



Bay Area UASI Program

DRAFT MINUTES Regular Meeting of Bay Area UASI Program Approval Authority

Thursday, November 10, 2011

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Kronenberg called the regular meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. Chair Kronenberg took roll and Renee Domingo, Emily Harrison, and Chris Godley were present. Chair Kronenberg mentioned that Dan Mahoney was attending on behalf of Monica Fields; Rich Lucia was absent and Brendan Murphy from the state sent word that he was running late.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES *(October 13, 2011)*

Chair Kronenberg stated that the minutes from the October 13, 2011 meeting could not be approved because they inadvertently wrote "September 8th" on the Agenda instead of "October 13". The minutes from the October meeting and the November meeting will be approved at the December retreat. Member Harrison suggested that if there were any corrections, they should be submitted. Chair Kronenberg asked the public and members if there are other changes to the minutes of the October meeting. There was no comment or response from the public or members. Chair Kronenberg asked that any changes or proposed changes be sent to staff before the December meeting.

3. STATUS REPORT OF THE PROCUREMENT POLICIES/PROCEDURES MANUAL

UASI General Manager, Craig Dziedzic, reported on the status of the procurement policies and procedures manual. At the October 13 meeting, it was requested that he provide an outline regarding the project in reference to the policies and procedures for the procurement. He attached a brief outline and overview to the Agenda item for Approval Authority review.

The purpose of the document is to provide the standards, policies, and processes for the administration of the grants and also to provide clarity and transparency around Grant's Management. Roles and responsibilities of the various entities participating in the project, including the Approval Authority, the Advisory Group, the working groups, and the management team will be included in the document. A second document will focus on the life cycle of UASI projects, from the project's identification (how it's organized and how it meets the group's strategic goals), through the planning and management phase, to evaluation and closeout.

Included in the written document will be procurement, financial processes, and administration through the development of templates and forms. Mr. Dziejdzic indicated that clear direction on project sponsorship, including the criteria necessary to determine project leads, the coordination of administrative procedures and shared responsibilities would be described.

Member Godley requested a brief report institutionalizing the grants management information prior to the full report. He expressed concern about the potential loss of key staff. He also requested to work with staff regarding graphic diagrams he would like to see added.

Member Harrison echoed Member Godley comments. She thanked Craig for exceeding the expectations of the Approval Authority in the preparation of these manuals. Chair Kronenberg also thanked Craig for exceeding expectation again and asked for other comments.

Member Godley moved to approve General Manager Dziejdzic's report. Following Chair Kronenberg's request for public comment, she indicated that a microphone was available for the meeting. There being no public comment, Chair Kronenberg proceeded to the next agenda item.

4. FY 2009 PSIC REPORT

Tristan Levardo, the UASI CFO discussed the status of the Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) grant. Funds have been allocated to Alameda, Oakland, and Contra Costa in the East Bay; San Mateo, and San Francisco in the West Bay and the South Bay. All projects have been completed with the exception of Alameda. In Alameda, three of the four project sites chosen for site improvement have been completed. UC Berkeley, the final site, will be completed this month.

As previously reported, San Francisco is now connected by fiber to the South Hill radio site and its 4-site 6-channel P25 700 MHz system is fully operational. San Mateo has completed its project adding the Pise Mountain site to its P25 700 MHz system. Contra Costa County completed the installation of 13 dispatch consoles with its Sheriff and Fire Departments, and the City of Richmond and Pinole Police Department will be receiving the dispatch equipment. Oakland's project has been completed and Santa Clara has completed its Phase I ECOMM Microwave project.

Santa Clara and San Mateo have been fully reimbursed. The final check of \$32,533 will be issued to Oakland by the end of this month. The remaining 5% of the allocation for San Francisco should be fully liquidated prior to the performance period. To date, Alameda has received reimbursements of \$818,918 which is approximately 17% of its funding and Contra Costa has received \$454,365 in reimbursements which is 23% of its MOU.

Four reimbursement claims from these counties are expected to follow shortly. Finally, as part of the on-site monitoring visit, updating of the equipment inventory worksheets has started and will be an ongoing process until early 2012. Interoperable Communications Project Manager, Jeff Blau, has inspected the San Mateo site and is scheduling the remaining visits for sites funded by this grant.

Chair Kronenberg asked if there were any questions and Member Domingo asked if this report concerned the FY 09 or FY 07 PSIC grant. Mr. Levardo clarified that it was for the FY '07 PSIC and apologized for the typographical error.

