



**Bay Area UASI Program
Approval Authority Meeting**
Thursday, March 8, 2012 10:00 a.m.
Alameda County Sheriff's Office OES
4985 Broder Blvd.
Dublin, CA 94568
Room 1013

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Roll Call

Vice Chair Rich Lucia called the regular meeting to order at 10:06 am. Vice Chair Lucia informed the public that Chair Kronenberg would not be present but her officially appointed alternate, Amiee Alden, would represent her. Chair Lucia took roll call and informed the public that Member Daniel Mahoney, Member Sherrie Collins, and CalEMA Representative Brendan Murphy were running late. Members Carlos Bolanos, Renee Domingo, Emily Harrison, Mark Aston, Chris Godley , Mike Casten, General Manager Craig Dziejdzic and Robin Donoghue, Counsel for the Approval Authority, were present. Member Bob Doyle was not present but his alternate, Dave Augustus, was in attendance in his place.

2. Approval of the Minutes
(March 8, 2012)

Vice Chair Lucia asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the March 8, 2012 meeting. Member Harrison made a motion to approve the minutes. Member Alden seconded it. Chair Lucia asked if there was any discussion or changes. There was no comment or response, and the minutes were approved.

3. General Manager's Report

a) Revised UASI Management Team Policies and Procedures Manual:

General Manager Craig Dziejdzic reported on the revised UASI Management Team Policies and Procedures Manual. He noted that page 7 of the manual outlines how "at-will" employees from different jurisdictions will be given notice if returning to their home jurisdiction. A sample MOU form, based on the By-Laws and Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) is included on page 72 as Exhibit F.



Member Harrison commented that the reason for this revision was due to past arbitrary actions by previous General Managers. Should the General Manager decide that he/she is unhappy with a team member; the team member may bring the matter to the Approval Authority for discussion within a 30-day period. She hopes to avoid that discussion, but was in support of the clause.

Mr. Dziedzic next reported that San Francisco employees contacted their City Attorney to confirm that the UASI Management Team does not have a specific requirement to submit a California Statement of Economic Interest Form 700 (Form 700). The response obtained indicated that any requirement to submit a Form 700 must come from the employee's own jurisdiction. Mr. Dziedzic indicated that San Francisco employees are governed by the California Campaign & Governmental Conduct of Code. The verbiage has been added to page 10 of the Manual.

Questions/Comments:

- Vice Chair Lucia asked about participation in other associations/groups and submission requirements for the Form 700 more than once per year.
- Robin Donoghue, legal counsel, stated that a separate Form 700 must be filed for each entity that requires the form. However, there are provisions in the code that allow for one expanded statement to be filed with their jurisdictions. The forms need to be signed and filed for each entity.

Chair Lucia informed the public that Member Dan Mahoney and Member Brendan Murphy had arrived.

Motion and Vote:

Mr. Dziedzic requested that the Approval Authority adopt the Manual. Vice Chair Lucia asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board.

Vice Chair Lucia asked for a motion and Member Godley moved to approve the changes made to the Manual. Member Harrison seconded the motion.

At Ms. Donoghue's reminder, Vice Chair Lucia asked for public comment. Upon hearing none, Vice Chair Lucia called for the vote. All members voted in favor of the motion and it passed.



b) Report on the FY 2013 Department of Homeland Security Budget:

Mr. Dziejdzic next reported on the proposed FY 2013 Homeland Security Budget. On February 13, 2012, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security released its proposed 2013 National Preparedness Grant Program which included a number of changes to the existing program. The most significant of these changes is the abolition of the UASI program and the combination of it and 16 other specific grants into one block grant. Other changes include: the performance period reduction from 3 years to 2, the requirement to maintain continued membership in the Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC), and a new allocation methodology in which the initial funding to each state would be population-based level and the remainder of funds competitively awarded.

Brendan Murphy indicated that this is a conceptual plan and is still in the early stages of development. He does not have enough information to answer concerns or questions about the proposal.

