

# MEETING NOTES

## **California Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (CalSCIP) Implementation Workshop**

February 26, 2008

OES Headquarters, 3650 Schriever Avenue, Mather, Ca 95655  
*Sponsored by the Office of Emergency Services (OES)*

**Workshop Purpose:** *To lay out the 2008 plan to establish work groups for the 16 CalSCIP Initiatives; adopt final channel names for the 800 MHz interoperability channels; overview of FEMA Region IX's new Regional Emergency Communications Coordination Working Groups; and an update on PSIC grant.*

### **Handouts:**

- ✿ Agenda
- ✿ Ground rules
- ✿ List of 16 CalSCIP initiatives
- ✿ Draft CalSIEC Charter

ATTENDANCE: Sign in sheet on file and available on request from OES.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. Next CalSIEC MEETING date set: April 28, 2008 in Sacramento
2. All are encouraged to submit comments on the CalSIEC Charter to Sam Williams, OES.
3. NOMINEES FOR VACANCIES FOR CalSIEC chair and membership now being collected by Sam Williams and will be forwarded to the steering committee.
4. 800 MHz FINAL CHANNEL NAMES: John Powell to circulate to CalSIEC for approval, 800 discussed. At next CalSIEC meeting will be formally adopted.
5. Contact Pat Carriveau, 408-489-1668 (cell), [pveau@pacbell.net](mailto:pveau@pacbell.net) to request training and planning assistance from Interoperable Communications Technical Assistance Program (ICTAP), U.S. Dept of Homeland Security for TICP & CASM development.
6. Contact Vinnie Buehler, Governor's Office of Homeland Security (OHS) to start to set up a CASM account.

### **WELCOME**

Henry Renteria, the Director of OES welcomed all and explained that the workshop purpose is to develop a road map for the sixteen CalSCIP initiatives. Three of the initiatives have PSIC federal funding but the others do not and that funding is a contentious issue. There is much work to be done. The Governor, as well as state and local agencies has great interest in this effort. Two important reports have gone to the legislature, the CalSCIP and the 2008 PSRSPC Report to the Legislature. He thanked everyone for their support.

### **AWARDS**

Henry presented an award to John Powell for his service as CalSIEC chair and announced that John will now take on a new role as "Special Advisory on Interoperability to the Director." Bob Sedita, Vice-chair of CalSIEC has retired from LA County Sheriff. Bob who was not able to attend was also recognized with an award for his service to CalSIEC.

## AGENDA & GROUNDRULES, INTRODUCTIONS

Adam Sutkus, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) gave an overview of the day. He explained that the day's meeting would help design a work plan for CalSCIP in 2008. He also explained that there would be some discussion of the CalSIEC charter as it is the first initiative of CalSCIP. The charter will be up for CalSIEC adoption at the next CalSIEC meeting. The afternoon session was devoted to discussions on the sixteen initiatives. Self-introductions were then made.

## UPDATE FROM OES ON CALSCIP

### CalSIEC Charter

Sam Williams, OES, gave a brief history of the current draft of the CalSIEC charter. It was developed in October 2006 but was never formally adopted. He sent it out again two weeks ago and he has received six comments, mostly favorable. In the morning he had also received comments that were not as favorable. He emphasized that everyone is encouraged to send him comments and feedback is really needed. He will be also be sending out another request in the next week for comments. All received comments will go to the sub-committee which is consisted of Bill DeCamp, John Penido, Don Root and Sam Williams. The CalSIEC charter will be put up for a vote at the next meeting.

### CalSCIP Review

The CalSCIP review feedback process has brought out two areas of concern- confusion regarding the planning areas and secondly, consistent with the entire country, the reviewers do not like SCIPS that are set up with multiples committees regarding interoperability. California has two bodies doing this, CalSIEC and the PSRSPC. Sam emphasized that the CalSCIP is a really important document. John said all federal grant money will require alignment with the SCIP. John also explained that his understanding was that the reviewers like that the state is broken into some type of planning areas or regions as the state is so big.

### CalSIEC Vacancies

Sam encouraged everyone to nominate folks for the membership vacancies on CalSIEC as well as for the CalSIEC chair and vice chair. John will serve as chair until a new chair is found.