Capt. Mahoney asked when the East Bay projects are expected to be completed and Mr. Levardo indicated that all the projects in the East Bay are completed except for Alameda and it is expected that the final site will be completed by the end of this month.

Capt. Mahoney asked for confirmation that Contra Costa's projects have been completed and Mr. Levardo confirmed it.

After seeking additional comments from the public and hearing none, Chair Kronenberg moved to item 5.

5. STATUS OF BAY AREA UASI RETREAT- DECEMBER 15, 2011

Chair Kronenberg indicated that she, Mr. Dziedzic, Member Harrison, Aimee Alden, Sherrie Collins and Heather Tannehill-Plamondon had discussed the format and the hours of the upcoming retreat . They came up with a five-hour retreat on Treasure Island. It was also agreed that Aimee would be the point person concerning the planning of the retreat.

Aimee Alden introduced herself and described the idea behind having a retreat- that several new members of the Approval Authority are being added and it was thought that it would be helpful for the new members and the staff to get to know each other to build good working relationships. The group also thought it would be helpful to build a baseline of common knowledge about UASI. Some of the discussion items will include; how does the grant process work, how to write MOUs, and information on the by-laws. She further indicated that one of the attorneys from Meyers Nave will be making the presentation on some of the complexities of the Brown Act.

Aimee provided some additional details of the retreat and that the December 15th date replaces the December 8th date for the usual Approval Authority meeting. The venue is a beautiful reception hall called "Casa de la Vista" on Treasure Island. It has floor-to-ceiling windows that look out over San Francisco and is free since this is a government agency. Ms. Alden further described that parking is available and free.

The planning committee has identified a facilitator, highly recommended by Mike Sena, named Chuck Eaneff. He is an experienced facilitator who has worked with FEMA, the Department of Justice, and other agencies and is associated with the Center for Homeland Security and the Naval Post Graduate School. Originally, Mr. Eaneff worked for the Sunnyvale Public Safety Department and has local connections as well as national experience in facilitating meetings. He would be performing this service without charge and the planning committee recommends he attend and help facilitate the Retreat. The planning committee is still working on the details and the agenda and Craig Dziedzic will be sending out a formal invitation to obtain RSVPs as soon as the documents are completed.

Member Godley requested that the agenda include a summary of the UASI program, with a history and review of the grants, the programs and the projects that have been completed to provide some context for the new projects. Member Godley indicated that he did not want to see a Power Point that was extremely detailed, but this information should be included in the history. He further indicated that a separate issue requiring discussion is the future of the UASI program since, based on the climate in Washington, D.C., the UASI's future is clouded. Finally, Mr. Godley suggested that the UASI needs to discuss educational efforts to Washington in order to provide them with the importance of keeping the UASI grant funding.

Ms. Alden indicated that she would take these comments to the planning committee.

Chair Kronenberg asked for comments from the Approval Authority and informed them that this retreat will be a publicly noticed meeting. She further questioned the requirement of additional notifications and Ms. Alden indicated that no additional notices were necessary.

Chair Kronenberg indicated that the Planning Committee will meet again with the facilitator and thanked everyone for the report. She asked if there was any public comment and there were no responses. She then moved on to Item 6.

6. PROJECT UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL CATASTROPHIC PREPAREDNESS GRANT (RCPGP)

Chair Kronenberg asked Kathleen McKenna for her report.

Ms. McKenna indicated that the RCPGP Advisory Committee met on October 27th and discussed the projects for the FY 10 Grant. The first plan, the Logistics Plan, was discussed and the State will be the project lead. The scope of work for this project was provided to the group and some members wanted to add additional information. These requests were included in the RFP document provided to the Approval Authority. It is scheduled for release on November 15. The second project is Public Outreach and the first meeting of the Public Outreach Steering Committee occurred on November 9. They are in the process of preparing scopes of work for the three projects in the next month and she will be bringing that information to the Approval Authority. The third project is the Training project. The RECP group is working with the Regional Training and Exercise Team to vet some of the requested classes to ensure that the proper classes are conducted.

Chair Kronenberg asked if there were any questions or any public comment on this item. There were no questions and no public comment. She then indicated that Brendan Murphy had arrived. Mr. Murphy apologized for being late.

7. SELECTION OF VENDOR FOR THE REGIONAL PUBLIC INFORMATION AND WARNING CAPABILITIES ASSESSMENT AND STRATEGIC PLANNING PROJECT.

