

## **California Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee (CALSIEC)**

**Meeting Notes, October 6, 2006**

**10:00 am -3:00 pm**

Governor's Office of Emergency Services  
Multi-Purpose Room, 3650 Schriever Ave. Mather, CA

**MEETING PURPOSE:** Quarterly convening of CALSIEC.

***NEXT MEETING:*** January 25, 2007-location to be determined. (***NOTE THIS DATE WILL LIKELY BE CHANGED!***)

### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. Technical Review Workgroup- new committee for CALSIEC to be established to streamline licensing.
2. OES staff will draft charter for the Technical Review Workgroup and procedures and work on them with committee volunteers Don Root, Gary David Grey, Pres Thomson (APCO North Advisor), Glen Savage (CDF); Glen Nash (DGS) ; Kevin Nida (Firescope South) and a rep from Firescope North. Don Root will also draft an outline to assist this effort. A standardized review will be put in place.
3. Nomenclature adhoc group will be a formal workgroup rather than adhoc CALSIEC.
4. Draft Governance Document to be amended in a number of areas as agreed on at the meeting and presented for adoption at next CALSIEC Mtg on 1-25-06.
5. CALSIEC State Communication Plan Workgroup will have a phone meeting on 11-8-06.
6. Find out what folks think about dividing by six Mutual Aid Regions of OES rather than the 4 Planning Areas now designated for the CALSIEC Planning Areas before making any changes.
7. 2007 Test Period to have one northern and one southern com regional system on full CALSIEC (others at the planning areas).
8. Put item (#7 above) on regional com systems in full CALSIEC and planning areas on the agenda of new Capitol/Bay Planning Area.
9. OES to bring up CALSIEC Planning Areas at MARAC.
10. Invite MARAC to Planning Area meetings to cross-educate.

### **EXECUTIVE GREETING**

Frank McCarton, Chief Deputy Director, Governor's Office of Emergency Services (OES)

Mr. McCarton thanked Robert Samaan, Deputy Director; Governor's Office of Homeland Security (OHS) for his efforts on regional interoperability via the Planning Areas and noted it is beginning to build significant momentum. He discussed key events in coming weeks such as the deployment of gateway units, and goals for next year's legislature.

## **CHAIR REPORT**

John Powell, CALSIEC Chair

John summarized key points from past meetings as well as goals for the future. He reminded everyone that the meetings notes are on the CALSIEC website and in today's packet.

Everyone is welcome to add any corrections. Some of his key points:

1. A change in channels to allow broadband overlay will depend on Regions 4 and 6.
2. The national broadband proposal: 700MHZ band siren call is available on the internet.
3. Funding appears to be working out.
4. There is a proposed to 30MHZ charted for auction which will be managed by Public Safety Commission and nationally built out to withstand natural disasters.
5. FCC meeting with Nextel will slow down timeline.
6. The President signed order to re-organize homeland security including: tech support stripped and moved with SAFECOM, but the standards will stay; is a new OE commissioner, but no director; all support will come from SAFECOM, such as the continuum; new bill can potentially be a benefit with everything under one office, but done quickly, includes lots of holes. For example, funding did not move with the re-organization; SAFECOM national base study has been completed with return results of greater than 30%. It was one of the best returns on a survey. The results were normalized throughout country and can be used immediately; emergency response (SAFECOM) group will not be broken down.
7. State planning guidelines, in FY 07 state plans must be submitted. The minimum requirement will be a strategic plan. California and bigger states will be more ambitious.
8. DHS procurement hit the street and was protested by at least 6 groups.
9. Searchgroup will be working with LA County; how can we expand this and development and other functions within the com unit to not only look at a unit but other pieces such as personnel?

Adoption of June 16, 2006 CALSIEC Meeting Notes

- The group adopted the notes with any minor changes to be provided in next week before post to website.

