

**PUBLIC SAFETY RADIO STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
(PSRSPC)
MEETING NOTES
- DRAFT -**

Wednesday, November 30th, 2005

1:00 P.M. to 3:00 P.M.

**Held at the Governor's Office of Emergency Services,
3650 Schriever Avenue, Mather, CA 95655**

Attendees

- Committee members (or designated reps)
- Technical Working Group members
- Public observers (see attendee list)
- Local and State agency interested parties

Documents Available

- √ Today's agenda
- √ Draft November 23rd *PSRSPC 2006 Statewide Integrated Public Safety Communications Strategic Plan* (Legislative Report)
- √ Executive Summary of draft November 23rd Legislative Report
- √ One-page summary of key elements in the Report
- √ Draft Collaboration Guidelines proposal for the PSRSPC
- √ "Gradients of Agreement" handout

Welcome and Call to Order

Adam Sutkus, meeting facilitator from the Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University Sacramento, called the meeting to order. Mr. Sutkus informed the audience that the purpose of this meeting was for the Committee to provide feedback on a complete draft of the Legislative Report submitted on November 23rd, 2005 by the Committee's staff-level Technical Working Group. A final draft of the report is due to the Legislature on January 1, 2006. Mr. Sutkus briefly went over the ground rules and introduced the acting Committee Chair, Grace Koch.

Chair's Greeting & Comments

Ms. Grace Koch, Deputy Director of the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (OES), welcomed all participants and observers and offered opening comments. Ms. Koch was acting as Committee Chair in place of OES Director Henry Renteria, who had been called away to a Governor's Cabinet meeting. In support of the high priority and fast track of the PSRSPC's work plans, Director Renteria used the opportunity to present Cabinet members with copies of the draft Legislative Report and let them know of the PSRSPC's status.

Ms. Koch extended her appreciation to the staff Technical Working Group and facilitator Adam Sutkus for their work in producing the Legislative Report. She remarked that the latest draft overcame a significant obstacle by allowing the technical component of the report to be articulated clearly and concisely.

Ms. Koch announced that there would be no formal vote for adoption of the report at today's meeting. Rather, the purpose of the meeting would be to have a dialogue by Committee members to comment upon the document and address any outstanding issues.

Part I: Briefings and Updates

Report on Meeting Goals

Adam Sutkus, meeting facilitator, said that OES Director Henry Renteria's meeting with the Governor's Cabinet provided the PSRSPC with a major opportunity for agency secretaries and directors to become directly involved in the PSRSPC's efforts. At the same time, this also presented challenges of additional scrutiny and comments on the draft report.

The original intent of today's meeting was to formally approve the Legislative Report. Instead, the most likely outcome of the meeting would be to finalize the Committee's expectations of the report. There will be another public meeting of the PSRSPC* to have formal approval of the final draft. In the meantime, the Technical Working Group would continue to incorporate final comments received from agency executives.

Report on Activities of the Technical Working Group

Adam Sutkus reported that the staff Technical Working Group had made considerable progress since the previous PSRSPC meeting on November 2nd. The Technical Working Group met 4 times over the last 3 weeks to incorporate comments received from the Committee members. Many advances have been made to the report, including:

- ❖ **Length.** It is a shorter document. The desire was to keep the main report as focused as possible. A Compendium was attached as a separate document for those interested in greater details.
- ❖ **Strategic Planning.** The report serves a dual purpose. It is both a status report to the legislature on the Committee's activities and a larger strategic plan for statewide public safety and interoperability. Initiatives and goals have been strengthened.
- ❖ **Action-oriented.** As a strategic planning document, it features an aggressive work plan with specific recommendations and action items for achieving its initiatives and goals.
- ❖ **Operability.** There is now a greater emphasis on issues of basic operability, and not just interoperability.
- ❖ **Partnerships.** The report calls for partnerships with the California Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee (CALSIEC) and other regional bodies. Rather than subsume autonomy or create mandates, these partnerships would be intended as way to work together to coordinate activities and leverage resources.
- ❖ **Best practices.** The report now provides succinct descriptions of successful systems already in place in California. More detailed summaries are located in the Compendium.

* The PSRSPC's next public meeting was subsequently scheduled on December 14th, 2005.