Chair Kronenberg moved on to Item No. 7, the selection of the vendor for the Regional Public Information and Warning Capabilities Assessment and Strategic Planning Project.

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon presented her staff report and requested that the Approval Authority approve the selection of the recommended vendor. She indicated that his selection was the result of the RFP process done through the City and County of San Francisco process and a review panel made up of regional stakeholders. This project, a regional public information and warning capabilities assessment and strategic plan project uses FY '09 UASI dollars. This is the third attempt at completing this project and, for various reasons the first two attempts were unsuccessful. In the first case, no vendor met the region's needs. In the second case, funding concerns in the FY '08 grant did not allow for this project to be completed.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon indicated that this will be a very valuable product and will support not only the catastrophic planning efforts that have been undertaken within the region but also some of the interoperable communications and warning projects that are being done with UASI funds as well. She further indicated that the City and County of San Francisco will be the fiscal agent on this project. A steering committee, made up of members from throughout the region, participated in the review process of the four proposals that came back in response to this RFP and a select group of the review committee participated in oral interviews. The original staff report was prepared prior to the selection of a recommended vendor; however, the revised report submitted indicated that Filler Security Strategies was the most qualified vendor, receiving 86.5 points out of a possible 100. URS was the second team and then Blue Water was the third in terms of points.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon indicated that the review committee requests that the Approval Authority approve their recommendation and allow the City and County of San Francisco to enter contract negotiations with Filler Security Strategies.

Member Harrison asked about oversight of the project and Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon indicated that not only will there be an oversight committee, there will also be a management team member assigned to work on this project. Additionally, steering committee members will continue participating in the oversight of the overall project. Further, since this project will require a considerable amount of work gathering information and working directly with each of the local jurisdictions, there will be a great deal of stakeholder engagement throughout the duration of this project.

Member Harrison indicated that she would like to discuss a change between their review committee member and their subject matter expert and Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon indicated that she would work with her.

Member Godley made a motion to accept the selected vendor and move forward with negotiations and Member Harrison seconded it.

Chair Kronenberg asked if there any further discussions or any public comment. Hearing none, the motion was passed unanimously.

8. STATUS REPORT

Teresa Serata reported on the status of the FY 11 UASI grant. She indicated that the grant award still has not arrived from CalEMA. Due to the fact that the grant assurances document has increased in size from 8 to 18 pages, she stated that this was the possible reason for the delay. Ms. Serata reported that she anticipates receiving the award letter sometime within the next week and will report to the Approval Authority on all of the information received.

Ms. Serata reported on the FY 2012 UASI funding. She described how, during the 2010 process, there was a major kickoff meeting but because of delays in the 2011 process, there was an additional delay of providing that information to the Approval Authority. The same procedure is being followed as in the past with the exception being more stakeholders will be providing input.

The next status report concerned the risk management training. Ms. Serata indicated that this training has been completed and there was a lot of participation. In addition, the risk baseline and the capabilities assessments have been completed.

Ms. Serata indicated that the draft analysis has not yet been finalized. A draft of the homeland security strategy has been prepared and it will be circulated so the management team is able to hold workshops next week. An initial Advisory Group meeting to begin discussing the grant allocation methodology has already been held. Teresa asked Advisory Group Chairperson, Mike Sena, to provide more information on this subject and then continued her report. Teresa indicated that the Advisory Group will review all of activities that have been forwarded to the 2012 process. Further, the strategy will also be brought to the Approval Authority (as well as the grant guidance) for review. The solicitation and evaluation of projects will hopefully start in January for a three-month period of time, so a sufficient amount of time will be available to solicit projects, evaluate projects, and make recommendations to the Approval Authority.

The methodology initially discussed at the Advisory Group meeting was discussed. Initially, the group had a discussion concerning the issue brought up by Member Godley earlier today and that is the

funding status for 2012. It was Ms. Serata's opinion that the UASI will not be receiving the same allotment. The reason for this is the prospect that there will be significant cuts, from the possible elimination of all but Tier I UASIs to cuts to the remaining UASIs. She also indicated that there is so much happening at the federal level that her answer had to be vague.

Ms. Serata asked if the Approval Authority they would like to hear from the Advisory Group first, or if they would like her to provide a summary of the discussion? Chair Kronenberg made a motion that Items 8 and 9 be combined and the Approval Authority agreed.

