

**WASHINGTON STATE  
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY (CHS)  
MEETING MINUTES**

**December 7, 2005**

**MEMBERS & ALTERNATES PRESENT**

Mr. Dennis Anderson, Department of Health (Alternate)  
Mr. Mark Arras, Fire Protection Bureau  
Mr. David Byers, Department of Ecology (DOE)  
Mr. Scott Chapman, Department of Information Services (DIS)  
Ms. Linda Crerar, Department of Agriculture (Alternate)  
Mr. D'Acci, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)  
Mr. Dan Eikum, Washington State Patrol (WSP)  
Dr. Lee Glass, Department of Labor and Industries  
Mr. Jim Hall, Washington State Emergency Management Association (WSEMA) (Alternate)  
Mr. Roger Hieb, Emergency Management Division (EMD) (Alternate)  
COL Craig King, Military Department (MD)  
Mr. Mike Matlick, State Fire Marshal  
Mr. Jim Mullen, EMD  
Mr. Dave Peterson, Local Public Health (Alternate)  
Mr. Bruce Roberts, WASPC (Alternate)  
Mr. Steve Romines, Emergency Medical Services  
Mr. Jim Scharf, Co-chair, Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC)  
Mr. John Scheer, Homeland Security Regions  
Mr. Roger Serra, WSEMA  
Chief A.D. Vickery, WSAFC (Alternate)  
Mr. Dick Walter, Association of Washington Business  
Mr. Bill Wolak, Urban Cities

**MILITARY DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT**

Mr. Mario Badua, EMD  
Mr. Alec Chapman, EMD  
Ms. Amy Cook, MD  
Mr. Bob Isaman, EMD  
Ms. Cheryl Jardine, EMD  
Mr. Donald MacSparran, EMD  
Mr. Max Messman, EMD  
Ms. Evelyn Peters, EMD  
Ms. Arel Solie, EMD  
Ms. Jennifer Swidler, EMD  
Mr. John Ufford, EMD

**GUESTS PRESENT**

Mr. Dave Byrnes, Homeland Security Region 9  
Mr. Neil Clement, Region 1  
Mr. Bill Edstrom, Spokane Regional Health District  
Mr. John Fortugno, Homeland Security Institute  
Ms. Karin Frinell-Hanrahan, Office of Financial Management/WCNCS

Ms. Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services (Minutes Secretary)  
Ms. Kate Greenquist, US Attorney General's Office  
Mr. Dave Hyres, United States Coast Guard (USCG)  
Mr. Steve Kalmbach, WSP  
Mr. James Kane, US Army Reserve (SEPLO)  
Mr. Bruce Kuennen, WASPC  
Mr. Bill Miele, IPSC  
Mr. John Orfao, US Army Reserve  
Mr. Thomas Peterson, WSDOT  
Mr. Don Pierce, WASPC  
Mr. Ernie Schnabler, Region 4  
Mr. Tom Symonds, Region 5  
Mr. Charles Walruff, Yakima Training Center

### **OPENING/INTRODUCTION**

Mr. Roger Serra called the meeting to order at 1:07 p.m.

All present provided self-introductions.

Mr. Jim Scharf representing WASPC was introduced as the new Co-chair for CHS.

### **Approval of Minutes for October 5, Meeting**

**A.D. Vickery moved, seconded by Dave Byers, to approve the minutes of October 5, 2005 as presented. Motion carried.**

### **UPDATES**

#### **ODP Grant Update**

Ms. Arel Solie briefed members on the status and process to apply for FFY06 Homeland Security Program Grant (HSGP) funds.

On November 16, approximately 45 stakeholders representing Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) and homeland security met and received technical assistance from Department of Homeland Security (DHS) on the state's application for FFY06 Homeland Security Grant Funds. The meeting covered how to develop an enhancement plan and funding justification.

