



DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting of
Bay Area UASI Program
Approval Authority

Thursday, May 12, 2011 - 8:30 a.m.
Oakland EOC Media Room
1605 Martin Luther King Jr. Way
Oakland, CA

ROLL CALL

Chair Kronenberg, called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m. All members were present. Daniel Mahoney (Alternate Member) attended the meeting on behalf of Monica Fields.

Chair Kronenberg stated that she had received a number of comments since the last meeting regarding text messaging. She read the following language received from the City Attorney regarding this topic, *"text messaging or use of other personal electronic communications devices during a meeting of a policy body presents serious problems. The Brown Act presumes that the public input during a meeting would be on the record and visible to those who attend or view a tape of the meeting but members of the public would not observe the text messages that members of the policy body receive during the meeting. Hence the public would not be able to raise all reasonable questions regarding the basis for the policy bodies actions and text messaging among members of the policy body concerning an agenda item or other business of the body could lead to an unlawful seriatim meeting in the midst of a formal meeting. Of course text messages that policy body members send or receive during a meeting that have nothing to do with the bodies business is okay if it has to be done in the line of work. A member of the public observing the meeting without knowing the contents of the text messages may assume otherwise"*. Chair Kronenberg stated that it is the opinion of the San Francisco City Attorney to avoid text messaging and strongly recommends that text messaging language be included in the MOU. She pointed out that text messaging can be a part of a public records request.

Member Domingo requested a copy of the language.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Member Hofmann stated that there were two changes to the Minutes:

- The correct date of the last meeting was April 22, 2011 not March 22, 2011.
- On page 12, there needs to be some clarity on the comments from Guy Bernardo in the sixth paragraph as the sentence was not complete.

Member Hofmann made a motion to approve the draft minutes of the regular meeting of April 22, 2011 with the discussed changes. Member Domingo seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Kronenberg introduced Barry Fraser, who has just joined the UASI Team and will be responsible for interoperable communications relating to such projects as BayRICS. Mr. Fraser



has been working with San Francisco Department of Technology and has worked on this specific project and is very knowledgeable. His position was previously held by Clement Ng.

Barry Fraser thanked Ms. Kronenberg for her kind words and stated that he looks forward to working with everyone. He stated that he had worked for city government over the last 13 years in San Francisco and San Diego in a variety of roles related to public safety and telecom regulations.

WORKPLAN FOR INTERIM UASI GENERAL MANAGER

Ms. Kronenberg announced that the Approval Authority members had a closed session meeting on April 26th in which Craig Dziedzic, a current employee in the Assessor's Office, was interviewed and unanimously chosen to act as Interim General Manager of the UASI as a search is done for the permanent General Manager. He will begin work on Monday; he wanted to participate at this meeting but he had other duties to fulfill at his current job. However, Mr. Dziedzic will attend next week's meeting regarding the MOU.

Priorities:

- Getting up to speed and making sure that he is on top of the grant process and requirements
- Getting to the know the Approval Authority members, other local partners and the key state and federal players
- Revision of the Policy and Procedures Manual to accurately reflect how the Approval Authority operates.
- Revisit the tracking tool and the process and if there is a more effective way to track items.
- Possible one-day retreat for planning and management issues (may be more suited for the permanent GM)
- Staffing Assessment (meet with each of the staff to get up to speed on current projects)
- Resolution of Outstanding Assignments and Agenda Items
- Provide a work plan with expected deliverable dates, understanding that whatever is not finished by Interim, will be carried over to Permanent GM.
- Have the mindset that they are in this role indefinitely and that way decisions are made for short and long-term results and it is not based on the interim position status.

STAFFING OF UASI MANAGEMENT TEAM

The Approval Authority members agreed to defer this item to the Interim GM for his review and assessment.

UASI PROJECT SPONSORSHIP

Chair Kronenberg stated that she put this item on the agenda because after the last meeting there was still confusion about the definition of an Executive Sponsor. She wanted to put forth a proposal for the Approval Authority's feedback about what an Executive Sponsor is and when projects come for approval to the Approval Authority;

UASI Management Team to discuss the role of a sponsor, often called Executive Sponsor or Project Sponsor; she feels for consistency it should be called Sponsor. The sponsor has been used to advocate for the project internally and externally, to develop the budgets and manage the procurement processes and costs, to resolve problems or issues, and to ensure successful completion of the project.