## **GROUND RULES**

Adam Sutkus, Center for Collaborative Policy

- Keep comments non-personal and stay focused on California benefits in communications and keep it factual based.
- Participant/visitor comments are welcome but the focus is upon members of the table.
- Please respect the time limit.

## **CALSIEC PLANNING AREAS- UPDATES**

Robert Samaan, Deputy Director Governor's Office of Homeland Security (OHS)  
 Bill DeCamp, FCC Region 6, RPC, 700 MHZ (Sr. Engineer, Dept of General Services (DGS))

Robert provided an overview of activities on Planning Areas over the past few months. His office has been very instrumental in setting up the meetings. He noted that CALSIEC Planning Areas are in process of being launched in the north, central valley and capitol bay areas. He also explained that CALSIEC member Ken Alvis who is active in starting the Central Valley Planning Area is looking at use of the Southern governance structure model.

Bill has also been very active in supporting CALSIEC Planning Area development and expressed concerns over common terms. He said Southern California is more sophisticated than Northern and Central California and there is the need to be speaking common terms. He also discussed operability is a problem within our own agencies. What are we doing with PRSPC that can change governance in Southern and Central California? There were different spins on the issues at the various Planning Area meetings to date. Hopefully everyone was able to mutually benefit.

## **NORTHERN PLANNING AREA**

Dennis Garton, Under sheriff, Tehama County

- First meeting, August 23, 2006, second meeting, September 29, 2006
- As a result of the last meetings, working group is now talking.
- Frequency is a big concern in the Northern area because there is just not enough for everyone.
- Per John Powell: Northern area is in a good position operating on VHF. However, it was clear more channels will have to be found. Other options such as IMTS will have to be looked at since they are rarely used.
- Concern over mutual aid channels. Day to day channels are being filled up and not sure new channels can be built.
- IMTS may be the logical channel to go with. The group to help will come from Sacramento and having 5 channels and other channels will be a big help.
- Issue of operability rather than interoperability came out loud and clear in the North meetings.
- The need for gateways in Northern California seems backburner.

## **CENTRAL VALLEY PLANNING AREA**

Ken Alvis, California State Association of Counties, (Mgr. Kern County Communications)  
John Penido, California Fire Chiefs, South, Chief, San Marino Fire

- First Meeting: September 27, 2006 - 65 people attended meeting, 30 agencies. With talks, they are very motivated with next steps.
- California Central Fire Chief Association appreciates efforts of CALSIEC to establish Central Valley group. Found everything went well at the first meeting on September 27, 2006 and much was learned such as funding. John Penido explained that some states have updated radios using portions of State SOGP funds normally for counties to set up small programs and a number of old radios are being turned into narrow band. He noted the minimum capability of the radios helps them narrow band and provided MSRI as an example in their 3rd year of doing so. John noted that other agencies are looking at the possibility and this is being strongly supported by small agencies.
- Second meeting scheduled to Central Valley Planning Area on October 27.

#### SOUTHERN PLANNING AREA

Robert Sedita, California State Sheriff's South (Commander, Los Angeles Sheriff)  
Don Root, Member at Large (Asst. Mgr, San Diego-Imperial County Regional Communications System)

Don Root, CALSIEC member and Asst Mgr, or San Diego-Imperial County Regional Communication System said the Southern Planning Area has met two times recently: 8-21 and 9-19. He stressed a number of issues.

- One was the representation from each county because the main goal is to have fire, law and government disciplines represented from each county.
- Another was a process to deal with deconflicting mutual aid interop repeaters.
- Places in Southern CA not high in elevation where handhelds can communicate could be an issue.
- Working group meeting in coming weeks.
- Upcoming meeting on November 21, 2006.

#### **CLEMARS, CALCORD and CALSIEC APPROVAL PROCESS DISCUSSION**

Current Application Process for CLEMARS or CALCORD

Jurisdiction Request → Law to OES Law (Charlie Simpson) or Fire (local folks) → Dept of General Services (DGS) on behalf of FCC
---

Discussion:

- Law Enforcement is CLEMARS process
- Fire is CALCORD- is a local process, done truly by volunteers. Long term basis what happens? Fire Mutual Aid give up white channels and control goes to state.
- Process needs to be streamlined, consistent, via CALSIEC and not fragmented.