### *Discussion Comments Regarding CalSCIP Governance & CalSIEC Governance Charter*

- a. *Still not clear emerging/forming of this governance and how pushed down to city and county levels. Have PSRSPC that is well established in the state and CalSIEC interaction to a lesser degree. How to get buy in by locals?*
- b. *Super UASI's out there and blending and get representation from other levels.*
- c. *The UASI's are missing from the CalSIEC charter.*
- d. *Who makes decisions for the state? The two organizations on parallel tracks. Who is the shot caller? Concern for continual funding. Was a good start in '04 and then lost funding. Stop/start needs to stop.*
- e. *How does charter align with SCIP and SAFECOM? Since '06 working for legislature to recognize CalSIEC.*
- f. *Essential to exercise steering committee of qualified people to meet regularly and also how CalSIEC and PSRSPC can work together.*
- g. *CalSIEC if practioner focused, then how do you get to places like Modoc County? CalSIEC had alternates. Representatives of their constituents where meetings in each of the Planning Areas and information filters back and forth. We do see new counties, like Butte, Kern. See more synergies growing and not static.*
- h. *Integration of two groups- state users and local and regional systems. Won't be economies of scale. Could be competing for funds even. Any way to integrate?*

- i. *With PSIC it seems like the Planning Areas are natural for initiatives like CASM and COML. A lot already have a UASI. Don't want to reinvent, but leverage existing. Planning areas got a good start and it would be nice to build on that for the initiatives.*
- j. *Moving from planning to implementation stage. Initiative 4 caught my attention, ongoing funding for the CICO. But funding as state agency under PSRSPC was not funded.*
- k. *Steering Committee great idea using Planning Area. But first responders and how focus groups will work and get work done is important.*
- l. *Is PSRSPC aware of the problem where there are 2 groups? Yes.*
- m. *CalSIEC membership should represent the interests of group affiliated with, however not formally representing the organization. Suggest changing draft charter, p 12 to modify and not use word 'appointing.'*
- n. *Mutual aid and interoperability are not the same. Important to stress day-to-day success of interoperability.*

## **REGIONAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS COORDINATION (RECC) WORKING GROUPS, FEMA Region IX**

John Powell reported that the region is now hiring a person. Each state in the nation has a SIEC which will be the proper contact. FEMA recently had a meeting but it was a disaster since it was just by invite rather than using existing groups for outreach.

### **800 MHZ – UPDATE ON FINAL CHANNEL NAMES**

John Powell sent out an email the morning of 2/26/08, prior to the CalSCIP workshop regarding an 800 MHz Interoperability Channel Naming Addendum and proposal. This topic raised lively discussion and the topic was then further discussed during lunch by a number of interested folks who made a number of suggested changes that were reported back to the full group. There was overall agreement on the recommended changes. John will email out the revised table to CalSIEC for immediate adoption. Concern was noted also that this information was not circulated sooner. At the next CalSIEC meeting, however, the proposal will have the opportunity for formal adoption.

*Background material:* In John's email he noted that the items have been discussed, some in-depth, at previous meetings (CalSIEC) and it was important that they be approved so the names can be distributed to agencies who are in the process of re-banding, and to the 800 MHz Transition Administrator. He further explained that the names for the five FCC-designated 800 MHz nationwide interoperability channels, as recommended by the NPSTC Channel Naming Report (and with its associated implementation schedule) were approved by CalSIEC last year. As with that approval, the intent of approving these added names is that the use of these names will also be required as a condition for using these channels by California agencies.

#### Item #1: Short Names for National Channels

Some radios, in particular earlier models sold by EF Johnson and Motorola, offer a programming feature that automatically adds the Zone designator at the beginning of the displayed name. For these models, that is a radio wide feature meaning if it is enabled it is applied to all channels. Some agencies require this feature for their operational channels. Its implementation leaves a maximum of five characters for the remainder of the name. At the request of agencies from across the U.S., NPSTC approved the following five character names for use only in this specific situation:

<b>Full name</b>	<b>Abbreviated name</b>
8CALL90	CAL90

8TAC91	TAC91
8TAC92	TAC92
8TAC93	TAC93
8TAC94	TAC94

Item #2: California Statewide Fire and Law Enforcement Channels

John's email also explained an attached spreadsheet contains the recommended channel names, as discussed in previous CalSIEC meetings. Figure 1 attached contains that spread sheet.