Member Reed inquired about the process for evaluating a sponsor. She would like to see a method for evaluating the sponsorship especially if the project involves multiple jurisdictions as it is important to make sure that expectations are being met along with all of the needs of the jurisdictions.

Member Lucia pointed out that most of the projects have deliverables; the level of satisfaction of the deliverable and the rate of deliverance of the deliverables would be ways to review the projects.

Member Hofmann stated that this should be put into the Policy and Procedures Manual and it should be required that the Sponsor report back to the Approval Authority upon project completion so that accountability is provided, further, she pointed out that there is value in looking at the various levels of sponsorship (Project, Executive, Fiscal) and either define and formulize this in the Policy and Procedures Manual or don't use them at all. Ms. Hofmann asked for further clarification on these levels of sponsorship.

Member Domingo requested that there be a consistent process for selecting sponsors; she recommended that the process be an RFP process as was done with the Training and Exercise. She pointed out that there have been opportunities for sponsorship relating to the RCPGP grant that she wasn't aware of. By having an open process it would make it equitable and transparent so that the UASI is soliciting anyone who is interested in sponsoring these projects.

Member Hofmann stated that the Approval Authority has been discussing approving the allocation process and should also be approving sponsors as well. She indicated the approval amount should be consistent with the amount in the by-laws (\$250,000) and should be on Regional Projects.

Interim GM will review this item and provide recommendations to include addressing the appeal process and identify various mechanisms that are transparent, expedient and uniform for sponsors in which the Approval Authority can review.

UASI 2011 ALLOCATIONS

Teresa Serata gave an overview of the UASI 2011 allocations as revised on 4/15/11:

- At the last meeting Member Reed had proposed to proportionately allocate the additional reduction to all of the projects – Regional Initiatives, Management & Administration, and Target Allocations.
- The project planning funding component for the Management Team was reduced by \$121,801 and will be left to the discretion of the Interim General Manager on how that will be implemented.
- There were conversations with the Executive sponsor for the Fusion Center, which is currently the San Mateo Sheriff's Office who delegated authority to Ron Brooks as the Director of the NCRIC. Their additional reduction would be \$249,668 and they currently have about \$250,000 allocated to regional training.
- Regional Exercise/Training program would be reduced by \$317,863. The recommendation is to reduce \$158,932 from the Training budget and \$158,931 from the Exercise budget.



- These are initial recommendations because at this time the UASI still doesn't have the 2011 grant guidelines and some of this information may change.
- In regards to Management & Administration the UASI is only allowed to set aside 5% for M&A, which is dependent upon how much is allocated to the UASI.

Member Reed made a motion for Alternative #3, to use the risk allocation formula and make proportional reductions across the regional initiatives and target allocations for the hubs. Member Hofmann seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-1 (the no vote was from Daniel Mahoney).

RCPGP 2010 BUDGET

Guy Bernardo pointed out that he had provided a more detailed report of the 2010 RCPGP suggested budget and allocations.

Member Reed asked for clarification on the Regional Catastrophic Incident Training/Exercise Planning for \$591,000.

Guy Bernardo explained that this represented the planning costs for conducting the exercises that are going to be specific to the Regional Catastrophic Plans that have already been completed or will be completed soon.

Member Hofmann inquired about the South Bay's proposal for FY11 funding for their allocation for a Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Exercise for the 15 cities Santa Clara County and Santa Cruz as well.

Next Step: the UASI would like to give all jurisdictions the opportunity to submit their proposals for exercises in which funding will be allocated based on the priority list.

Teresa Reed stated that there is a lot of money in regards to the Regional Logistics Plans, Regional Restoration of Lifelines Plan, Regional Training and Regional Public Outreach. She feels that the UASI needs to be more strategic in how the money has been distributed.

Action Item:

Provide an accounting of exactly how the money was spent so that when the Approval Authority is discussing this item next year, they can make a true evaluation and be diligent on how it is spent. She requested for FY2010 RCPGP any amount of \$500, 000 and above there be a spending plan outlining how the money was allocated and presented to the Approval Authority.

Member Hofmann stated that Oakland, San Francisco, and Marin asked for their own allocation for planning support and she wanted to know if Santa Clara County could have their own allocation as she feels that they would benefit from this.