Mike Sena reported that the recent Advisory Group meeting was very good and that many of the members in the audience had also participated in the meeting.

The Advisory Group wishes to specifically designate participants, so at the request of the members, letters were sent to the County and City administrators of the core cities, requesting designated representatives for the Advisory Group to advise the Approval Authority.

To date, the Advisory Group has received only two responses and had hoped to have a better response. Mr. Sena will personally follow up to see if the request had been received. Mike indicated that people need to be present at these meetings on a regular basis so there is continuity in the information being provided to the Approval Authority.

The Group also discussed their composition and focus. The goals of the UASI grant, and how to ensure the sustainment of the region's capacity to prevent, protect, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism. From that discussion, working groups became a focus. Previously, there were eight working groups which made coordination a nightmare. Since the same people were in many of these meetings, it was suggested to reduce the working groups to four priority areas.

Mike outlined the four priority areas:

- a) Information Sharing Group: (intelligence, exchange of data and information);
- b) Risk Management: (primary members of the Advisory Group as the team with fusion center support, and anyone else able to contribute to risk management);
- c) Training: (working with the CBRNE group);
- d) Interoperable Communications Group (radio interoperability group).

He suggested that by focusing on these four initiatives then conducting an additional meeting to bring all the groups together for a day might be beneficial. This would be helpful also for those who have to drive long distances to attend the meetings. He also reported that these groups should come under the direction of the General Manager to provide information for the Advisory Group. Using this methodology, the group can develop programs and projects which is the next step in the discussion.

Mike noted that in the last year, there has already been a 25% reduction in Homeland Security grant programs and posed the question of where the region will be next year? Will there be another 25% reduction or will it be worse? Based on these questions, it became clear to the group that maintenance of the current ongoing projects (or at least the major projects) was important. Sena suggested that a sustainment strategy should be considered. He indicated that the group feels it is important to complete projects that have had a lot of public funds invested and are requesting that the General Manager provide a list of anticipated costs for the current projects and the amount required for their completion. He concluded by indicating that the group will leave the development of the working groups to the General Manager.

Mr. Sena stressed the importance of educating our representatives in the House and Senate. Currently, there is a lot of disagreement which will allow time for education to occur. He indicated that the fusion center is his primary focus and they cannot exist without the Homeland Security grant project. He will be in Washington, DC and will be speaking from 10:30 to Noon with House Staff and representatives to provide educational information and then at 2:30 will report to the Senate on the same topic. He is hoping for a good turnout to the meeting and based on his previous meetings, there is a great lack of knowledge about the importance of sustaining these fusion centers. He reported that he has heard questions about why this work is being done at the local level. Mike believes that the region has a lot more personnel resources and a great deal of local and state talent, which makes the difference.

Mike then introduced John Gordnier, an expert on information and intelligence. Mr. Gordnier was brought out from New Mexico to assist the working group develop policies and procedures for information sharing, specifically, public information systems and cameras. Mike described John's career history and experience with the Attorney General's Office and as a D.A. investigator. Further, John is working on the statewide privacy policy among other topics.

Chair Kronenberg asked if there were any questions and Member Harrison requested that a written report be prepared and submitted by the Advisory Group to allow the Approval Authority time to review it prior to the meeting.

Member Harrison agreed that reducing the number of working groups was a good idea and would allow greater efficiency and momentum within the groups. She noted that Santa Clara is trying to sort out secondary positions and give priority to communications and public health. She asked the Advisory Committee to think about the mission and title of the groups as she wants to ensure that all the priorities and the broader vision are met. She further indicated that she appreciated that they are no longer using the HUB concept.

Member Domingo commented that she also appreciated both Teresa and Mike's presentations and agrees with Member Harrison that the groups must provide a forum for regional collaboration but in a streamlined process. She also indicated that as funding dwindles, it is important to determine what projects can be sustained and examine strategies for doing that.

Member Domingo requested that she receive more advanced notice of the Risk Management working group meetings. Also, she indicated that she received late notice of the Capabilities Assessment, and due to the late notice and the "Occupy Oakland" situation, she was unable to send the staff she would have liked.

Member Harrison requested a calendar and Chair Kronenberg indicated that now that the Management Team has additional staff, a calendar will be prepared.

Member Godley requested that staff prepare a summary of the Advisory Group's recommendations and describe the allocation methodology. He indicated that there are three priorities: sustaining capabilities, funding gaps, and completing funded projects. He requested information on the process and mechanism for the quantitative allocation of resources and indicated that, at some point, the group will have to look at percentages or some other means of allocating funds.