**COML UNIT WORKING GROUP**

There is PSIC money to train a couple of hundred people across the state. This is important as proven by the recent So Cal wildfires where there was interference in communications since there is on one to coordinate in California (VHF). The training will be based on curriculum approved by DHS. A draft instructor's guide is out. It appears that the NIMS integration center will bless this if they receive it in the next few weeks. Expect to have whole package to NIMS by mid march to be rolled out to the whole country in April. Los Angeles City Fire has volunteered to host training and be instructors. If interested, give names to John Powell. OHS approves curriculum so that it can be POST certified and people can get credit.

*Comments Regarding COML Training*

- o Want list of Interested Agencies for Training so ready to go when grant money released.
- o Need to clarify- Bay Area UASI is the Point of Contact (POC)
- o Need to clarify- web based high level, train the trainer and COML so there are three levels for ODP approval and then goes to OHS
- o Need to determine student prerequisites for the training. 5 classes required or can't take class.
- o For initial certification into the class will require ICS 700, 800, 100, 200, 300. Will this requirement be released? When curriculum is out will post requirements.
- o There is concern about how defining sponsoring entity requirements to take the class (in addition to the ICS classes)
- o Training is broader than first responder audience. Exact wording is not out.
- o How is this related to the Las Vegas class on COML a year ago? Brent Finster to work with John Powell on this. People will be grandfathered for that training so you don't have to go back through the training but must do task book, a three year window where go back and get signoffs.
- o What is the COML training Manager in COML Unit is key in ICS so this position is first one concentrating on. The ICS manager is the next focus. Also radio operator (goes by several names), COML technician also important.
- o Also be aware resources can be an issue, not just coordination (after trained)
- o National IFOG is coming out. CA's effort on that will follow.

Figure 1

## 800 MHz. Interoperability Channels Proposed Nomenclature for California Statewide Channels

emailed out by John Powell

Dated 7/18/2007A

Note: several changes suggested to these table below and to be emailed out with revisions made.

<b>Prior to Rebanding</b>					
"Existing"	Rx FREQ	Rx CTCSS	Tx FREQ	Tx CTCSS	Emission
I-CALL	866.0125	156.7	821.0125	156.7	W
n/a	866.0125	156.7	Simplex	156.7	W
I-TAC 1	866.5125	156.7	821.5125	156.7	W
n/a	866.5125	156.7	Simplex	156.7	W
I-TAC 2	867.0125	156.7	822.0125	156.7	W
n/a	867.0125	156.7	Simplex	156.7	W
I-TAC 3	867.5125	156.7	822.5125	156.7	W
n/a	867.5125	156.7	Simplex	156.7	W
I-TAC 4	868.0125	156.7	823.0125	156.7	W
n/a	868.0125	156.7	Simplex	156.7	W
FIREMARS	868.9875	None	823.9875	156.7	W
n/a	868.9875	None	Simplex	156.7	W
FIREMARS2	866.9125	None	821.9125	156.7	W
n/a	866.9125	None	Simplex	156.7	W
CLEMARS 9	868.5125	None	823.5125	156.7	W
CLEMARS 8	868.5125	None	Simplex	156.7	W
CLEMARS 21	866.2000	None	821.2000	156.7	W
CLEMARS 20	866.2000	None	Simplex	156.7	W
<b>Post-Rebanding</b>					
"Future"	Rx FREQ	Rx CTCSS	Tx FREQ	Tx CTCSS	Emission
8CALL90	851.0125	156.7	806.0125	156.7	W
8CALL90D	851.0125	156.7	Simplex	156.7	W
8TAC91	851.5125	156.7	806.5125	156.7	W
8TAC91D	851.5125	156.7	Simplex	156.7	W
8TAC92	852.0125	156.7	807.0125	156.7	W
8TAC92D	852.0125	156.7	Simplex	156.7	W
8TAC93	852.5125	156.7	807.5125	156.7	W
8TAC93D	852.5125	156.7	Simplex	156.7	W
8TAC94	853.0125	156.7	808.0125	156.7	W
8TAC94D	853.0125	156.7	Simplex	156.7	W
FMARS3	853.9875	none	808.9875	156.7	W
FMARS3D	853.9875	none	Simplex	156.7	W
FMARS4	851.9125	none	806.9125	156.7	W
FMARS4D	851.9125	none	Simplex	156.7	W
CLEM11	853.5125	none	808.5125	156.7	W
CLEM11D	853.5125	none	Simplex	156.7	W
CLEM12	851.2000	none	806.2000	156.7	W
CLEM12D	851.2000	none	Simplex	156.7	W