- Need to recreate the Technical Review Committee for governance purpose to handle all channels in Fire, Law, etc. Handle applications that are not cookie cutter or are waiver.
- Folks on Technical Review Committee should be a mix from around the state of technical folks.
- Should Technical Review Committee replace OES T-com in the review process?
- One of the main issues - confusion with change in staff and issues on areas of development.
- Problems have come up on channels being used and law Enforcement has elevation requirements to keep coverage down.
- Does full CALSIEC body need to be involved with every application?
- 800 MHz channels, state wide channels, and UHF channels will have the same issues and suggested reestablishing a technical working group. (See "Technical Review Committee" proposal)
- Those who want a new license must give up current frequency.
- Concerns for long term control of the situation as new channels come on board and asked whether volunteer fire companies were bonafied, and/or recognized, and supported by 9/11.

#### CALSIEC Technical Review Committee

Group decided to reestablish a *Technical Review Committee* of experts when licensing process runs into particular problem. It will rethink regulations and issues on CLEMARS and CALCORD and present to full CALSIEC.

Suggestions regarding CALSIEC Technical Review Committee:

1. Differentiate between policies versus technical issues.
2. If operational issue, before goes to CALSIEC Technical Review Committee important first step to consult with local OES re local issues. Does it enhance or conflict with interoperability at local level?
3. Something needs to be in written form as personnel changes occur, such as PSRSPC and CALSIEC packets.
4. The committee should only review those processes with model issues.
5. We should look at local issues/people because they are most critical.
6. We should let OES handle it since it is not a policy issue.
7. Build a knowledge base with every group since it is typically very generic.
8. Have OES form the first draft in conjunction with committee, then look at who can form group.

Next Steps on CALSIEC Technical Review Committee:

1. OES Staff will draft charter (for the committee) and procedures.
2. OES staff will work with committee member volunteers: Don Root, Gary David Grey, Pres Thomson (APCO North Advisor), Glen Savage (CDF); Glen Nash (DGS) ; Kevin

Nida (Firescope South) and a rep from Firescope North. (This is relatively open until solidified.)

3. Don Root will draft an initial outline.
4. A standardized review will be put in place.

## **STANDARD CHANNEL NOMENCLATURE**

Chief Tim McClelland, Chair, CALSIEC Fire Workgroup-Firescope, Fire Chief  
John Powell, CALSIEC Chair  
John Penido, Cal Fire Chiefs

John Powell noted a document was sent out yesterday. He discussed the lack of standard channel names as a problem in Hurricane Katrina. Some channels had common channels on the radio but were named something different; therefore, they could not communicate. If the commission had adopted the suggestion, there would only be one name. The FCC report has been reiterated and adopted by all national associations after many hours of discussion as a compromise. There is a big question of how much this is being used in Texas, New Hampshire, and Missouri.

Driven by Katrina, The President's new OE commission will need to address issue promptly. This is very new as regional implementation just worked out. (This is included in the document). John stressed the fact that this is not a state plan, it is a national plan and possibly now going international with interests from Canada.

Tim McClelland questioned if there was a need for a national standard, what should it be? This is an opportunity, so it should be taken to develop a national approach. Nomenclature should also be made so it is easy to understand. Tim presented interest in developing a more conscious decision among fire groups.

John Penido on video mentioned his conversation with people at CALCHIEFS and Fire services. There seems to be resistance to what has been put forward and he is not seeing the numbers in regards to people changing what they have. John Penido explained it is clear fire service needs to be educated and consulted on the need for nomenclature, the benefits in NCC, and nomenclature proposals: Vcal, ucal, ical. More work needs to be done by all.