Member Godley also discussed the issue of funding gaps, the risk analysis tool and corrective action plans for exercises. He indicated that the region has invested heavily in the strategic development of UASI initiatives and a strategy that's driven by many of the data assessment and analysis projects. Based on this effort, the UASI submits its application to the federal government. He indicated that the

use of the risk analysis tool may lead to problems and cited the example of a jurisdiction that holds an exercise which identifies a gap, where there is a possibility that this jurisdiction's gap may not be as high a priority as another and therefore should not be prioritized as highly. He stated that although setting priorities is the most important, the formal methodology - the qualitative and quantitative allocation must be considered.

A member of the public (unidentified) indicated that he agreed with the change away from the HUB concept. He also mentioned that there should be equitable distribution among the regional areas.

Member Godley asked Chair Kronenberg if a recommendation had been made concerning the continuation of the core City allocation. Mr. Dziejczak indicated that no recommendation had been made but was going to be a topic of discussion at the next Advisory Group meeting.

Chair Kronenberg asked if there were any other comments from the Approval Authority members. Upon hearing none, she opened the floor for public comment.

Chris Helgren indicated that he remembered a discussion at the Advisory Group that specifically dealt with public health and whether they should be included in the working groups. One of the issues discussed was the difficulty in moving these projects forward. He felt it was very important to remain focused on the original intention of the UASI as a terrorist-based response and capability program. He further indicated that the group discussed the public health element and the fact that other federal dollars were available to them.

Chair Kronenberg stated that there is a nexus to public health in these grants. Further, she indicated that there is a tendency for first responders, like law enforcement, to have the primary focus but that health needs to be there as well. She also indicated that the UASI is working to develop the meeting schedules and who should attend.

9. REPORT OUT FROM ADVISORY GROUP

Items 8 and 9 were combined during the meeting.

Ms. Serata noted that all comments made today will be taken into consideration and that no decisions had been reached. Member Godley suggested rolling the funding allocation recommendation made for 2012 into the working groups and Ms. Serata indicated that this has been done for the Advisory Group to make an informal decision.

10. BayRICS JPA STATUS REPORT

Chair Kronenberg introduced the next item.

Barry Fraser reported that negotiations are continuing and a lot of progress has been made over the last month because they were able to hire an attorney to help them work with Motorola. Specifically they are working to define responsibilities in some key areas. He further defined the specific areas that the JPA will be responsible for, what that exactly means, and technical design questions. They are currently working with the TAC team and Motorola on an interactive design process for which they will have more information as the technical components of the system come into place.

Barry indicated that Motorola requested a November 15 deadline for all jurisdictions to provide a finalized list of radio sites with either an executed site use agreement, or letter of intent and progress

report. They expect to have use agreements executed soon. On November 18, the JPA will finalize the new agreements to circulate to the JPA.

Beginning in December, Motorola will provide a report of the sites (the new site configuration, any back-hall changes, and their most recent design plan back to the NTIA and these the NTIA will be reviewing). At that time, the site list will include approximately 193 sites in the regional application. Both the JPA and Motorola will have to wait for the NTIA response.

On December 12, Motorola intends to begin ordering the equipment for the radio site system.

January 16 is the earliest date that the JPA can execute the group agreement which included a 90-day comment period. On that date, the JPA could take action on the new agreement. They are hoping to have negotiations completed by January 16.

On Other JPA issues Barry indicated that the JPA is working to get insurance coverage. In addition to special counsel for the new agreement, they hired general counsel for the JPA so that they have legal representation. They are working on the statement through the use of an attorney.

There was question from the audience about the possibility of an extension of the November 15 site list deadline and Barry indicated that was not currently possible due to time lines and other restrictions. Motorola will be responsible for improving the sites and making them ready for troubleshooting and installation. In the next phase, there could be substitutions, additions, or deletions and they are planning to work out the process for site remediation.

Chair Kronenberg asked if there were any other questions from the Approval Authority members or public comment on the item.

11. SCOPE OF WORK OF THE GENERAL MANAGER FOR THE BayRICS JPA

Upon hearing none, Chair Kronenberg moved on to Item 11. During the last Approval Authority meeting, it was agreed that the UASI would fund the BayRICS JPA General Manager position for a one-year period of time. It was with the exclusive understanding that at the end of that one year period, the JPA will have had enough time to get some infrastructure in place to take on the funding for that position. Barry and other staff from the UASI drafted a scope of work for the BayRICS JPA General Manager based on Bill McCammon's job description. Due to the funding, Chair Kronenberg requested comments.