Mr. Dziejdzic noted that in response to the FY 2012 funding allocations, in which the Bay Area received a 38% cut, a number of letters were sent to Secretary Napolitano from Bay Area cities as well as Senator Feinstein. Member Alden added that staff representatives from the offices of Congresswoman Pelosi, Senator Feinstein, and Senator Boxer met with Department of Homeland Security staff regarding the Bay Area's allocation. They discussed the fact that the Bay Area was designated as a Level Two urban area in terms of threat and yet received a significant reduction in funding that was out of proportion with other UASIs. Representative Honda will also write a letter expressing his concerns. Congresswoman Pelosi's office requested information about how the allocation reduction will impact projects.

Discussion on establishment of Ad Hoc Legislative Committee:

Mr. Dziejdzic asked the Members for action to establish a committee to examine legislation, and develop creative plans to preserve future UASI allocations. Member Alden expressed her support of the General Manager's proposal to create a sub-committee.

Member Aston suggested that the committee be comprised of four Approval Authority members, each representing one of the four areas of the Bay Area. He suggested that General Manager Dziejdzic facilitate a coordinated effort with members of this committee to engage with legislative delegates. A discussion about the appointment of members to the committee ensued. There was also a discussion concerning the role of the committee and it was suggested that members of the committee should focus on legislative issues that impact the UASI and develop guidelines for the Approval Authority to approve. The Approval Authority will oversee which issues and policies the committee works on and the committee will report on their activities at the monthly Approval Authority meeting.



Motion:

Member Harrison made a motion to approve the development of this ad hoc committee which Member Alden seconded

Robin Donoghue asked this would be a standing committee of the Authority and subject to the Brown Act or an ad hoc committee with a temporary term to deal with the proposal. Member Harrison and Member Alden discussed timing and

amended the motion to add that the committee be given a nine-month term, ending on December 31, 2012.

Vice Chair Lucia re-stated the motion and asked if there were any comments from the Board members. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia asked for public comment. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia took a vote for the motion. All members were in favor and the motion passed.

c) New Management Team Staff Update:

Mr. Dziejcz introduced new Management Team staff members to the Approval Authority:

Frances Culp, who is responsible for the Medical Surge project and is working with the Regional Catastrophic Planning Grant Team to reinstate a sub-group to represent the Bay Area. She is reaching out to the various regions to help develop her contact list and begin her project. Frances Culp introduced herself to the Board and expressed excitement in facilitating the health and medical-related projects.

Captain Kevin Jensen, from the Santa Clara Sheriff's Department, is replacing Mark Eastus, who is transitioning back to the Sheriff's Department. Captain Jensen will be the UASI Management Team liaison for the South Bay Hub and Project Manager for Risk Management and Information and Sharing projects. He expressed appreciation for the help he has received from the UASI Management Team and from Captain Mark Eastus.

Ms. Julie Linney from the Santa Clara County Fire Department.. She will be managing the CBRNE projects, replacing John Justice who has been promoted to Deputy Chief of the Santa Clara County Fire Department. Ms. Linney stated that she is excited to begin working with the team and thanked everyone for the opportunity.

Chair Lucia asked for comments or discussion. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia asked for public comment. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia moved to item 4.



4. Approval of FY 2011 UASI Additional Projects

Teresa Serata reported that the Approval Authority approved the FY 2011 UASI grant allocations for submittal to FEMA and were awarded the same amount as the FY 2010 allocation. Shortly thereafter, CalEMA returned 3% of its eligible 20% grant holdback to the Bay Area UASI in the amount of \$1,284,829. The Advisory Group and the Work Groups discussed, reviewed, and analyzed projects that were previously prioritized (but were unfunded during the 2011 UASI grant process) to determine if these projects were still relevant.