Step one of the process included the recent update to the state' strategic plan. Step two efforts will involve establishing a statewide working group to identify strengths and weaknesses and gaps and efficiencies in the state's preparedness for homeland security. The program capability review is a high level mechanism for evaluating state homeland security capability and program strengths and weaknesses. The results will be used to develop a Program and Capability Enhancement Plan for the maintenance of strengths and mitigation of weaknesses of the state's homeland security program and capabilities. The Enhancement Plan will guide the investment justification on how the state plans to expend FFY06 Homeland Security Grant Funds to bridge gaps in the Enhancement Plan.

Ms. Solie reviewed the National Preparedness Goal (NPG) comprised of seven national priorities:

- Implement the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and National Response Plan (NRP)
- Expanded Regional Collaboration
- Implement the Interim National Infrastructure Protection Plan
- Strengthen Information Sharing and Collaboration Capabilities
- Strengthen Medical Surge and Mass Prophylaxis Capabilities
- Strengthen CBRNE Detection, Response, and Decontamination Capabilities.

The state's three major priorities focus on:

- Food and Agriculture Safety and Defense
- Citizen Preparedness and Participation
- Critical Infrastructure Protection

To meet federal deadlines, a December 3-day workshop will be convened to complete the program capability review and develop the Enhancement Plan and Investment Justification. The effort brings together key stakeholders within the state to identify strengths and weaknesses of the state's current homeland security program and capabilities. The group will assist the state in aligning the goals and objectives in their homeland security program with the National Preparedness Goal. Subject matter experts will be present to assist. Attendance is expected to be approximately 200 people. The statewide plan must be completed by January 1, 2006 to prepare the grant application.

The first day of the workshop will involve the capabilities review with the second day focusing on development of a draft Enhancement Plan followed by a draft of the state's Investment Justification on the last day of the workshop. The effort will be led by a facilitator.

The investment justification describes how FY 2006 HSGP funds will be utilized to support initiatives outlined in the Enhancement Plan. It will be evaluated based on how effectively the state's solution addresses identified needs and mitigates risk. The document will be submitted with the Enhancement Plan as part of the FY 2006 HSGP application.

The Enhancement Plan will be sent to stakeholders in January for a short review period. Regions will submit an investment justification for each initiative identified in their respective action plans. After review by DSEG and OFM of the final Enhancement Plan and Investment justification, the documents will be sent to the Governor for review and approval for submission to DHS on March 2, 2006.

Ms. Solie reported the application process is different than in previous years. The state has two choices – do not comply and receive no funding or work within the short timeframe and receive funding. It is imperative that all stakeholders participate in the process.

Ms. Solie addressed questions about the short timeline, how regional processes will align with the effort, and how funding will be allocated. There is no funding limit attached to the application. The state will need to document what it can accomplish within the 24 month grant performance period. After receipt of the funding award, guidance will be provided to the regions.

Mr. Serra expressed concerns about the short timeline for regions to submit funding justifications by January based on the Enhancement Plan. Ms. Solie agreed there is a short lead time. EMD just recently received the template. Hopefully, the regions have been considering their respective funding needs for 2006. Regions will need to align activities with the initiatives from the Enhancement Plan.

Discussion ensued about the short timeline and eligible activities for funding. Ms. Solie responded that the process is different than in previous years and there is no guarantee the state will receive similar awards. The capabilities review, Enhancement Plan, and Investment Justification are new processes and it is imperative for all stakeholders to participate. The effort includes incorporating the state's regional processes and state agency plans into the process. Initial information released on December 2 indicates there is no UASI allocation or CCP/MMRS amounts designated. During the past year, the state has been lobbying to allow hiring of analysts with Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETPP) funds. Currently, Washington Joint Analytical Center (WAJAC) is working with contract employees. The FFY06 grant will allow hiring FTEs but with a caveat of restricting the hires to the 24-month performance period. The state will need to develop a plan documenting sustainability of the WAJAC plan.