## PSIC GRANT OVERVIEW

Vinnie Buehler, OHS, explained that the PSIC Investment Justifications (IJ's) from December 3 are still in review. OHS has mid March approval slated and awards can then be done. In the meantime, it was suggested that people go to the website and check out the link for the workbook. As UASI's are the main sub grantees (except in Northern California), it's expected that folks will fill out the workbook. If there are any changes to the IJ's you will need to work with Vinnie to determine how fundamental they are or not. It will be necessary to parse out any changes and work with grant staff to keep you accountable for reaching milestones. There was concern if money would actually be available from the federal sale of spectrum to fund various PSIC IJ's. It looks like money will be available but it will take longer to come out than initially anticipated.

For the CASM and IFOG Initiatives funded by PSIC, attend Planning Area meetings for updates. By the end of 2008 everyone must complete a TICP. So far 30 of 58 counties have done a TICP. Funds have been set aside by a PSRSPC Investment Justification for funding of TICP planning. TICP's can be a single Operating Area (OA) or multiple and even regional. ICTAP is available and eager to provide TICP training.

### CASM Update

- Need for accounts, data, and training
- Initiative now will focus on creating accounts and when the State receives the PSIC funding we will populate CASM with data and do training.
- So Cal is now working with Vinnie on setting up account.
- Contact Vinnie if you want to start to work on an account.

## SCIP INITIATIVES -- Breakout results

The workshop provided extensive time for participants to breakout into groups based on the CalSCIP initiatives. The results from these groups are in **Attachment 1**. **Attachment 2** lists the sign ups for each of the initiatives.

## WRAP-UP/ ADJOURN

The meeting closed with reminders as to the next CalSIEC meeting, April 28, 2008 and for all those interested in signing up for CalSCIP Initiative Work Groups to please contact Sam Williams, OES.

*Meeting Attendance roster on file and available on request from OES.*

## Attachment 1: SCIP INITIATIVES BREAKOUT GROUP RESULTS

<b>GROUP 1: Initiatives 1 &amp; 3: CalSIEC Governance &amp; MUTUAL AID REGIONS/PLANNING AREAS</b>		
	The questions were not answered directly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Confusion about initiatives; is it the charter? Or whole governance package?</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More clearly define the initiatives.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Who approves the recommendation that is made? Steering Committee, Exec Committee?</li> <li>○ Suggest creating a small working group to review charter and present edits to next CalSIEC meeting; then to Vinnie for action.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Groups should merge to streamline the process; linear vertical process preferred.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No problem w mutual aid being different from planning area because of radio frequency propagate;</li> <li>○ Do the Ca Mutual Aid regions need to be looked at? Law? Fire?</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Coordinate mutual aid folks need to be meeting w CalSIEC;</li> <li>○ Try to align planning areas based on review of mutual aid regions</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Could use more time to deal with this issue.</li> </ul>
<b>GROUP 2: Initiatives 2, 4 &amp; 9: CALSCIP GOVERNANCE, CICO Office, CALSCIP COMPLIANCE</b>		
I-2. CalSCIP	1. Leveraging Partnership: Are there any existing groups, committees, organizations, action teams, workgroups, etc. that you believe share the concerns of CalSCIP initiatives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CalSIEC, PSRSPC, NAPCO, CPRA, FCC;</li> <li>○ How to insure inclusion?</li> <li>○ Most players are already at the table.</li> </ul>
	2. What specific recommendations do you have for a governance body charter agreement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cabinet level oversight - independent from OES</li> </ul>
I-4. CICO Office	1. How do you envision an action team working with OES to make the CICO viable and sustainable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The CICO should work hand in hand with OHS and Legislature to ensure funding availability for interop systems.</li> <li>○ CICO should be independent from any state agency to ensure appropriate oversight is unbiased, yet has full support by Exec and Legislature.</li> </ul>