Based on this, the Advisory Group recommended the following list of regional projects:

Priority #1:

Risk Management/Information Analysis & Infrastructure Protection Work Group

North Bay Risk and Capability Planner (Sonoma County)
West Bay Risk and Capability Planner (San Mateo County)
East Bay Risk and Capability Planner (Contra Costa County)

Priority #2: CBRNE Equipment

South Bay Law Enforcement Surveillance Equipment (San Jose)
ROAR Tactical Robots (Santa Cruz)

Priority #3: Communications Work Group

Interface Equipment (Marin County)

Discussion on Recommendations:

Ms. Serata stated that FEMA will no longer grant extensions and therefore it is important that all projects must be completed with all funds spent in a timely manner. The Management Team requests approval of the list of projects recommended by the Advisory Group.

Member Domingo posed several questions about the planners' roles within the jurisdictions. Ms. Serata explained that the individual jurisdiction named would receive the funding and the planner would be responsible for both this jurisdiction as well as the Hub area. Additionally, the planners would be responsible for coordinating all Risk and Capabilities Assessments, integrating that information into core capabilities, facilitating the Working Groups, and linking that information back to the UASI Management Team for the overall strategy. She also indicated that the planners will work with the UASI Management Team to monitor the projects and ensure they are completed in a timely manner. The planners out in the field will coordinate with the UASI Management Team to promote transparency.



Member Mahoney asked if these were new positions, or if these planners are currently being paid for by a different funding source. Ms. Serata responded that the planner positions do not exist in the new jurisdictions. When the Approval Authority Board expanded, they also expanded the planning area in the South Bay. Ms. Serata credited Member Harrison for developing the idea of having a South Bay Planner who will work collaboratively with San Benito, Santa Cruz, Monterey, Santa Clara, and San Jose. The other new planner positions are modeled on the South Bay Planner position.

Member Collins asked for an explanation of the differences between the planners' positions and the position that Captain Kevin Jensen holds. Ms. Serata explained that Captain Jensen is a Project Manager and is currently the liaison specifically for the Risk and Information Sharing project. He will be overseeing the NCRIC contract, all the Information Sharing Tool contracts with ARIES and COPLINK and also coordinating with staff.

Motion:

Chair Lucia asked for a motion approving the spending plan for the additional allocation of \$1,284,829. Member Godley made the motion and Member Harrison seconded it. Chair Lucia stated that the motion had been moved and seconded to adopt priorities one, two and three in the spending plan for the additional allocation. Chair Lucia asked for comments or discussion from the Board.

Member Domingo clarified that the spending plan is for a one-time allocation and not for future grant years. Member Domingo asked what period of time will the funding cover for the planner positions.

Ms. Serata responded that once the MOUs are developed, accepted and expended within their jurisdictions, the planners will be funded from June 1- July 31, 2013. There will be negotiations regarding salaries and benefits. Funding lasts a year and they have the option to add a month beyond the year.

Chair Lucia asked if there were any other comments or questions from the Board. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia asked for public comment. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia took a vote for the motion. All members were in favor and the motion passed. Chair Lucia moved to item 5.



5. Grant Expenditure Reports: FY 2010 Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant (IECGP) and FY 2007 Public Safety Interoperable Communications Grant (PSIC)

Tristan Levarado presented two expenditure reports on the status of the FY 2010 IECGP and FY 2007 PSIC grants.

The IECGP provides funding to improve regional interoperable emergency communications, including communications in collective response to natural disasters, acts of terrorism, and other man-made disasters. The grant budget is \$1.2 million with a required 25% match for all equipment. Currently, all funds have been committed and all MOUs are in place with the exception of El Dorado and San Francisco (these MOUs are currently being drafted). The projects in Placer County have been completed and Alpine County also has its projects underway with 64 percent of its \$245,000 grant budget already disbursed. A total amount of \$288,000 has already been expended between these two counties. Approximately \$647,390 of the remaining grant funds has been committed, leaving a balance of \$291,430 between El Dorado and San Francisco.

Member Godley asked how San Francisco was able to expend funds without an MOU. Mr. Levarado clarified that San Francisco actually has a Letter of Agreement (LOA) in place and has expended \$75,702.