Mr. Bob Isaman pointed out that the LETPP grant may be insufficient to fund WAJAC. Ms. Solie noted that LETPP costs can only be covered by the LETPP grant. The FFY06 grant has specific crosswalks and dictates what activities can be specifically funded – there is no crossover allowed.

Ms. Solie shared information on the funding percentage allocated for state and local grant administration costs. The state is limited to 5% and locals have been designated 3%. However, the state can augment the local allocation not to exceed 5%. The guidance includes a 15% cap on personnel. The nationwide average is 8%. Additionally, some of the recording requirements have been changed making the process difficult as well as shortening some of the deadlines.

Ms. Solie reported DHS and the Presidential Directive focus on all hazard. DHS has reiterated the grant is terrorism focused. However, DHS has lifted the some restrictions to enable all hazard planning as long as it is part of the terrorism effort.

Mr. Serra asked whether there are similar guidelines for the HRSA and CDC grants. Ms. Solie reported the grants will be reviewed by a national review panel and scoring each state's application by how it will accomplish the directives.

Ms. Solie shared that the state is a leader in many areas. Leveraging can come from all areas and the state can document how it is leveraging its resources and demonstrate how through leveraging, the state is not solely relying on homeland security funds.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Action Plan Funding Recommendations**

Ms. Amy Cook and Mr. Isaman presented the Strategy Development Working Group's (SDWG) Action Plans Prioritization Recommendation.

Ms. Cook reviewed SDWG membership and the prioritization criteria approved by the CHS, EMC, and the State Interoperability Executive Committee (SIEC). The presentation included a

review of each action plan's score and prioritization recommendation along with an explanation of how each action plan was scored. Out of a possible 100 points, the highest action plan scored 85.

Ms. Cook reported she also reviewed 38 other state plans and the state's efforts reflect the state is leading and is moving in the right direction. The state's FY06 grant application will undergo a peer review process utilizing a score sheet. The state's action plans are utilizing a similar process, which positions the state in a better funding position. Additionally, the new terminology for action plans is "initiatives."

Ms. Cook reviewed the prioritization criteria:

- National Preparedness Goal Priorities – Must support at least one National Preparedness Goal Priority
- Capability – Build or enhance target capability within FY 2006 grant performance period (May 06 – April 08)
- Sustainability – Must be sustainable long term without federal funding
- Objectives – Specific, measurable, achievable, results-oriented, time-limited
- Implementation Steps – Specific measurable, achievable, results-oriented, time-limited
- State/Regional Benefit – Regional Benefit and Statewide Benefit
- IED Target Capability – Provides one or more of the Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Elements of Capability

The National Preparedness Goal Priorities criterion focuses on two areas:

- **Overarching:**
  - Implement NIMS & NRP
  - Expanded Regional Collaboration
  - Implement NIPP
- **Capability – Specific (Strengthen)**
  - Information Sharing & Collaboration
  - Interoperable Communications
  - CBRE Detection, Response & Decontamination
  - Medical Surge & Mass Prophylaxis

Mr. Isaman reviewed target capabilities for:

- Implementing NIMS & NRP
- Expanded Regional Collaboration
- Implementing NIPP
- Information Sharing & Collaboration
- Interoperable Communications
- CBRNE Detection, Response, & Decontamination
- Medical Surge & Mass Prophylaxis

Critical tasks for IED target capabilities include:

- Conduct IED Threat analysis
- Command, control, & coordinate IED response operations
- Conduct IED on-site response
- Perform IED render safe and/or disposal procedures
- Detect IED terrorist weapons

Ms. Cook reported the action plans were scored for FY 2006 funding needs. A total of 36 plans were received with one plan requesting contingency funding and six plans not supporting National Priorities. Those seven plans were not scored.

Action plans were due on October 1, 2005. However, not all action plans were received until November 21, 2005. Ms. Cook underscored the importance of meeting established deadlines to enable the state to meet DHS deadlines. Additionally, it is important for agencies to understand and apply target capabilities, review the guidelines and template, do the homework, and understand the goals to incorporate target capabilities within the strategic plan.