John Penido noted the energy spent in coming to national interop standards. He felt it is important to adopt operationally appropriate standards. His main concern were over potential mistakes, if the standards were adopted, so that no one should be confused at the fire service level. However, this is currently not on the radar screens of other states; CA should spend time learning what other states want to do and come up with a national consensus and address what needs to be fine-tuned. John Penido provided a personal example from his group regarding proper usage of channels: "My group brought radios to an incident and the programs were downloaded. There were no chances of making mistakes because everyone had the same local channel plans and names at that incident. This was a way to ensure no mistakes are made. These ideas will need to come up ensuring multi-incident agencies are on the same channel." Work on this issue will continue as a regular item at CalSIEC meetings.

Tim McClelland provided the group with an overview of the survey taken: 11 agencies that use 700 MHz nomenclature will continue. California and Florida were the only states that adopted 800MHZ. New Hampshire placed a hold from concerns over what might be done nationally.

John Powell noted huge issues that came with the NCC (group from CA), there have been many e-mails, quarterly meetings. Discussion from representatives from service and manufactures all adapted and went to SCC. The recommendation was to re-write all interoperability rules and adopt the 700MHZ. This was to be adopted nationally as an industry standard. After Katrina, this is mandatory. This is still under the SCC doc and Katrina Doc.

#### **NATIONAL MUTUAL AID**

Brent Finster mentioned Fire service is developing a national mutual aid system. There is a meeting in Washington DC at end of this month to work through other issues. Ken asked to move forward with other pieces other than fire so it can be developed more. He also stressed no other entity moves as much as the Fire group and felt lives and properties are at risk if Fire did not have enough time to work through the issues.

Adam provided the group with an overview of the meeting:

- new information
- lots of discussion on fire chief side
- new material and legislation
- informal dialogue from other states
- data gap that would help decision making
- Suggest process- nomenclature adhoc group came up with some ideas. Info gaps must be filled. Suggest reconvene nomenclature group and have adhoc group be main group. Should choose key people in order to bring education and information level up.
- Address timing issues.
- Need dedicated meeting.
- Upgrade nomenclature meeting.

John Powell provided several comments on the discussion. He acknowledged the time critical issue and explained agencies are forming programs for re-programming in California. John Powell mentioned those who want interoperability will have to reprogram their radios twice. John Penido agreed -programming costs money, time is critical. However, Nextel will not use channels until everyone has reprogrammed, and we should proceed with appropriate caution to make sure addresses California's diverse needs. Southern Ca. will be programmed first then Northern Ca.. It was agreed that this is the best way to make the system work.

#### **CALSIEC GOVERNANCE**

**Bill DeCamp, DGS**

MEMBERSHIP TO CALSIEC

Bill asked the group for thoughts on the members-at-large category. Don Root felt the reason they were titled members at large is because they did not represent a regional planning committee or affiliated with any other organization such as fire. They were striving to get representation from San Diego.

#### REGIONAL COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS

John Powell suggested taking regional reps and making them a member at large from that region with the understanding that it will be the chair or vice chair. Make those members represent those Northern, Central, and Southern regions. They would remain members at large. John was concerned more and more regional systems are coming on board such as East Bay and Sacramento, and need to be coordinated. May need to look at two from N and S and have them get together.

#### MEMBERS AT LARGE

Gary Grey suggested members at large also represent big interop systems. He felt that not everyone was represented. Different counties may not have the same populations; therefore, it makes sense to have the categories. We should address big counties such as Orange County and LA. Gary was concerned we will lose personality if North and South are combined.

Mary Cook thought instead of having members at large, the group should make them a separate workgroup—perhaps there should be a regional system of work groups like fire, police, etc. Robert Sedita offered that this differed very little from the regional groups we already have.

#### SIZE

Robert Sedita mentioned when the CALSIEC membership board was put together, Northern and Southern areas like fire and police were separated for a reason. He was concerned some groups already have representations that are sitting on the board so we must be careful not to make the CALSIEC group too big. If we add people, we will get to a very high number of members. Too much expansion!