Mr. Levarado next reported on the PSIC grant. The team has processed reimbursements claims from Alameda County, Contra Costa County, and Oakland. All the projects have been completed; and all claims have been processed and disbursed to the counties. There is one outstanding payment from San Francisco that is still under review. Once this final payment is made, the Grants Unit will proceed with the grant close-out.

Chair Lucia asked if there were any other comments or questions from the Board. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia asked for public comment. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia moved to item 6.

6. Project Update on the Interoperable Communications Systems

Jeff Blau presented a power point presentation (*found on the UASI website*) on the region's P25 systems. He used population as a basis for measurement and included the amount already funded and progress of the project.

Member Domingo requested information on the costs associated with the various P25 systems, and also to know how much of the costs came from grants and how much from other types of funding. Mr. Blau explained that the total cost noted in his presentation is



the most current for each agency and/or county, and reflected the cost of each system. The East Bay Regional Communication Systems (EBRCS) is for infrastructure only. Mr. Blau asked Member Domingo if Oakland's costs were correct, and Member Domingo indicated that they were not accurate. Mr. Blau stated that he would speak with her after the meeting to correct the information. Mr. Blau also pointed out the San Mateo had originally included their subscriber costs and Mr. Blau believes this may be the same reason that Oakland's amount is incorrect. The total costs should only include infrastructure.

Member Godley asked if PSIC was included in the UASI cost and Mr. Blau indicated that it included the PSIC as well as the COPS grant.

Chair Lucia asked if there were any other comments or questions from the Board. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia asked for public comment. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia moved to item 7.

7. Status Report on the FY 2012 UASI Grant Guidelines and Approval of the FY 2012 UASI Grant Allocation for Sustainment Projects and Planning Hubs

Teresa Serata reported on the Fiscal Year 2012 Grant Guidelines allocation and indicated that the FY 2012 grant represents a transition between the original UASI grant process and the FY 2013 process of multiple, separate preparedness grant programs stream-lined into a more concise model. Additionally, it calls for addressing core capabilities to build and sustain these capabilities rather than creating new ones. Finally, the other major change was a shortened performance period from three years to two years.

Strategy Implementation Guidance Planning Hub Workshop:

Ms. Serata reported that the UASI Management Team hosted a Strategy Implementation Guidance Planning Hub Workshop on February 28, 2012. She also provided information on the changes in the FY 2012 UASI grant guidelines, presented an overview of the FY 2012 UASI Strategy Implementation Guidance, and reviewed the 2012 grant performance period.

Timeline:

As soon as the state receives the grant notice from the federal government, they have 45 days to issue the grant award to the UASI Management Team. The anticipated end date for the grant will be April 30, 2014 and the performance period for sub-recipients will be October 1 through November 30, 2013. Sub-recipients will be required to submit their final cash reimbursement requests by January 3, 2014. Since the FY 2011 and FY 2012 grants have overlapping performance periods, there can be no grant extensions for either of these grants. In order to assist sub-recipients, there will be a significant amount of monitoring done by both grant and project management staff to complete all projects and avoid the return of any funds to the state.



FY12 UASI Allocation Methodology:

Ms. Serata stated that the Approval Authority approved the FY 2012 UASI Allocation Methodology on January 20, 2012. It was based on a \$14.2 million budget that provided funds for sustainment projects, the three core cities, and management and administration. In addition, the Approval Authority recommended that if the allocation to the Bay Area UASI was more than \$14.2 million, the balance of the remaining funds would be allocated to the Planning Hubs using the risk formula.

Ms. Serata explained that at the February Advisory Group meeting, the Management Team provided a status report on the FY 2012 UASI grant guidelines. At this meeting, a proposal to include BayRICS sustainment costs was presented. The request was for \$265,000 and included BayLoop maintenance and network monitoring. These funds are needed in order to continue the projects. Ms. Serata also indicated that the Approval Authority would take an additional vote on the Management and Administration allocation once the BAUASI receives its allocation. The total for regional sustainment, Core City Allocation and Management and Administration would be \$14,955,285.