	<b>CALSCIP COMPLIANCE</b> 1. What steps need to be taken to implement this initiative?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Legislative recognition of CalSIEC to have a bottom-up approach.</li> </ul>
	Additional comments not associated w a question:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ As a county, you get confused about who you need to talk to with various agencies, different mutual aid and planning areas and funding agencies.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lack of voice for non-UASI counties, i.e. Kern;</li> <li>○ Kern County preference is to be associated as part of the Central Planning Area because they don not like being a zebra.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Representation should be consolidated to minimize confusion and repetition.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Non represented / non UASI should be included and formalized for ongoing planning purposes</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Locals have a lack of faith in the state entity (PSRSPC) governing locals, therefore the key to success equals create one governing body with local representation;</li> <li>○ Linear process to avoid completing interests therefore common interests.</li> </ul>

### **GROUP 3: Initiative 5: IMPLEMENT SYSTEM OF SYSTEMS**

	1. Who needs to coordinate with regions and localities to minimize operability shortfalls and help systems migrate towards interoperability?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Use SEMS structure - start with state stakeholders, then county, then locals.</li> <li>○ Local information and issues will drive what solutions (technology, etc) should be implemented.</li> <li>○ Planning areas of Mutual Aid response groups; urban areas rep to OAS to State</li> </ul>
	2. How the coordination would be best done: Is there a regional/local structure that can be leveraged?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Use UASIs / SUASIs, Mutual Aid Regions, and local working groups to feed info up to the state working group.</li> <li>○ Work Groups in the op areas feeding into planning group and approval authority.</li> </ul>
	3. What role does the state have in coordinating with regions and locals?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ State must reach out to the entire local (co or multi county) work groups and be the link to each other.</li> </ul>
	4. Any particular linkages that could be leveraged with any of the other actions teams/initiatives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes. Governance and spectrum teams need to coordinate.</li> </ul>

**GROUP 4: Initiatives 6 and 8: GATEWAYS/SPECTRUM MGMT/IP and SPECTRUM MANAGEMENT**

<p>I-6: Gateways/ Spectrum</p>	<p>1. What other efforts are now underway that may leverage any of the items in this initiative?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ACU 1000 and other patchers as available. Created the LARTC.</li> <li>○ The TICPs were the catalysts to develop MOUs in the local areas to add to the regional plan and the state.</li> <li>○ Allocation of operability spectrum (700 MHz) by DGS and OES, PSRSPC/CalSIEC interop spectrum mgmt.</li> <li>○ Mandates; unused available.</li> <li>○ Resources: 1.79 GHZ avail in Sacco by DHS.</li> <li>○ Bartach - example of success (Bay Area) MOUs, Etc.</li> <li>○ TICPs forced awareness and documented processes.</li> <li>○ Key regulatory agency participation.</li> </ul>
	<p>2. Who are some of the key contacts (identify for what item)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ LARTC.org</li> <li>○ DGS, OES, PSRSPC, Calsiec, Fed, State Local agencies, Mil, Fire, Police, EMS</li> </ul>
	<p>3. What are some of the challenges for this initiative and how could they be addressed successfully?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Outreach, resources (frequencies)</li> <li>○ Complete cooperation with all players;</li> <li>○ funding;</li> <li>○ needs analysis.</li> <li>○ Interop too much spectrum use; which strains bands;</li> <li>○ misuse of gateways.</li> <li>○ ID challenges first.</li> <li>○ Interagency part cooperation paramount.</li> <li>○ SUASI participation + et al.</li> </ul>
	<p>4. Any particular linkages that could be leveraged with any of the other actions teams/initiatives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SOPs and SOS;</li> <li>○ UASI and SUASI</li> <li>○ PSRSPC/CalSIEC DGS + Agency coordination at state, regional levels</li> </ul> <p>Comments in side lines of I-6: Use existing infrastructure wymax mobile broadband</p>
<p>I-8: Spectrum</p>	<p>1. What steps could be taken to develop an action team that coordinates efforts as laid out in the SCIP for active and equitable coordination</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Users + tech committee connected</li> </ul>
	<p>2. What timelines could you put to these action steps?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mostly in place today.</li> <li>○ Mandates are driving dates.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Mandates driving timelines</li> </ul>
	3. Are there any other groups that should be included?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o APCO AFC</li> </ul>
	4. Any particular linkages that could be leveraged with any of the other actions teams/initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Link to initiative 12.</li> <li>o 800 rebanding; 2014 - 12.5 MHz obsolete;</li> <li>o 2016 use terminates;</li> </ul>
	Other comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o MOUs are very important</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o local organizations meet and communicate with each other; managed through CASM</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o It would be great to have one radio that can do all the bands.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Come up with a state general MOU for all agencies that can be tweaked by the locals.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o SOPs are very important</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Comm Leads in an area public safety, UASI, emergency Ops personnel, (key contacts), information should be listed in CASM.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Challenges - no oversight, locals go their own way.</li> <li>o No region plan</li> </ul>