Member Harrison clarified that this is not a City and County of San Francisco position. She indicated that this is a position that the Approval Authority will be overseeing as part of the Management Team but it is not a permanent position. Chair Kronenberg agreed that it is not a permanent position but it was her intention to go through the City and County process for a one year period and not to continue it beyond that time. Her intention was to hire this person for only one year because she wants the requisition for this position back at the end of the year.

Member Harrison requested the agreement in writing and Chair Kronenberg agreed since she wants to ensure that she gets the requisition back. Chair Kronenberg indicated this was being done as a favor to the JPA because they really need this position right now.

Member Godley asked if the BayRICS General Manager would be a direct report to the UASI General Manager.

Chair Kronenberg indicated that it would be the same type of relationship that the Approval Authority has with Mr. Dziedzic. That is, he is a City and County employee and serves at the pleasure of the Approval Authority. That's how the BayRICS JPA will want it as well.

Member Harrison stated that she believed that General Manager Dziedzic reported to Chair Kronenberg and Ms. Kronenberg agreed that that was how it appeared. However, she further explained that the process hadn't been completely thought through but she indicated that the BayRICS General Manager may or may not report to her but they will be a San Francisco employee for the year and will be taking direction from the BayRICS Authority.

Member Harrison requested that this be thought through and verified in the report because of the JPA ordinance.

Member Godley commented on the relationship between someone representing the interests of the BayRICS and working in the UASI General Manager's office and the potential for a conflict of interest. Further, he is concerned that the JPA might require an additional year of funding for this position.

Chair Kronenberg clarified that the requisition did not end in a year but that she would like the requisition back at the end of the year. She would like to see the BayRICS authority stand on its own and not rely on the support of the Approval Authority.

Member Godley requested an update on the reporting mechanism because of the time invested developing the policy and procedures information to the General Managers' relationship with the City and County of San Francisco. He stated that it was important to have everything in writing so that everyone understands, especially if it's going to ask the same individual to represent the BayRICS JPA, which may possibly be at odds with other jurisdictions or other members of UASI.

Chair Kronenberg indicated it was her intention to bring this issue to the next meeting of the BayRICS JPA so that they can put together some kind of hiring committee and move forward.

Mr. Fraser suggested that since the BayRICS JPA has legal counsel, it probably would be good to get an opinion from their legal counsel about the potential conflict of interest.

Chair Kronenberg asked how the Approval Authority wished to proceed.

Member Harrison requested clarification on the issues discussed and indicated that Mr. Fraser's suggestion concerning legal counsel should be considered. Further, she hoped that all would agree on the optimal relationship of the BayRICS General Manager representing the BayRICS JPA. If this is the goal, then the request to have a legal review of the issue is a good one. Chair Kronenberg stated that a lengthy legal review may not provide the JPA with a General Manager in a timely fashion but Member Harrison disagreed. Chair Kronenberg stated that it is her intent to move the process forward as quickly as possible because the JPA needs assistance and Member Harrison agreed.

Chair Kronenberg asked for public comment, and hearing none, moved to Item 12.

12. 2012 CALENDAR FOR THE APPROVAL AUTHORITY MEETINGS

Mr. Dziedzic indicated that he does not have a written report on the 2012 Calendar. He questioned whether there should be changes to the meeting dates as everyone is used to having particular meetings on the certain days and it is difficult to make changes. Chair Kronenberg had no objection to leaving the meeting schedule the same and asked for opinions.

Mr. Dziedzic then asked if the members wanted the Approval Authority meetings to be on a monthly basis. Chair Kronenberg confirmed that meetings will be on a monthly basis. However, when new members join the group, they may wish to do something different. At this point, though, she indicated that monthly meetings were appropriate. She then asked for public comment.

Undersheriff Mike Chasten of Contra Costa County indicated his support for monthly meetings.

13. SELECTION OF THE LAW GROUP TO PROVIDE LEGAL SERVICES TO THE APPROVAL AUTHORITY

Chair Kronenberg indicated that Item 14 on the Agenda would be discussed next because of the potential for a closed session of Item 13. Member Harrison asked if the closed session was necessary to discuss the legal services. She indicated that since she and the Chair were part of the group that was moving the recommendation forward, it probably wasn't necessary.