Discussion about BayLoop and the Advisory Group:

Member Godley noted that the Advisory Group report did not include a vote to recommend BayLoop sustainment costs to the Approval Authority and Chief Barberini indicated that the BayLoop sustainment recommendation was not an action item on the agenda, but a suggestion made by the City and County of San Francisco. The Advisory Group does not yet have a formal recommendation as some of the Advisory Group members wished to speak with various Joint Power Authority (JPA) members to collect more information before voting.

Captain David Lazar commented that the additional \$265,000 in funds for the BayLoop maintenance and network monitoring sustainment costs was introduced at the Advisory Group meeting.

Member Godley noted that the BayLoop sustainment funding is included in the proposed budget for the Approval Authority to vote on.

Dave Kozicki (representing Barry Fraser) added that the proposal includes an extended warranty and maintenance agreement. The UASI would fund sustainment for the next fiscal year, which would give the BayRICS JPA enough time to identify another funding source for BayLoop maintenance. It has been suggested that maintenance could be incorporated in the Bay WEB plan through a System Funding Plan. To date, the UASI has contributed over \$4 million to BayLoop. The proposal asks for an additional year of funding to sustain the project.



Vice Chair Lucia asked about the allocation of funds and which vendor would handle the maintenance. Mr. Kozicki indicated there was a tentative agreement with AVIAT (the company that built the system) to maintain it and operate a remote network to run the system for 12 months. Member Godley asked if all the jurisdictions that are currently maintaining the system were in agreement with relinquishing the BayLoop maintenance to BayRICS and Mr. Kozicki responded that it was his understanding that this was the case. Member Godley asked for the reason why members of the Advisory Group wanted to meet with BayRICS representatives and Mr. Kozicki stated he was not a part of that meeting and could not speak to the discussions that occurred there.

BayLoop's Regional Benefits Discussion:

Member Harrison noted that although BayLoop was intended to be a regional system, there is only one site in the South Bay but eight sites in the Bay Area. She asked if part of the discussion would address BayLoop's benefits for parts of the region not using it.

Shelly Nelson added that several ad hoc committees are discussing BayLoop. Those agencies maintain BayLoop sites and will continue to maintain them within the current 12 month period. Member Harrison asked about the benefits to Santa Clara by sustaining BayLoop. Jeff Blau indicated that there is connectivity between Santa Clara and the rest of the Bay Area. In the event there is a need to connect the South Bay system to one in Alameda County or Contra Costa County, a conduit would allow them to do this. Additionally, ARIES is in use in some of the cities in Santa Clara County. He also stated that the county currently pays AT&T for connectivity to Martinez, but Santa Clara County has the option to use their ECOMM system and connect with BayLoop to link with Martinez and eliminate the extra AT&T expenses.

Mr. Kozicki indicated that BayLoop will be necessary for the anticipated users of BayWEB, currently Sunnyvale and City of Santa Clara in Santa Clara County. Member Domingo asked if this request for BayLoop maintenance would be funded indefinitely or for 12 months and Mr. Kozicki responded that it was for one year of funding.

Member Alden summarized the conversation and promoted BayLoop's regional benefits. She noted that projects like COPLINK benefit San Mateo and Santa Clara County, but not San Francisco; however, it is still considered a regional priority. BayLoop is similar and is a priority for the region. She indicated that the report produced by Teresa Serata included two options of comparing funds (with and without the sustainment of BayLoop). She concluded that sustaining BayLoop benefits all the Hubs.

BayLoop's Sustainment Proposal Discussion:

Member Harrison asked if funding for the BayRICS General Manager's salary and benefits are placed under sustainment. Member Domingo confirmed that they were a one-time



allocation and not placed under sustainment. Member Harrison then suggested that sustainment for BayLoop be a one-time allocation as well.