John Powell agreed with Robert Sedita Bob on the size problem. He agreed with Gary regarding people with different views need to be included (small groups) each user has a different operational need. Let's leave user issues with the organization representatives.

#### CONNECTING REGIONAL SYSTEMS (Like in Bay and Sacramento) WITH PLANNING AREAS

Don felt when this was set up, there was not definite the middle layer of dealing with regional issues. The group may need to look at those areas such as the Bay Area and Sacramento that have regional systems and strive to get representation in those Planning Areas. Keep at large members and see if there are specific skill-sets we want to keep. The paradigm is shifting!

Adam Sutkus, facilitator, asked the group about about geographical representations—perhaps it would be natural for local systems that are very active to serve as a criteria and entry point.

Robert Sedita felt is time to clean it up because we need to interact within own regions. Gary thinks it is a big committee, and does not suggest making it big and opened ended. He only wanted to capture the strength and weakness and viewpoints. Don't want to loose that. John Powell would like to see at least one Northern and one Southern on the committee. It may be 'a wash'. They bring important concepts not known unless you are from that area. John Penido offered that we are dealing with principles and individual interests. The group needs regional systems represented or needs regional systems as an interest group (interest group as users).

Adam asked the group if they were willing to accept this as a test period for the new 07 model and re-evaluation. Planners will try to make this an issue to discuss on the agenda in the Bay Area. Mary felt if we did, the group should add the Bay Area Capital Planning Committee that is not represented here yet. (Brent agreed via phone) John Powell suggested that this be suggesed to the group formally. The January meeting will follow up on this issue.

### **CALSIEC GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT**

The group formally adopted the charter, vision, and mission. The second draft will move forward with the following agreed upon changes/revisions.

1. Two CALSIEC meetings minimum per year.
2. Meetings should stay at quarterly until issues of governance and Planning Areas are resolved.
3. Members who miss more than two meetings may be reviewed or removed.
4. Change to Draft document - first bullet...I would say "AND" NPTIC not "OR".
5. Recognize an idea from June meeting was to have a steering committee.
6. The chart left out the vice chair from the steering committee! Take alternate out please.
7. Clarify agencies and its members.
8. Revise ordering: Exec is not subsidiary of the steering committee; it is the other way around. The chart is backwards, The Steering is on top of the box...!
9. Group should be willing to give editorial digression as far as grammar or clarifying words and incorporate.
10. Correction-Figure C.state nonstate..can forestry conserve to fire protection.

### **Listing of Workgroups for Governance Document Agreed upon:**

1. Technical Review Workgroup (CLEMARS & CALCORD) This is a new workgroup.
2. Law Enforcement
3. Nomenclature Workgroup (note: this was an adhoc workgroup and was designated now as standing full Workgroup).
4. Fire & Rescue
5. Governance
6. Tactical Audio Switching (listed as WG-5 on web) was reformed at 6-16-06 meeting as a joint group with PSRSPC. (Jim Pratt at the meeting said folks had been invited from CALSIEC but had not responded.

7. EMS
8. Plan Writing

**Workgroups Not to be listed in Governance Document:**

- WG6- Mobile Data
- WG7-Allied Org
- WG8-Database

**Reflect as a Stand-up Workgroup when needed since not active now:**

- WG9- Education & Training-

**Workgroup that is a subset of the Southern Planning Area so not for listing in full CALSIEC governance:**

- W-11 LA Basin UHF-TV

**PLANNING AREA MAP & RELATIONSHIP TO MUTUAL AID REGIONS**

The map below is referenced throughout the discussion.



The history on the rationale for breaking down into four CALSIEC Planning Areas rather than the six OES regions states was discussed, as well as the benefits/drawbacks of using one model over another.