Part II: Committee Discussion on 2006 Report to the Legislature

Committee Discussion on 2006 Report to the Legislature

Chairwoman Koch opened up the meeting for Committee members to express their comments on the report. In general, Committee members remarked that the report had been substantially improved since the October 31st review draft. They also liked the separation of the document into a more concise Report and a longer Compendium appendix.

Although there was broad agreement that funding sources were an important issue, there was disagreement about specifically identifying “Budget Change Proposals” (BCPs) in the report. Common concerns were that BCPs were too narrow in scope to address the greater issue of funding, and that PSRSPC review and/or endorsement of PSRSPCs could undermine the autonomy of agencies to pursue funding requests specific to their needs. On the other hand, Committee members expressed common interest for the PSRSPC to provide mechanisms for collaborative information sharing and strategic coordination of funding requests to the CA Department of Finance and the Legislature.

There were several specific comments on text:

- On the description of renewable funding strategies, there was a comment to change the specific reference to “911” into a broader statement about effective models already in place.
 - The text was amended with agreement from the Committee.
- A concern was raised that the Work Plan calls for prematurely developing a Request for Proposal (RFP) before enough specific guidance is in place.
 - There was agreement to change “develop a standardized RFP” to “develop a criteria and outline for a RFP,” as well as to add a reference to developing a “Statement of Requirements” as an action plan for 2006.
- A comment was made that it was difficult for readers to reconcile the different Initiatives and Goals within the 3 Phases of the Work Plan.
 - There was agreement that the Technical Working Group would reorganize the Initiatives, Goals, and Work Plan to increase clarity.
- With regards to agency BCPs, a comment was made to change “endorse of these requests” to “support in pursuit of these requests.” This was done to emphasize that the Committee members will support each other as a collective of 12 agencies to move forward together to meet their common goals for interoperability while at the same time not impede the immediate efforts of agencies to address their critical operational needs.
 - There was agreement that the Technical Working Group would make this change and add a sentence explicitly state the intention of the PSRSPC is to support efforts of other agencies to meet immediate operability needs as well as facilitate interagency cooperation using the PSRSPC as a coordinating mechanism.
- A comment was made that there seemed to be 3 sets of deliverables in the document – in the Executive Summary, Work Plan and Conclusion. It was confusing to the reader.
 - There was agreement that the Technical Working Group would reconcile the different sections.
- A request was made to clarify the summary of Findings and Next Steps in the Executive Summary – make them more precise or break them out.

- There was agreement that the Technical Working Group would reconcile the different sections.
- A comment was made to remove references to specific agencies who were seeking BCPs.
 - There was agreement that the Technical Working Group would reconcile the different sections.
- A concern was raised whether the PSRSPC had the authority to review BCPs since they are confidential documents.
 - Discussion supported the coordination of the *concepts* contained within the BCPs, but there was no expectation that actual confidential agency BCPs would be physically shared.
- A related concern was whether the PRSPC had authority to veto BCPs by agencies who were seeking funding to meet their immediate-term operability needs.
 - There was agreement that the PSRSPC should have an advisory role but that the funding proposals should not be contingent upon PSRSPC endorsement.
- A suggestion was made to develop more details on how interagency dialogue and information sharing would occur.
- A suggestion was made to reframe the BCP terminology in the context of an operational business plan.

The Technical Working Group was tasked to address these comments and return a final draft to the Committee before the next public meeting of the PSRSPC.

Part III: Collaboration Guidelines for Committee

Facilitator Adam Sutkus presented the Committee with a draft *Collaboration Guidelines* document, a governance tool for the Committee to consider as it implements the Work Plan for 2006 as outlined in the Legislative Report. The purpose of the document was to clarify rules of engagement and help the Committee proceed with interaction and decision-making. The draft *Collaboration Guidelines* was an offshoot of a similar document that had already been adopted by the staff-level Technical Working Group.

Mr. Sutkus asked Committee members to review the *Collaboration Guides* and give their comments to their Technical Working Group staff representatives. He also invited Committee members to send their comments to him directly. Chairwoman Koch thanked Mr. Sutkus for his work on the *Collaboration Guidelines*.