Action Item: Teresa Serata to set meetings to discuss with San Jose and Santa Clara County (and Sonoma) possibility of funding regional planners.

Member Lucia asked for clarification on how the match is handled for the RCPGP budget.



Mr. Bernardo explained that all of the RCPGP grants have been an in-kind match in most cases or cash; very little cash matches have come in from the jurisdictions over the last couple of years. He pointed out that there is significant work being done in the local jurisdictions and the UASI has been trying to capture as much of this as an in-kind match.

Report due back in July.

Member Mahoney made a motion to approve the RCPGP budgets of the smaller projects in the amount of \$500,000 and under; the other projects will be reviewed at the July Approval Authority meeting. Member Lucia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

IECGP 2010 BUDGET

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon discussed the allocation of FY2010 Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program (IECGP) budget:

- The IECGP grant is a sum of money that is funneled through the Bay Area UASI as the fiscal responsible party for the Capital Bay Planning Area for interoperable communications.
- The Capital Bay Planning Area is one of four planning areas identified throughout the state's California State Interoperability Emergency Communications group (CALSIEC).
- The report explains the proposed projects and the agency that has been identified as the Project Lead or Executive Sponsor of the funded initiative.
- The sponsors of each project were chosen through volunteering or suggesting that the project be funded through the Capital Bay Planning Area.
- All of the projects have been vetted and supported through the Capital Bay Planning Area Working Group.
- The Approval Authority is the approving body of the expenditures because the City and County of San Francisco is the fiscal agent on the IECGP funds.

A report will be given, as requested to the Approval Authority detailing what happens with all of the funding for this project as a part of the Quarterly and Annual Reports.

Member Domingo made a motion to approve the IECGP budget. Member Reed seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

BAYRICS JPA AND BTOP BOOM NEGOTIATIONS

Chair Kronenberg stated that at the last Approval Authority meeting it was decided that this item would appear as a standing agenda item, which will appear at the end of the agenda with the other standing agenda items. The region came up with a final JPA that is being put through the process of approval by many jurisdictions. It may be stood up as early as June; it takes 10 specific entities to have approved it before it is stood up. She thanked everyone for their hard work and felt that the final JPA was a good document.

- San Jose would be taking the JPA to the Public Safety Finance and Strategic Support Committee on May 19th and is projected to be presented to Council by June 7th or June 14th.
- San Francisco will be taking the JPA to the Public Safety Committee of the Board on May 19th as well. The hope is that it will be heard at the full Board of Supervisor's



meeting on May 24th. The Mayor introduced this already to the Board and it already has three co-sponsors at the Board.

- Alameda will take the JPA to the Board of Supervisor's on the 17th for explanation and will be on the agenda within two weeks after.

Ms. Kronenberg stated that as co-executive sponsors, this agenda item will be a standing item on the Approval Authority meeting agendas.

RFP FOR BEST PRACTICES DOCUMENT

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated that the Approval Authority had received a report outlining the Scope of Work and an identified \$25,000 planning budget out of UASI FY2009 for a project that will deliver the specific deliverable - Best Practices for the Urban Areas Security Initiative. This document will consist of a number of things primarily shared resources, working together on large projects, multiple funding sources, and funding sources with a responsible match associated.

Santa Clara County had offered to host this project once a budget was identified; a budget has been identified within the UASI 2009 funds with a performance period, deliverable due date, of September 30, 2011.

Member Hofmann stated that back when the Approval Authority first started discussing this project, the proposal by Chair Hennessy had been for a budget of up to \$50,000; she is concerned that \$25,000 isn't enough. Member Hofmann requested for the budget amount to be increased to at least \$30,000-\$40,000.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon stated that since the amount doesn't have to be included in the RFP, the Approval Authority can move forward and if proposals come back in the \$30,000-\$40,000 range she would make sure that this topic would be brought back to the Approval Authority to discuss an increase in the budget; in the meantime UASI staff will look for additional dollars beyond the identified \$25,000.

Member Hofmann made a motion to approve funding and proceed forward. Member Reed seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon stated that the target date for this report to come back to the Approval Authority would be October 13th based on the Approval Authority's approval of the new meeting schedule.