### **GROUP 5: Initiative 10: Training**

	1. Are there existing entities and structures that are currently actively working on some of these training tasks that could be effectively leveraged for an action team?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o POST; SEMS/NIMs; all state agencies provide SEMS/NIMs; OES; CSTI, FIRESCOPE</li> <li>o Firescope, (COML) for SOPs. ICS, local fire service via Firescope</li> </ul>
	2. What are the organizations entities that would be important to include in an action team?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o OES, Post, National Guard, need to identify COML orgs.</li> <li>o G575 = FEMA or OHS; CSTI, Comm specialist (urban search and rescue)</li> </ul>
	3. Is there a specific role for COML organizations for this initiative? What would it be?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o COML training. Full integration of communications training into other training and exercises.</li> <li>o Ex. Full integration into IC learns about Interop.</li> <li>o Awareness level COML training should be available and needed at all levels.</li> <li>o Fire is focus of COML training;</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o National Guard may have COML training.</li> <li>o Federal level of training in SEMs/NIMs (supported by federal dollars).</li> <li>o Create interop curriculum standard: 100 level for familiarity; 200 level for operations; 300 level for management.</li> <li>o Create separate module now but include in 100/200, 700/800 courses.</li> <li>o Create an interop standard to be injected into a training exercise.</li> <li>o Require certification at a local level that includes SEMS/NIMs training and the exercise participation.</li> </ul>
	4. What about NGO's and other volunteer partners for this action team? Who might they be?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Non-governmental agencies: red cross; private vendors; cert teams; ham radio operators; salvation army.</li> </ul>
	6. What about any private entities for partners for this action team? Who might they be?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Unknown. Needs to be created no contact person.</li> <li>o Possibly use CALFIRE academy;</li> <li>o Utilize CICO office if implemented.</li> <li>o DGS.</li> </ul>
	7. Are there training programs across state borders that need to be coordinated with for this initiative?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Firescope; RECC = collect</li> </ul>
	8. Any particular linkages that could be leveraged with any of the other actions teams/initiatives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o US Forest Service, OES, link w RECC, DHS and OHS. Incorporate some of these questions into the grant requirements. SICP = mandate training drills and exercises; Statewide standards / best practices;</li> </ul>
<b>(Group 5 con't) Initiative 11: USAGE PLAN/ PROTOCOLS</b>		
	1. Is there any entity in the state that would be best suited to coordinate this initiative?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o OES/ Firescope - make it a requirement of a general exercise - after sufficient training.</li> <li>o OHS (training division) Golden Guardian Exercise - incorporate drills and exercises;</li> <li>o TICP cert exercises</li> <li>o OHS evaluation for Golden Guardian;</li> <li>o Corrective action plan - incorporate into GG exercise.</li> <li>o Include how did you ex. Deal w interoperability.</li> </ul>
	2. Any particular linkages that could be leveraged with any of the other actions teams/initiatives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o IFOG (DHS);</li> <li>o Regional Planning Areas/ CalSIEC;</li> <li>o PSRSPC;</li> <li>o Expand Firescope to include all hazards representation.</li> </ul>