Part IV: Comment Period

No members of the public chose to give public comments.

Part IV: Straw Vote in Support of the Legislative Report

In a straw poll, the Committee unanimously voted in favor of the draft Legislative Report. Formal adoption of the final draft would occur at the next scheduled meeting on December 14th.

With regards to process, Adam Sutkus emphasized to the Committee that the formal approval of the Legislative Report should have consensus from the full body of the Committee. This document would require an extraordinarily high threshold for agreement. Other decisions by the Committee could be done in a parliamentary format with majority vote and minority reports, but the Legislative Report must truly represent the collective position and strong opinion of all PSRSPC agencies. He informed the Committee that the staff Technical Working Group has worked on a consensus basis. The default process of formal adoption would be on a voice vote, with the Legislative Report be transmitted to the Governor's Cabinet by Chairman Henry Renteria on behalf of the Committee. Another alternative would to have an actual signature by each Committee member.

On behalf on Chairman OES Director Renteria, Acting Chairwoman Koch said that Chairman Renteria would accommodate whatever method of approval the Committee wants. She asked Committee members to indicate their preference in their comments to the Technical Working Group.

Part VI: Closing Comments

Chairwoman Grace Koch said that through the PSRSPC, the California is taking the beginning steps of a short term and long term approach to achieve interoperability. The Legislative Report clearly articulates the need for both interoperability and basic operability and steps to be taken for meeting both. The Technical Working Group has had much discussion and dialogue on these issues, and she was encouraged by watch the team work together to meet the distinct yet complimentary missions of all Committee agencies. The greatest strides for achieving the overarching goals will be done in partnership. For the State of California, this is something to be proud of. Other states will look to California as a model.

Chairwoman Koch concluded by recognizing that the PSRSPC's Report to the Legislature will not be a document that sits on a shelf—instead, it will be an active work plan for 2006. Next year the Committee will look back at the document and see if it had done the things it had committed to do. The Committee will be held accountable, and that what the Committee had wanted.

Chairwoman Koch closed by thanking everyone for their comments and for coming to the meeting.

Future Meetings

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for December 14th, 1:00 to 3:00 P.M at the Governor's Office of Emergency Services, 3650 Schriever Avenue, Mather, CA 95655. The purpose of the meeting would be to approve for transmittal a final draft of the Legislative Report. A notice will be put on the PSRSPC website (<http://psrspc.ca.gov>) and sent via the PSRSPC e-mail distribution list.

Attendance

Committee Representatives

Reggie Chappell – California Highway Patrol (CHP)
Mary Cook – Emergency Medical Safety Authority (EMSA)
Corey Cummings – Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR)
Nancy Foley – Department of Fish and Game (DFG)
Sony Fong – Department of Water Resources (DWR)
Richard Green – Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF)
Barry Hemphill – Department of General Services (DGS)
Grace Koch – Office of Emergency Services (OES)
Richard Lopes – Department of Justice (DOJ)
Robert Samaan – Office of Homeland Security (OHS)
Randy Sederquist – Department of Parks and Recreation (P&R)
Steve Takigawa – Department of Transportation (DOT)

Others Present

Charity Azadian – OHS
Ken Chappelle – CDR
Mary Cook – EMSA
Bill De Camp – DGS-TD
Reggie Chappelle – CHP
Dennis Elwell – DGS-TD
Richard Engelson – DFG
Lorretta Fine – CDCR
Gary Grootveld – DGS-TD
Mike Hewitt – CSG
Kim Ismail – DOJ
Karen Jackson – DOJ
Balbir Johl – DGS-TD
Dan Kelleher – Motorola
Chris Lindstrom – CA Assembly
Gail Lockhart – OES
Ken Martzen – EMSA
Jake McHatton – OES
Scott Mullon – Unisys
Glen Nash – DGS-TD
Markell Pierce – CA Department of Health Services (CDHS)
Don Root – OES
Glen Savage – CDF
John Schmidt – DOT
Charlie Simpson – OES
David Sumi – Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento (CCP)
Adam Sutkus – CCP
Carlos Talamantes – CHP
Stephen Virdure – DOJ
Steve Waters – Unisys
George Wiley – CA Assembly
Tom Worden – OES