OES STRUCTURED ALONG MUTUAL AID & DIFFICULTY OF REACHING ALL  
 Rich Osborne, CA OES stated that OES operational areas perform daily work within mutual aid criteria and also in disaster and response areas. CA OES and local OES offices are accustomed to working in that way. Rich said he is being asked by those who have not come to Planning Area meetings “why were we not included in the meetings or regions?” Rich noted there are three OES administrative regions and six OES mutual aid regions. John Powell noted the three OES regions were looked at. John suggested asking people on the border line such as El Dorado and Sierra, “Who do you work with most day in and day out?” and make choices accordingly. Brent believed the real issue was if areas were not changed, a decision should be made on how we reach out to them (Sierra/Central). They need to be listened to as much as we can and try to support.

### CROSS BOUNDARY INTEROP BESIDES OES MUTUAL AID NOW IN PLACE

Don Root noted Southern California has under developed systems providing interoperability between boundaries. For example, LA and San Bernardino Counties have a case of cross boundary work and are working right now on connecting. There has been legislature to provide interoperability which goes across mutual aid regions. This effort was done looking at where populations are in 2003 vs. mutual aid region as laid out in pre-interstate highway days when highways were main transportation options. Now we are looking at real world today vs. administrative layout of the old.

### DAY TO DAY INTEROP BASIS FOR ESTABLISHING FOUR PLANNING AREAS

John Powell said a very conscious decision was made early on to look at how, 100% of interoperability happens day to day with incidents. John mentioned no overlap was visible for day to day interop work so regions were split.

### FIRE CONCERNS REGARDING NOT USING MUTUAL AID SYSTEM

There has been discussion from fire folks about why CALSIEC is not using mutual aid regions. Fire community uses mutual aid regions on a day-to-day basis and fire is experiencing confusion because the State is failing to follow the SEMS model for daily operation. When the two systems of mutual aid are examined, it does not prohibit other regions from getting together. Question asked: "How can we make either more effective and to make stakeholders happy?"

### NUANCES OF PLANNING AREAS & NEED TO HAVE SISTER REGIONS

If there is a coastal disaster, is everyone coming all from coastal? CALSIEC Planning Areas must span and have sister regions. We need to have daily plans and interop plans. It was suggested to go forward with six regions. John Powell noted with the exception of few counties, the map (with the 4 Planning Areas) on the screen is a consolidation of some of the OES regions (refers to OES six mutual aid regions). From a radio standpoint, Kern County should probably stay with OES region 5. Upper 1-80 corridor and north is the important region. How can we consolidate so it has the same boundaries (referencing two different maps, one by the 6 mutual Aid regions and one by the 4 planning areas of CALSIEC). Gary Gray agreed with John.

### TECHNICAL VERSUS OPERATIONAL BASIS FOR PLANNING AREAS

John Penido explained what people likely mean is that there is already a system in place. The Planning Area regions of CALSIEC were planned with the technical in mind (what systems can connect and what systems conflict); this is technical. We need to design something that supports the operational folks, not technical folks. We need to address what the operational folks need also. Mutual aid region concerns need to be addressed. Brent liked having four areas, but thought we should combine regions 2 and 4, and Humboldt and Del Norte should go to Northern area. John Powell agreed. Richard Osborne said if one looks at the survey on regional coordinates assigned to the areas, it is an issue if they need to reach out to the others. Some regions did not know why six regions were made into four regions. Rich asked to be mindful of all concerns across the board as a revised coordination system is established.

## TICP'S & CONFUSION OF SIX VERSUS FOUR PLANNING AREAS

Mary Cook asked if it (CALSIIEC Planning Areas) go back to six areas (versus current four), whether there were TICP'S for all regions. Why aren't there interop plans written if they work together? They are not averse to having four, it is a question of why? Mary asked if we don't have TICPs, do we want more Planning Areas and make it more confusing?

## MARAC INVOLVEMENT

Adam Sutkus suggested providing education, and providing an opportunity to advance discussion between technical and operational people. He also suggested coming up with a history of why or why not's, and making streamline areas tighter. Adam suggested bringing up the dialogue at MARAC meetings to get input, see if this makes sense in the governance committee, and then bring back the discussion. Mary wanted to invite the MARAC group attend the planning meetings so they would have a better understanding of the questions and concerns. An "overlay" concept may take shape to coordinate between and among Planning Areas and Mutual Aid Regions for 2007, to examine best methods for coordination.