UASI MANAGEMENT TEAM 2010 ANNUAL REPORT AND FY2011/12 WORK PLAN AND BUDGET

Teresa Serata discussed the 2010 annual report, which highlighted the various processes that the UASI has been working through during the last year. She pointed out that the strategic goals were organized based on the Homeland Security strategy and for consistency all projects will align with the strategic goals. Ms. Serata stated that next month she would be presenting all of the budget details to the Approval Authority for the various grants and projects in a report that goes back to 2007.



Chair Kronenberg stated that the report was very clear and it was nice to see all of the information in one place.

Member Reed stated that she didn't receive the Annual Report early enough to thoroughly review and comment on it; she recommended that the items are separated out and that the Annual Report is deferred for further discussion at the next meeting.

Member Reed recommended deferring the work plan until the next meeting so that the Interim General Manager has had a chance to review it and approve it; he can determine the best way to proceed.

Teresa Serata stated that it would be fine if this item was deferred as long as staff can still proceed with their duties so that work isn't delayed such as monitoring audits for sub-recipients and getting ready for next year's processes.

Member Domingo requested a summary of the work plans that were submitted to Ms. Kronenberg.

The Approval Authority members agreed to defer the work plan until the Interim General Manager has had a chance to review it.

Member Frizzie stated his concern about the number of vacancies and how critical it was to fill the positions. He requested that a briefing/update be given by the Interim General Manager at the next meeting regarding the vacancies.

Chair Kronenberg stated that she has been very concerned about the staffing shortage particularly in the accounting area as current staff has been working long hours and are behind on processing due to the vacancies.

Teresa Serata discussed the vacancies and explained that the CFO position has been vacant since December 2010 and one of the Accounting positions has been vacant since July 2010.

Member Domingo requested an organizational chart for review for the next meeting as well as clarification on the vacant positions (if they are new or existing positions) in the report to be presented in June.

Member Reed proposed that a list of questions be put together for the General Manager so that all of these questions associated with this item are answered at the next meeting. She will take the lead on putting this list together and requested that if the Approval Authority members had questions to provide them to her by next Thursday. She would like to give the General Manager three weeks to review the questions.

Member Domingo inquired about ALCO staff person that has been working on BTOP; there was a discussion about possibly funding it out of UASI.

Anne Kronenberg stated that in moving forward, she thinks that this position is valuable and would like to pay for the position, but it is not currently reflected. A proposal will be developed.



(The Approval Authority took a break from 10:52 a.m. – 11:03 a.m.)

REPORT OUT FROM THE ADVISORY GROUP

Chair Kronenberg stated that the Advisory Group had not met since the last meeting and that there was no report.

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated that the Special Advisory Task Force had a meeting. This Task Force is the smaller group of the Advisory Group tasked with looking at allocations, risk formula, obtaining necessary secret clearances, and to ensure that the work being done between the regional partners and the Digital Sandbox Project RAC is being translated in a manner that is acceptable to the Approval Authority. The Special Advisory Task Force is working on putting together their Concept of Operations, vision, goals, etc. The primary decision that this Task Force made was that anything that comes from the group would go through the Advisory Group first and then to the Approval Authority. She stated that the Advisory Group's next meeting is in June and they will provide a report then.

MEDICAL/HEALTH AND DONATIONS MANAGEMENT CONTRACT FOLLOW UP

(Regional Medical and Health Preparedness Initiative)

Michael Clark, Program Manager, was unable to attend the meeting, however he submitted a staff report that discussed the process used for the selection of the contractor and the scoring results. The contract was less than \$500,000.

Chair Kronenberg stated that the documents that Mr. Clark and Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon put together were helpful to her. She pointed out that it would be a cleaner if the Approval Authority retroactively approved this contract.

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated that right now the plan is in the public comment phase through the State's EMS level and once the public comment is incorporated and through the approval process the final copy will be ready for distribution.

Teresa Serata stated that she would e-mail the Approval Authority members a copy of the final Med/Health Plan per Member Domingo's request.

Member Reed made a motion to retroactively approve the Regional Medical and Health Preparedness Initiative. Member Mahoney seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

(Donations Management)

Guy Bernardo stated that he had submitted a report to the Approval Authority on the procurement process for the RCPGP Donations Management Plan and the contracting plan with URS

Guy Bernardo stated that the scope of work stayed the same and the RFP stated the cost adjustment language. He clarified that changes couldn't be made to the proposals after the selection process was completed and while URS was in contract negotiations. Mr. Bernardo explained that URS was not the lowest bidder, it is due diligence on behalf of the UASI. The UASI will try to negotiate the best price for contracted services. Once contracting negotiations



were entered into with URS that's when the UASI on behalf of the region was able to negotiate the terms of the contract at a lower cost with the same scope of work.