Ms. Cook and Mr. Isaman summarized the 25 scored action plans and described how the plans either failed or succeeded in meeting the criteria.

Mr. Isaman presented the prioritization recommendation totaling approximately \$4.8 million allocated to different funding programs (SHSP, LETPP, UASI, & CDC) in addition to a funding allocation split between SHSP/LETPP and CDC/UASI programs.

Members were asked to provide comments and concerns.

Mr. Isaman addressed concerns about the timing disconnect between the action plans and requirements for the grant application. Mr. Isaman indicated all the action plans relate to national target capabilities and the issue is how the action plans will align with the Enhancement Plan.

Mr. Jim Mullen indicated he was reluctant with approving a recommendation that he does not like or agree with as he is with being unprepared for the meeting with the EMC in January. However, he suggested moving the recommendation forward to the next level. The prioritization recommendation lines up with the program and capability review and development of the enhancement plan. He asked members to share concerns or complaints.

Mr. Serra complimented the work group for its work and detail of attention given to the priorities. It's important to recognize the action plans are state projects and that 80% of the grant award will not impact any of the state's projects. He agreed with Mr. Mullen and recommended polling members to ascertain whether the decision should be a recommendation to the EMC to review. It will be helpful to the process for all members to review the prioritization process.

Ms. Cook reminded members that it's unknown what the grant award will entail. The work is in the initial stages of the application process. The request to the CHS is to authorize the recommendation to move forward to the EMC at its January meeting.

Mr. Bill Wolak recommended eliminating the two funding scenario slides. Ms. Cook agreed with the suggestion.

Ms. Cook answered questions about the scoring. She stressed the importance of coordination, collaboration, and sustainability within the action plans.

Mr. Serra pointed out that there are some action plans that did not receive points and that if the agencies believe there is some argument for the plans; agencies could pursue the issue during the joint meeting.

**Linda Crerar moved, seconded by Steve Romines, to move the SDWG's Prioritization Recommendation to the Emergency Management Council for its review and consideration.**

Mr. Chapman commented on defending some of the less successful action plans and the time involved. Jim Mullen suggested that members that want to argue the value of an action plan should submit a justification in writing on why it fits with target capabilities. Mr. Chapman asked about the deadline for submitting additional information. Mr. Serra suggested reviewing the matter with the working group. Mr. Chapman reiterated his concerns especially since efforts and focus will be in gearing up in preparation of the grant application.

**The motion carried.**

Mr. Serra recessed the meeting for a break from 3:01 p.m. to 3:14 p.m.

### **Equipment Subcommittee**

Mr. Donald MacSparran reported the subcommittee approved 82 budgets of which 47 were Buffer Zone Protection Plans. Subcommittee members also approve 16 new equipment categories and Bob Isaman is working on a detailed list of approved equipment. The goal is to develop an online tool to enable jurisdictions to select equipment items that are allowed for quicker processing and receipt. The goal is to reduce the equipment ordering process to several weeks.

The Equipment Subcommittee has been operating under a draft charter and is now at the point to formally formalize the charter. He asked members for approval of the Equipment Subcommittee Charter.

**Steve Romines moved, seconded by Scott Chapman, to approve the Equipment Subcommittee Charter as submitted. Motion carried.**

Ms. Solie reminded members about the joint meeting between the CHS and EMC on January 4, 2006.

### **Training Subcommittee**

Mr. Serra reported the subcommittee will meet next month and select a new co-chair.

### **Infrastructure Protection Subcommittee**

Major issues discussed during the subcommittee meeting included data collection for critical infrastructure. There are 7 sectors that lack substantial data. The initial target for completion was December 1, which has been extended 90 days due to complex issues associated with

data collection and privacy issues. The goal is have a substantial amount of the data completed in the first quarter of 2006.

