 20% are in good shape, 20% are in definite need of replacement, 60% require reprogramming.

Grant Funding may require a 25% match

A question was raised to what level of P25 the SIEC was requiring. No formal vote was taken although the group appeared to be in consensus that P25 as defined by the SIEC meant the top level of P25 operability. Specifically, any radio, regardless of vendor, will be able to talk to one another in a digital format.

12:15- Working Lunch

Technical Subcommittee Preliminary Plan

    Discussion- It is a working document
    - Concern is that 95% coverage isn't good enough
    - Issue of Road coverage vs. Building Coverage in different areas of state- this is problematic because different areas have different needs
    - Does state plan hamstring people because it takes their frequencies when they join
        o If locals want state grants, assumption is that the state plan trumps the local plan

Motion was made to accept report from the Technical Subcommittee by David Collins, seconded by Tom Czaja. This report was identified as the January 12 Draft Plans for Continuous Interoperability, Technical Section, Pages 13-17 and Attachments _____.

An issue was raised about the number of channels

Preliminary Approval of report from Technical Subcommittee
    - If approved, a text document will be provided at the next meeting to discuss details including number of channels
    - Clarification of Drafting Process- Vote, Draft, Vote on Final Plan
    - The final plan will be:
        o Will be basis for funding
        o Will be basis for statewide engineering
        o Will be basis for process
    - Need direction, the details can be tweaked at a later time

Discussion on the necessity to vote on the whole document or to instead piecemeal it.

Functional specification excluded from adoption vote today

As there was no indication of anyone wishing to be on record voting against the plan, Chair Steingraber noted for the record that the preliminary plan was approved by all participating members.

Polished Text Document will be presented at the next meeting

Operational Subcommittee Report-

Chief Sue Riseling reported for the Operational Subcommittee
- Handout- "SIEC Op and Business Subcommittee"
- Committee wrote out what the current status of Wisconsin is, then tried to come up with long and short term goals.
- Question to Group
  o Does anyone know of any state SOPs that are multi-jurisdictional, multi-hazard?

March 13- Operations Subcommittee will meet again to do short and long term goals. They will try and create a PowerPoint for review. Efforts will be added to what was adopted at today's meeting

Operational Subcommittee asked the SIEC to review and comment on the operational subcommittee handout on State of Wisconsin interoperability status. Once approval of the council is given, the operations subcommittee will develop the short and long term goals for the State; Subcommittee doesn't want to work on "flawed assumptions"

    -Johnny needs to get this for his staff to review. Look at surveys and react to this document. Robbie will email the adopted plan to WEM.

If there are questions, a good reference is the "Operational Guide for the Interoperability Continuum Lessons Learned," for definitions used by the operational subcommittee in their document

All the subcommittees have struggled with how to deal with "regional" language
- Had a hard time defining regions because changes can be based on incident, needed response etc.
- Sue suggested that at some point, SIEC adopted a definition of "region" so that SOPs work
- Dave asked if using state-wide SOPs solved that problem
- Addresses issue of what type of council the SIEC is for governance purpose and their ability to make SOPs statewide
- Mayor Oitzinger advocated the use of County EMs/Statewide EM because they are already in place → utilize the tools that already exist, even if our goals/plans exceed existing purposes/uses.
- Subcommittee will discuss more at length using the EM SOPs and bring back discussion to the SIEC
-

NIMS Discussion- Is there any good SOPs in NIMS?
- Can apply NIMS but will be problematic because the SIEC cannot legislate

- Also a problem due to home-rule
- Technical subcommittee, Carl will pull any information he can on the states or feds and what they want to see for radio use. He will send out the information prior to the March 13 Operational subcommittee meeting.

Outreach Subcommittee Report- Skipped for today
Outreach Subcommittee Discussion

- The Outreach subcommittee is not doing the "usage" part of the SAFECOM continuum. Gale wrote document with his interpretations, this may have led to confusion.
- Doug said the subcommittee sees outreach as "public education"; usage isn't the term they use or a task they think they are responsible for.
- There is a need to clarify who is responsible for "usage"

SIEC Action Item- Council agreed that the Operational Subcommittee takes "usage" back.

Sue asked Doug to work with the operations subcommittee to summarize what outreach does
- Doug replied, he, Robbie and Johnnie are working on language that will outline the duties of the outreach subcommittee

Dave Steingraber suggested that the SIEC think of the Outreach subcommittee as strategy, Operations and Technical as plan creation, and outreach is the public promotion/education of the plan.

Next Meeting- Monday April 10, 11am-2pm at the Office of Justice Assistance