



SENIOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes for the June 15, 2026 meeting.

MEETING DETAILS

Date: June 15, 2026

Time: 10:00 AM

Location: IN Government Center South – IDHS Resilience Room

[Meeting Materials](#)

[Live Stream Access](#)

[Archived Meetings](#)

MEMBER INFO

Name	Present		Means of Participation
	Yes	No	
Jonathan Whitham	☒	☐	In Person
Joel Thacker	☐	☒	NA
Steve Cain	☒	☐	In Person
Dr. Eric Yazel	☐	☒	NA
Jack Zeeks	☐	☒	NA
Warren Lenard (Proxy – Hemant Jain)	☒	☐	Electronic Means (MS Teams)
Joshua Kiilu	☒	☐	In Person
Andrea Baughn	☒	☐	Electronic Means (MS Teams)
Kevin Hobson	☒	☐	In Person
Brian Baird	☒	☐	In Person
Joshua Gisi	☒	☐	In Person

MEETING MINUTES

1. Call to Order

- The meeting was called to order by Jonathan Whitham at 10:02am.

2. Roll Call

- Roll was called and quorum was met for the June 15th, 2026 meeting. See above for attendance details.

3. Approve Minutes from October 17th, 2025 Meeting

- i. Joshau Gisi moved to approve the minutes. Steve Cain seconded the motion.

Motion to Approve	Vote	
	Yes	No
Jonathan Whitham	☒	☐
Joel Thacker	☐	☐
Steve Cain	☒	☐
Dr. Eric Yazel	☐	☐
Jack Zeeks	☐	☐
Warren Lenard (Proxy – Hemant Jain)	☒	☐
Joshua Kiilu	☒	☐
Andrea Baughn	☒	☐
Kevin Hobson	☒	☐
Brian Baird	☒	☐
Joshua Gisi	☒	☐

4. Discussion

- i. General
- Rachel Cosner reviewed the attendance policy, electronic communication policy, and general meeting cadence of the SAC.
 - State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) 2025 was discussed. FEMA has released funding holds but placed programmatic hold on all national priority projects and all Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Activities (LETPA) projects.
- ii. Drones/Counter Drones
- Discussion occurred about whether the group would like to allow drones for funding.
 - Joshua Gisi spoke about some restrictions that law enforcement face when using drone technology and upcoming training for some IMPD officers.
 - Counter-drone projects
 - Gisi spoke about exploring this area. Awaiting training for some IMPD officers to be able to engage in additional work with drones. Policy will need to be built.
 - Discussion and explanation of counter-drone meaning and certain related terminology took place. Additional discussion of certain scenarios involving drones took place (e.g., drones dropping off contraband in a prison yard).
 - Jonathan Whitham suggested waiting to fund drone projects for another year due to desire for more information and existing funding elsewhere for such programs.
 - Joshua Kiilu stated mutual aid may be a method of closing gaps that counties identify if funding for drones will be limited.
 - Jonthan Whitham
 - If other higher priorities are identified, the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) can state that drone projects are eligible for funding but are lower priority for funding due to lack of federal guidance. This would also allow DHS to remain flexible and adapt if additional information or guidance comes.

- ii. Joshua Gisi stated that mutual aid would be a natural step with drones, and it would make sense and be a more efficient use of drone/counter-drone technology.
- g. Jonathan Whitham moved to keep drone and counter-drone projects eligible for funding but to also make it clear in the NOFO that such programs will be lower priority for funding. Joshua Kiilu seconded the motion.

Motion to Approve	Vote	
	Yes	No
Jonathan Whitham	☒	☐
Joel Thacker	☐	☐
Steve Cain	☒	☐
Dr. Eric Yazel	☐	☐
Jack Zeeks	☐	☐
Warren Lenard (Proxy – Hemant Jain)	☒	☐
Joshua Kiilu	☒	☐
Andrea Baughn	☒	☐
Kevin Hobson	☒	☐
Brian Baird	☒	☐
Joshua Gisi	☒	☐

- iii. Marion/Hamilton County Projects
 - a. Discussion took place about whether Marion and Hamilton County projects should be eligible for SHSP funds since they also may have access to Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) funds. Previously, there were a lot of programs that could have fallen into UASI bucket.
 - b. Eligibility between UASI and SHSP funding is not linked and funding for one does not exclude funding for other.
 - c. Jonathan Whitham suggested keeping the funding model the same to allow for flexibility if circumstances change. UASI funding should have a more regional focus, and SHSP funding should focus more on the needs of the individual entity applying.
 - d. Jonathan Whitham moved to approve to continue funding Marion/Hamilton projects as previously done, and the group will evaluate collectively how to fund and if certain projects would be better suited for funding out of UASI. Steve Cain seconded the motion.

Motion to Approve	Vote	
	Yes	No
Jonathan Whitham	☒	☐
Joel Thacker	☐	☐
Steve Cain	☒	☐
Dr. Eric Yazel	☐	☐
Jack Zeeks	☐	☐
Warren Lenard (Proxy – Hemant Jain)	☒	☐

Joshua Kiilu	☒	☐
Andrea Baughn	☒	☐
Kevin Hobson	☒	☐
Brian Baird	☒	☐
Joshua Gisi	☒	☐

iv. Schools

- a. Discussion to determine public school eligibility for SHSP funding took place. Last year, it was determined they would not be funded because public schools can apply under the Secured School Safety Grant for anything they would seek under SHSP.
- b. Jonathan Whitham moved to keep funding model same for public schools. Joshua Gisi seconded the motion.
 - i. Steve Cain asked if there were any issues with the workload for IDHS under the current approach. Rachel Cosner stated there were no issues currently.