Guy Bernardo explained that there are many factors that go into selecting a vendor, the scoring criteria is very comprehensive and there is a sheet for scoring and commenting on the written proposals as well as the oral presentations. The finance piece is given to the CFO, who evaluates the financial proposals item by item and then the CFO turns in his scoring. Mr. Bernardo explained the four separate categories on the written evaluation scoring worksheet:

- Project Approach (with four sub-questions) - 50%
- Assigned Project Staff - 20%
- Experience of Firm & Sub consultants – 20%
- Fee Proposal – 10%

Mr. Bernardo pointed out that only the first three categories were scored by the scoring panelists and the CFO scored the fee proposal. He stated that he would email the Approval Authority members a copy of the written evaluation scoring worksheet as well as the scoring panelists' names, in addition he will provide a list of all of the awards to URS in the past 5 years.

Member Mahoney made a motion to retroactively approve the RCPGP Donations Management Plan; Rich Lucia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

PROPOSED NEW MEETING SCHEDULE FOR APPROVAL AUTHORITY MEETINGS THROUGH 2011

Chair Kronenberg stated that at the last meeting the Approval Authority members expressed their desire to start meeting monthly; a proposed schedule for the rest of the year was put together for the members' approval.

Chair Kronenberg asked if the Approval Authority members wanted to change the start time of 10 a.m. The members agreed to keep the 10 a.m. start time.

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon pointed out that the meeting schedule for the Advisory Group didn't change. Member Reed recommended that the standard Advisory Group report agenda item appear on the agenda every other month to coincide with their meetings.

Member Reed made a motion to accept the amended meeting schedule as it will alleviate the need for special meetings and when items are deferred there is less time in between the next meeting. Member Mahoney seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

TRACKING TOOL FOR UASI MANAGEMENT TEAM AND APPROVAL AUTHORITY TO FOLLOW UP ON ITEMS AND REQUESTS OF STAFF

Chair Kronenberg stated that the tracking tool has been very helpful to her and hoped that it had been helpful to the other members.

Member Reed reviewed and discussed the items on the Tracking Tool:

- #2 RFP for External Review of Cornerstone is moving forward with the request to possibly increase the funds.



- #4 Interoperable Communications Progress Report will be heard at the June 9th meeting. Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated that the Approval Authority members had requested additional information on this topic.
- #5 UASI Annual Report was deferred.
- #6 RCPGP- 2010 Budget was completed.
- #7 IECGP – 2010 Budget was completed.
- #8 Med Health & Donations Mgt Contract Follow Up completed
- #9 Identification of Minimum Qualifications for UASI General Manager – Chair Kronenberg stated that she hasn't had time to complete the MQ's for this position but will discuss this at the June meeting.
- #10 Define Executive Sponsor/Role of a Project Lead – the Approval Authority requested for the Interim General Manager to come up with some suggestions for this topic.
- #11 Role of UASI as Co-Executive Sponsor for BTOP/BayWEB wasn't discussed.
- #12 Vote to Approve the Allocation Formula was completed.
- #13 Second Extension of the Current MOU is in progress.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – GOOD OF THE ORDER

Member Hofmann announced that it was her last regular meeting that she would be in attendance at as she was relocating to Washington State with her family. She stated that it was a privilege working with everyone; it has been exhausting and at times trying. However, she is confident in the Approval Authority's ability to continue to do the best to support this region and the various jurisdictions. She stated that she was proud to have been a member of the Approval Authority and to have served the County of Santa Clara. She stated that her alternate Emily Harrison would be attending the next regular meeting.

Chair Kronenberg commended Member Hofmann for her hard work on the Approval Authority.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Member Hofmann requested that Member Frizzie give a presentation on the CalEMA proposed merger memo so that any implications are understood.

Chair Kronenberg pointed out that the agenda now has a "pending agenda items" section for better track keeping.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Member Domingo thanked the Management Team for all of the comprehensive reports which helps the Approval Authority for making better decisions.

Chair Kronenberg thanked the Management Team as this has been a stressful period of time with the transition; she can verify that they are working very hard.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:43 a.m.