Members received briefings on a variety of issues to include the terrorism insurance act pending in Congress and a major national effort in developing evaluation tools. The subcommittee continues working with sector leads to complete data and review the draft of the National Critical Infrastructure Plan. Members will work with sector leads to develop appendices. EMD and the subcommittee are working on developing a 12-month work plan for presentation to the CHS at its February meeting.

Mr. John Ufford reported staff has asked DHS about the risk methodology with no success. It is unknown how DHS applied the national critical infrastructure database to the risk equation as well as gaining any clarification about the methodology for target capabilities. The state wants to mirror its work toward the national effort.

Mr. Serra noted that a number of counties have conducted vulnerability assessments and suggested it might be helpful for the subcommittee to obtain the data.

Mr. Ufford responded to questions about private sector public disclosure concerns concerning schools. The current exception to public disclosure is terrorism related vulnerability assessments. The schools have not met the court challenge and it is of much concern from the private sector about releasing information. A national gas association is proposing legislation to exempt information they provide from public disclosure. There are also other efforts to expand the legislation to different hazards.

### **Intelligence Subcommittee**

Mr. Serra reported the subcommittee met earlier and discussed the status of WAJAC and regional intelligence groups. Members revisited the original template and objectives for WAJAC and appointed a workgroup to reevaluate the document and will work to involve more law enforcement agencies.

The 911 Commission's report card on intelligence reflected a failing grade. The industry can do better. Other issues addressed included identifying who is in charge, who provides the guidance and champions the cause. Because of its neutral standing, the workgroup will push forward and review its finding to the CHS about the next steps for WAJAC and possible fusion centers.

Mr. Serra noted there is supposed to be a schedule for WAJAC to provide briefings to homeland security regions about the status of WAJAC and examples of success stories. He noted only a handful of the regional intelligence groups are working effectively and there will be efforts to assist them or possibility combining some of the groups. The analyst positions are a critical component of WAJAC and although consultants can be hired, some FTEs can and cannot be hired. Mr. Serra said he's unsure why some FTEs are allowed while others are not.

### **Agriculture and Food Security Subcommittee**

Ms. Linda Crerar reported the subcommittee held its second meeting on November 17. There was a good response from all levels. Regional homeland security representatives as well as federal and state representatives are in the process of completing the subcommittee's charter and action plans. Four subcommittees were established to address response, training, and

coordination that will meet twice annually utilizing different meeting methods such as video conferencing.

### **Advisory Group Reports**

Mr. Max Messman referred members to updated information on homeland security regions as well as a copy of Region 3's slide presentation.

Ms. Karin Frinell-Hanrahan provided an update on Citizen Corps. OFM's website now includes information about Citizen Corps, grant/funding information, calendar of events, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), and links to related websites. From January to June 2006, statewide community response training is also scheduled throughout the state.

### **MICELLANEOUS**

#### **Approval of Agenda for February 1, 2006 meeting**

Mr. Serra reviewed agenda items for the February meeting. Mr. Roger Hieb requested the addition of an HSRA briefing, which was previously postponed.

Mr. Serra noted meeting materials for the joint January meeting will be mailed as early as possible.

Mr. Romines commented that as a member of the SDWG he appreciated the work of members on the action plans and the efforts by Amy Cook and Bob Isaman.

Mr. Mike Matlick asked members not to accept additional comments on action plans or suggest a process. He reported that he would be duty bound to address any shortcomings in his agency's action plans and that the committee should not throw the process in the air. The action plans should move forward as presented.

**Mike Matlick moved, seconded by Scott Chapman, that CHS accept no refinements to the action plans as submitted and that the action plans as submitted are forwarded to the EMC for its consideration. Motion carried.**

Mr. Serra asked subcommittee chairs to update membership lists.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**Mr. Serra adjourned the meeting at 3:41 p.m.**

The next meeting of the Committee on Homeland Security will be on February 1, 2006 in Building 104 (Red Horse) at Camp Murray from 1:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. following subcommittee meetings scheduled from 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Prepared by: Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary  
Puget Sound Meeting Services