Motion to Approve	Vote	
	Yes	No
Jonathan Whitham	☒	☐
Joel Thacker	☐	☐
Steve Cain	☒	☐
Dr. Eric Yazel	☐	☐
Jack Zeeks	☐	☐
Warren Lenard (Proxy – Hemant Jain)	☒	☐
Joshua Kiilu	☒	☐
Andrea Baughn	☒	☐
Kevin Hobson	☒	☐
Brian Baird	☒	☐
Joshua Gisi	☒	☐

v. Scoring

- a. Discussion about if any changes desired on how scoring is done.
 - i. Discussion on scoring rubric took place.
 1. Steve Cain stated he felt the scoring was good in the current state.
 2. Joshua Kiilu commented on the scoring process. He stated he has been working on creating a process to verify compliance and hold counties accountable for Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment/Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA/HIRA) completion when applying for grants. This process would also help gear training to identified needs and bring county stakeholders together to collaborate.
 3. Different scoring areas were discussed but no changes were suggested.
 4. Jonathan Whitham moved to maintain the same scoring processes for the next round of funding. Steven Cain seconded the motion.

Motion to Approve	Vote	
	Yes	No
Jonathan Whitham	☒	☐
Joel Thacker	☐	☐
Steve Cain	☒	☐
Dr. Eric Yazel	☐	☐
Jack Zeeks	☐	☐
Warren Lenard (Proxy – Hemant Jain)	☒	☐
Joshua Kiilu	☒	☐
Andrea Baughn	☒	☐
Kevin Hobson	☒	☐
Brian Baird	☒	☐
Joshua Gisi	☒	☐

vi. Any Particular Priorities

- a. Discussion about whether any specific priorities should be higher or lower this year took place.
 - i. Andrea Baughn stated a priority would be alert and warning systems based on interactions with stakeholders around the State. Rachel Cosner stated that it might be tricky for counties due to need to tie to terrorism prevention. Jonathan Whitham suggested that mass communication might be a way to link funding to this need.
 - ii. There was discussion about the fact that radios are typically a major request from SHSP funding and are eligible projects as long as the project is tied to terrorism prevention.
 - iii. There was discussion about giving higher priority to applicants that would be new entrants to the State system instead of just sustaining what they have. Highest priority could be given to applicants who would be new entrants to the State system and further demonstrate that there is local collaboration or they are providing local matching funds.
 - iv. Joshua Kiilu stated that many counties state they have certain gaps but do not complete their THIRA/HIRA which would demonstrate the gaps.
 - v. Different solutions for counties to get radios were discussed.
 - vi. Jonathan Whitham asked Hemant Jain about cybersecurity priorities. Hemant Jain stated that he did not see anything that needed to be changed for cybersecurity initiatives.
 - vii. Brian Baird moved to give higher priority to applicants that applied for mass communication software and applicants for radio projects that would be new entrants to the State system instead of just sustaining what they have. Highest priority would be given to radio project applicants who would be new entrants to the State system and further demonstrate that there is local collaboration or they are providing local matching funds. Kevin Hobson seconded the motion.

Motion to Approve	Vote	
	Yes	No
Jonathan Whitham	☒	☐
Joel Thacker	☐	☐
Steve Cain	☒	☐
Dr. Eric Yazel	☐	☐
Jack Zeeks	☐	☐
Warren Lenard (Proxy – Hemant Jain)	☒	☐
Joshua Kiilu	☒	☐
Andrea Baughn	☒	☐
Kevin Hobson	☒	☐
Brian Baird	☒	☐
Joshua Gisi	☒	☐

- vii. Any Changes to the Application Form
- Discussion took place about whether changes to the application were desired. No changes were suggested.
 - Jonathan Whitham moved to keep application the same. Brian Baird seconded the motion.

Motion to Approve	Vote	
	Yes	No
Jonathan Whitham	☒	☐
Joel Thacker	☐	☐
Steve Cain	☒	☐
Dr. Eric Yazel	☐	☐
Jack Zeeks	☐	☐
Warren Lenard (Proxy – Hemant Jain)	☒	☐
Joshua Kiilu	☒	☐
Andrea Baughn	☒	☐
Kevin Hobson	☒	☐
Brian Baird	☒	☐
Joshua Gisi	☒	☐

5. Information Regarding FFY2026 SHSP

- i. Rachel Cosner stated that the SAC Charter will be amended when the SHSP NOFO is out and certain edits would be made to date references, SAC membership, and Preparedness Grants Manual references.
- ii. Kristi Shute stated that minor technical edits would be made to the SAC electronic communication policy.

6. Next Meeting

- i. The next meeting date will be determined when the SHSP NOFO is released.

7. Adjourn

- i. Jonathan moved to adjourn the meeting. Steven Cain seconded the motion.

Motion to Approve	Vote	
	Yes	No
Jonathan Whitham	☒	☐
Joel Thacker	☐	☐
Steve Cain	☒	☐
Dr. Eric Yazel	☐	☐
Jack Zeeks	☐	☐
Warren Lenard (Proxy – Hemant Jain)	☒	☐
Joshua Kiilu	☒	☐
Andrea Baughn	☒	☐
Kevin Hobson	☒	☐
Brian Baird	☒	☐
Joshua Gisi	☒	☐

- ii. The meeting adjourned at 11:20am.