**GROUP 6: Initiative 12: Coordinated Interoperable Communications with Neighboring States & Mexico**

<p>Group 6, Round 1</p>	<p>1. Are there any organizations, committees, groups, federal agencies, etc currently dealing with neighboring states and Mexico that are natural partners to work on an action team (besides the SDRCS and HLCC)? If so, what and who are they and contact info for them?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OES and OHS, FEMA?</li> <li>○ FEMA with the new RECC.</li> <li>○ Reg 9 Calif/ AZ/ NV; Reg 10 = OR.</li> <li>○ OES regional planning groups;</li> <li>○ mutual aid groups;</li> <li>○ SUASI/UASI</li> <li>○ Coordinate w states/ Mex.</li> <li>○ Arizona RPCs,</li> <li>○ Nevada RPCs,</li> <li>○ FCC</li> </ul>
	<p>2. Who are some of the key stakeholder in border counties that may also be key for an action team?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ FCC contacts? RECC? Consist of key stakeholders? (CALFIRE)</li> <li>○ SDRCS Calif Public Radio Assoc;</li> <li>○ First Responder Group that focuses CPRA (So Cal APCO chapter) APCO?</li> <li>○ San Diego, Imperial, Riverside, San Bernardino, Inyo Kern, Alpine, Placer, Nevada, Butte, Humboldt, Modoc, Trinity, and other boarding counties.</li> </ul>
	<p>3. Any particular linkages that could be leveraged with any of the other actions teams/initiatives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SAFECOM Initiative (federal); Initiative 13; Calif Emergency Response Plan; TWG; GEOEC</li> <li>○ Develop SOPs jointly with neighboring statewide interop gateways (initiative 15).</li> <li>○ Develop protocols with neighboring states (I-11).</li> </ul>
	<p>4. How might FEMA be effectively partnered with for this initiative?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Add FEMA to CalSIEC and PSRSPC efforts?</li> <li>○ RECC or is there already a linkage between OHS and FEMA?</li> <li>○ Also any other groups representing law enforcement, safety, justice, fire assoc, etc.</li> <li>○ Vendor Associations/ Groups?</li> <li>○ By assuming the role of the interstate coordinator and providing resources for the interoperation (caches, etc), housing, and repeaters.</li> </ul>

**GROUP 7: Initiative 13: Major Transit Systems, Ports, and Rail Operations**

	<p>1. Who are rail and policy subject matter experts that may have interest participating in or providing info to an action team?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ @ Cal OES Coastal Region: Mark Seeman; Sandra McKenzie</li> <li>○ Needs frequency sharing and MOUs.</li> </ul>
	<p>2. Anyone have contacts with the Regional Transit Security Working Groups (RTSWG),</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ John Urban @ mtg - RTSWG; Geoff Georgevich @ mtg - CMSC; In SF Bay Area - Neptune Coalition – CMSC</li> <li>○ No.</li> </ul>

	the California Maritime Security Council (CMSC) that may be helpful in outreaching to these groups for participation in an action team?	
	3. Any other key groups that may be important to invite to participate? Names, contacts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Railroad Police; Harbormasters Professional association</li> </ul>
	4. What action steps would help launch this effort and what time lines would you attach to them?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Agenda time at MARAC meetings</li> </ul>
	5. Who would perform these action steps?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Staff positions funded in part or whole by port security grants.</li> </ul>
	6. Are there some particular challenges to carrying out this initiative and how might they be addressed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There is not much precedent for rail and ports to intercommunicate. Transit is in somewhat better shape (witness MTC in Bay Area).</li> </ul>

**GROUP 8: Initiative 15: SOPs Gateways**

	1. How would it be best achieved the leveraging of FIREScope and the PSRSPC efforts as described above?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There are a lot of agencies buying them.</li> <li>○ PSRSPC should be coordinated.</li> <li>○ ID agencies who have them.</li> <li>○ Develop statewide policies;</li> <li>○ Under-deployed CHP has 12 fully operational.</li> <li>○ How to best leverage: -- spectrum management and frequency sharing agreements in place; -- coordination is key, possible to knock a first responder system off the air.</li> <li>○ Compliance of frequency agreements and coupled with FCC frequency license is valid.</li> <li>○ Problem - just gathering the initial data.</li> <li>○ Use working groups already established thru CalSIEC;</li> <li>○ Question about why interop channels are not sufficient. Nothing is wrong, just placing structure around how we operate together consistently.</li> <li>○ A specific protocol has been developed.</li> <li>○ Gateway potential is critical in local system failure.</li> <li>○ Gateways require a lot of planning and there is a potential that one agency may not</li> </ul>
--	---	---