## NATURAL ALIGNMENTS MAR'S 1+6, AND MAR'S 2+ 4, PLUS COASTAL NORTH

The MAR's 1+6 now naturally align for a number of reasons as does MAR 2+4. The coastal counties of Humboldt and Del Norte may find it best to align primarily in the Northern Planning Area MAR 3 for the most part.

## NEXT STEPS

Find out what folks think about dividing by MAR before making any changes. Adam suggested combining structural change and education without upsetting planning groups—and continuing the theme of 2007 as a 'transition' year with the new governance structure.

## **RECAP OF Planning Area Discussion & Governance Draft**

1. 2007 TEST PERIOD –Move regional systems users into membership of Planning Area rather than state wide CALSIIEC, but retain one communications system from the North and one from the south on the full CALSIIEC membership.
2. Formalizing services CALSIIEC
3. Adopt mission and vision
4. Word change by John Penido.
5. Issues of formal committee be mentioned in notes.

## **PSRSPC UPDATE**

PSRSPC workgroup

1. Google ICTAP, and TCIP will come up as option to take a look at; work continues on the Report to the Legislature; major coordination expected in 2007 with CALSIIEC.

## **STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT**

Holly provided an update of the Statewide Assessment. Holly mentioned several bills were passed. There is one joint meeting per year required now (CALSIIEC/PRSPC joint meeting handout and survey-lets get word out via website).

## **LESSONS LEARNED FROM DHS EXERCISE**

John Powell noted what he learned from the gateway governance project: importance of MOUs moving forward making sure coupled with those are operational sides. John noted when signed, they are agreeing to those issues; Governance has tech and operational, both needs to be covered.

Robert Sedita noted as a result of the system assessment, over 100 gateways were identified statewide. He also noted governance need to be in place, gateways do not need to be purchases; Governance is more and more important.

Don Root showed concerns regarding gateways that are not at locations where they can do the most good. Jake McHatton added “those can afford the gateways have it, those who don’t, don’t have it. If we have all those in place today, we don’t have to buy another”. Don asked Jake “based on what standard? If we are talking about SAFCOM- we have an issue”. Don asked the group what standards are being used when discussing when we are addressing this problem; what standard to we measure this against? Robert noted in the Planning Area meeting, Planning Areas were asked to tell us what gaps needed to be fixed. Holly explained the issue is there is limited funding, we want to place gateways in the best possible location. Original location looks like it may not be the best of its level. Governance is the key.

**CALSIIEC WORKGROUP REPORTS** Mary-meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> of this month. (Oct)  
Fire Workgroup, Brent Finster referred to the nomenclature effort presented by Chief McClellan – today.  
EMS: Mary Cook said nothing new to report.

## **CLOSING COMMENTS/THOUGHTS**

### **CALSIIEC STATE COMMUNICATION PLAN**

Brent Finster asked to schedule a conference call on Wed 11-08-06 in regards to state communication plan he started. Don Root noted workgroup 11 was removed last time.

### **WORKGROUPS**

Decided to mark workgroups not formed yet as inactive. Adam suggested that they be captured, pulled off to clean things up. Adam noted this way, groups can be brought back if needed. Don Root suggested to state “at the point we need to, we will set up education, at this point, we are not ready to set up education and training”. Don Root mentioned in part of planning, directions we are going, we need to recognize the planning of education and training workgroups.

### **GOVERNANCE IN OTHER PLACES**

John Powell noted lots of interesting stuff is out from across the country. John is putting together governance piece a collection of best practices and lessons learned. There are a few exercises left in New Orleans, however, by next meeting, the document should be ready.

### **MINUTES**

Adam asked the group if there were any issues with the minutes from 6/16/06 meeting. John motioned to approve minutes. The group approved the minutes.