Chair Kronenberg then continued with Item No. 13.

Chair Kronenberg indicated that after the last meeting of the Approval Authority, she, Member Harrison, and Mr. Dziedzic met with the Meyers Nave law firm. They asked a lot of questions and were very pleased with the discussion. Ms. Robin Donoghue will be representing the firm but will have a large team behind her. It was Chair Kronenberg's opinion that the cost structure was reasonable and that the firm was very knowledgeable. So, it would be the committee's recommendation to the Approval Authority that Meyers Nave be selected as the legal representation for the Approval Authority. The chair asked if there were any comments.

Ms. Donoghue spoke and indicated that her firm is excited about the opportunity to be the group's General Counsel and assured those who were not in the interview that her firm has extensive experience with similar entities. She also indicated that if anyone had any questions, she would be happy to try and answer them.

Member Domingo requested that the Approval Authority agenda contain an item summarizing the scope of services, the cost, and the term of the agreement. Chair Kronenberg agreed and indicated that the RFQ and the Meyers Nave proposal could be sent out for review as this would provide a good synopsis of the request and the response.

Chair Kronenberg asked if there are other questions or comments from Approve Authority members.

Member Harrison moved to retain Meyers Nave as counsel for the Approval Authority and Member Mahoney seconded it.

Chair Kronenberg asked for further discussions and received no comment or response from the members. She asked the public for questions or comments.

There was one comment in support of Robin and Meyers Nave and their representation of the ERCSA. Chair Kronenberg asked for additional public comments and upon hearing none, she called for a voice vote for the motion to retain Meyers Nave as counsel for the Approval Authority. It passed unanimously and they welcomed Robin as the new General Counsel.

14. TRACKING TOOL FOR UASI MANAGEMENT TEAM

Chair Kronenberg moved to item No. 14 and asked for any comments, additions, or deletions.

Member Harrison stated that she liked the format of the document because it was easy to read. Member Godley requested that the UASI management team administration manuals be added to the Tracking Tool. There was discussion about the grant process and the development of the next grant application. Member Godley indicated that the Approval Authority was going to need the information soon in order to move the process forward.

Member Harrison asked about the elections of the Chair and Vice Chair under the new MOU and Chair Kronenberg indicated that she thought it would occur at the Retreat in December. After some discussion between Member Harrison and Godley and Chair Kronenberg, it is agreed that they must be noticed in the agenda based on the parameters of the MOU.

She asked if there were other questions or comments about the Tracking Tool from the Approval Authority. Upon hearing none, she asked for public comment.

15. ANNOUNCEMENTS-GOOD OF THE ORDER

Since there was no public comment, Chair Kronenberg moved to item 15. She asked if there were any announcements from members of the public.

Member Domingo thanked the Alameda County Sheriffs and all law enforcement agencies that came to Oakland's assistance last week. They had a very busy week with the Occupiers and people were activated in the EOC for many long hours. Member Harrison indicated that this was a learning experience for the region.

Chair Kronenberg asked if there are any additional comments, questions or announcements.

16. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Kronenberg moved to item 16 and asked if there were any future agenda items.

Member Godley asked staff to determine the timeline for the grant allocation methodology and indicated that it will probably have to be submitted for approval.

Ms. Serata agreed and stated that the current plan is to have the discussion at the next Advisory Group meeting on December 1st. She further stated that the calendar is being developed and all the working groups and possible actions required by the Approval Authority and Advisory Group will be on it. Member Harrison requested that this be sent as soon as possible and not simply wait for the next packet.

17. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Kronenberg opened the floor for public comment.

John Wicjorek from CalEMA noticed some of the acronyms in the agenda are not defined. He thinks it would be helpful for the public to initially define them in the agenda. He also asked if there was a way to view the agenda prior to the meeting. Chair Kronenberg clarified that the agenda is posted on the UASI website.

Mr. Dziejdzic introduced Nubia Mendoza who joined the team as the administrative staff person and will be working on correspondence, tracking events and helping with the calendars. He also stated

that Elizabeth Holden has recently been hired and will work on the website to update it and make it more user-friendly.

Chair Kronenberg informed the members that Ms. Jackson is still out on medical leave and Nubia is a temporary replacement because Mr. Dziejcz has been without administrative support.

Seeing no other public comment, Chair Kronenberg adjourned the meeting.

18. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:33 AM.