		<p>want to participate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OES/ Firescope and other current operators convening to capture existing sops and enlarging. Who has them? Policies/ Protocols? How, When used?</li> <li>○ Coordination/ governance? Identify who has them.</li> <li>○ Develop guidelines for use; solicit frequency sharing.</li> <li>○ CalSCIP is the state plan -- none of the gateways have consistent SOPs.</li> <li>○ Licensing issues for fixed gateways must be addressed.</li> <li>○ Look at other states (NY, TX) to find out best practices; what worked, why they're no longer using; was it interim?</li> </ul>
	2. What groups, organizations, entities, etc would be interested in participating on an action team? Contact names?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ * Need revived gateway work group with all players at the table.</li> <li>○ Counties Calfire, regional Red Cross chapters, law, fire, EMS, mil, DGS, OES, Fed, etc. RCS vs. other systems EMS, etc; CalSIEC, Firescope; law, OES</li> <li>○ Leveraging LARTCS as a model for SOP; bay area SUASI - Laura Phillips as delegate; other states</li> </ul>
	3. What steps could be taken to encourage the participation of Tribal first responders in the PSRSPC Gateway SOP development? Any current mechanisms that could be tapped for this purpose? How would links be made with county services for the SOP's?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Need ways to build bridge to tribes.</li> <li>○ Planning, agreements and enforcement of agreements.</li> <li>○ Area tribal councils;</li> <li>○ FUA's developed at all levels;</li> <li>○ Protocol - MOU statewide.</li> <li>○ Connect with Tribal Fire Departments</li> <li>○ More outreach - PSRSPC going to them.</li> <li>○ We need to look at what systems they use.</li> </ul>
	4. Any particular linkages that could be leveraged with any of the other actions teams/initiatives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ So Cal fire authority</li> <li>○ Funding to facilitate acquiring equipment (I-16).</li> <li>○ Mou's.</li> <li>○ Planning/ inventories; protocols; coordination; enforcement?</li> <li>○ FCC compliance</li> <li>○ COML make sure they're part of plan; NPSTC.</li> </ul>

## GROUP 9: Initiative 16: FUNDING

	<p>1. Some local governments have explored/developed funding mechanisms on public safety communications. Any contacts?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Addition to E911 tax. Who would champion this initiative and what body would define priorities? Pursuit of earmarks. (also answer for #3)</li> </ul>
	<p>2. To leverage the 2008 recommendation in the PRSPSC report, will likely involve work with the legislature. What groups would have such resources to help that could be tapped for an action team?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Calsiec , PSRSPC, SUASI</li> </ul>
	<p>3. Are there any other funding strategies that could be leveraged?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○</li> </ul>
	<p>4. What organizations do you think would be key for this action team? Any contact info with them?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Need to identify a group or method to provide a voice for non-UASI agencies.</li> </ul>
	<p>Other Comments:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 911 fee on cell</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ public safety fee/ property tax</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ sales tax revenue sharing agreement</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Community service district - planning areas with taxing authority - end user.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ state fund backbone</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ regional fix - use planning areas; - ID leap; Gaming Fees</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tax fund - equip infrastructure - question on maintenance.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 2: CalSCIP Initiative Work Group Sign-up Results

NAME	1 Calsiec Charter	2 Calscip Govern	4 CSIC	5 SoS	8 Spectrum * Link with 12	10 Training	15 Gateway SOPS	16 Funding	Combined
1. Vincent Buehler	1								1
2. John Powell	1	2	4						1, 2, 4
3. Teresa Serata	1							16	1, 16
4. Chuck Parker	1							16	1, 16
5. Kent Eldridge	1							16	1, 16
6. Karen Avara	1							16	1, 16
7. Phil Caporale	1			5				16	1, 5, 16
8. Robert Stevens	1							16	1, 16
9. Ken Alvis	1							16	1, 16
10. Mary Cook	1	2	4						1, 2, 4
11. Angele Azevedo	1								1
12. Bill McCammon		2							2
13. Guy Bernardo				5					5
14. Charlie Fleshman				5	8				5, 8
15. Jerry Gamez				5					5
16. Ron Wong					8				8
17. Ken Mann					8				8
18. Jon Lopey					8		15		8, 15, 16
19. Bill DeCamp					8		15		8, 15
20. Andy McMurry					8			16	8, 16
21. Tonya Hines						10			10
22. Samuel Williams			4			10			4, 10
23. John Gulserian							15		15
24. Michael Chandler							15	16	15, 16
25. Tom Busk							15		15
26. Laura Phillips								16	16
27. Michelle Geddes								16	16
28. Sheryl Contois								16	16
	11	3	3	4	6	2	5	12	