### **MEETING EVALUATION**

1. Meeting was too long. Executive not here because meeting was too long.
2. Some items on agenda not addressed as needed. Bring to top of next meeting.

### **NEXT MEETING DATE: JANUARY 25 (TENTATIVE)**

Location not determined. Perhaps Fresno or Bay Area.

**ATTENDEES** (See Next Page)

CALSIEC Meeting 10-6-06 Members Attending (in person or via phone /video)

First Name	Last Name	Title	Organization
1. Ken	Alvis**	Kern County Communications	Ca State Assoc of Counties
2. Bill	Carpenter **	American Red Cross	American Red Cross
3. Ken	Chapelle	Telecom Mgr.	CDCR
4. Bob	Clemens	Asst. Chief	CHP (sub for regular CALSIEC member)
5. Mary	Cook	Comm. Dispatch Coord.	EMSA
6. Bill	DeCamp	Sr. Telecom Eng.	DGS Telecom
7. Michele	Elliott	Chief ITT Section	CDHS
8. Brent	Finster**	Contra Costa Co Fire	Firescope, North
9. Gary David	Gray	Freq. Coord.	CPRA
10. Frank	McCarton	Deputy Chief	OES
11. Tim	McClelland	Asst. Chief	CDF Firescope
12. Jake	McHatton	Comm. Officer	CDF Fire Telecom
13. Ferdinand	Milanes**		
14. Spiro	Mitsanass	CCP Com	Civil Air Patrol
15. Tom	Norman	Rep	TSG
16. John	Penido*		CA Fire Chiefs So
17. Sue	Plantz	Acting CTO-OES	OES
18. John	Powell	Sr. Engineer (retired)	At-Large Member
19. Jim	Pratt	Spencer	DGS TD
20. Don	Root	Asst. Mgr	SD Reg. Comm Sys.
21. Robert	Samaan	Dep. Dir.	OHS
22. Robert	Sedita*	LA Sheriff's Dept	Ca State Sheriff's South
23. Charlie	Simpson	Chief ITT Section	OES-Law Enf
24. Pres	Thompson	Advisor	NAPCO
25. Takeshi	Tokunaga	Sr. Telecom Eng.	Caltrans
26. Kim	Zagaris	Chief	OES Fire & Rescue

\* via video \*\* via phone

Others Attending (non members)

First Name	Last Name	Title	Organization
Bob		LA Sheriff	
Mark		LA Sheriff	
Lewis		LA Sheriff	
Angela	Azevedo	SISA	CDCR
Marlo	Bush		CA OES
Phyllis	Cauley	SC	CSUS/CCP
Dan	Caulfield	Manager	Day Wireless Systems
Tina	Chen		CSUS/CCP
Ed	Coolbert	PM	ICTAP SSC-SD
David	Golden	Info Sucs Mgr	Mil Dep CNG
Dennis	Garton	Undersheriff	Tehama County
Tim	Hennessy	Comm. Training Supervisor	Contra Costa County S.O
Rita	Lang	ICTAP Dept Prog. Mgr.	SSCSD
Bob	LaRose	Reg Mgr	Raytheon JPS
Julia	Lee	Faciliator	CSUS/CCP
Kate	Luginbuhl	Dir. Of Opt. & Safety	Mt.Shasta Fire Pro. Dist.
Ginger	Marshall	Officer	Mt.Shasta Fire Pro. Dist.
Meghan	Masera	Asst. to the Dept Director	CA OES

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Richard	Osborne	Acting Chief T-Comm	OES
R	Ryder	CASM Prog Mgr	ICTAP SSC-SD
Tom	Saavedra	Commander	Merced S.O
Steve	Smith	M/A Com ASM	MIA-COM
Adam	Sutkus	Sr Mediator	CCP/CSUS
Don	Turos	Dep. J6	Mil Dep CNG
Holly	Ziegler	Prog. Mgr	CA OES