Vice Chair Lucia stated that if a project is funded through regional sustainment it does not remain funded indefinitely, but rather is re-considered at each grant cycle. Member Alden added that the projects listed under regional sustainment are first for allocation before funds are distributed to the Hubs.

Member Godley stated that BayRICS would assume responsibility for BayLoop and that they are currently seeking funds to have enough time to develop other ways for future

funding. He concluded that a potential funding plan (e.g., Initial BayLoop Maintenance and Network Monitoring) could address methods of funding BayLoop.

Regional Sustainment Savings:

Member Godley commented that since the grant performance period was radically reduced, he wondered if there might be some unspent money from the sustainment projects and could these savings be reallocated to the Hubs. He cited the example of the Fusion Center and that they may not be able to expend \$4 million in one year. He asked what the amount for regional sustainment projects would be and suggested if they do not know, the Approval Authority should approve reallocating unspent sustainment funds to the Hubs.

Ms. Serata responded that all project proposals are due March 16. The Planning Hubs will also review those proposals to ensure that the funds will be spent within the performance period. Since there will be no extensions, the total amount spent must balance before the deadline. Any savings will be brought back to the Approval Authority.

Member Harrison stated that if there are savings, they should go back to the Hub process. In the South Bay, some projects will be funded and others will not. She noted it would be helpful to have a mechanism for re-allocating funds if there are extra savings. She was in support of Member Godley's motion to allocate funds according to the Board agreement, once the Management Team determines how much is left over.

Ms. Serata requested direction from the Approval Authority members to develop a list with projects above the line and below the line so that the process can be expedited. The Management Team is required to provide a draft of the Investment Justifications to the state by March 30.



BayLoop's Sustainment Motion:

Chair Lucia stated that there are two options regarding the BayLoop funding request: (1) does not include the \$265,000; or (2) includes the \$265,000. He stated that the motion must be made based upon one of the two options.

Member Harrison made a motion to include the \$265,000 funds for BayLoop and clearly designate it as one-time funding for BayRICS startup costs. The Board will give direction to the Management Team staff to allocate any savings from sustainment projects to the Planning Hubs for any previously unfunded projects.

Member Godley suggested sweeping the savings into the Hub process and made a motion. Member Collins seconded the motion.

Chair Lucia stated that the motion had been moved and seconded. He restated the motion: the Approval Authority will fund option two with the provision that the \$265,000 for BayLoop is a one-time allocation for BayRICS startup costs and any additional funds remaining from sustainment projects will be directed to the Planning Hubs based on the same formula. Chair Lucia asked for comments or discussion. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia asked for public comment. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia took a vote on the motion. All members favored the motion and it passed. Chair Lucia moved to item 8.

8. Report Out From the Advisory Group

Mike Sena indicated that Lieutenant Edward Barberini was recently promoted to Chief of the Millbrae Police Department. Previously, he was the OES director for the San Mateo County Sheriff's Department. Mr. Sena commended him on his great work and asked Chief Barberini to present the Advisory Group report.

Chief Barberini reported that the Advisory Group met on February 23, 2012 and most of the items that were covered and discussed at the Advisory meeting have already been presented to the Approval Authority. The Advisory Group made a recommendation for the FY 2011 additional allocation received from the state and the list of projects. He thanked the Board for confirming those projects. The committee heard proposals from San Francisco regarding BayLoop, but it was not an action item for the Advisory Group, so they were unable to develop a recommendation. They are working on the allocation methodology for FY 2013 as directed by the Board, and they intend to have a recommendation by July, 2012. Their final item was rescheduled for the March 29 meeting and will have a recommendation for the Approval Authority on April 12.

Chair Lucia asked for comments or discussion. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia asked for public comment. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia moved to item 9.



9. Project Update of the Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant (RCPGP)

Kathleen McKenna gave an update on her Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant project. The Regional Catastrophic Logistics Plan and the Training and Exercise project are in progress- the Regional Catastrophic Logistics Plan is currently under contract negotiations with URS and the Training and Exercise Program is in the final stages of the MOU process to move funds to Alameda County. After the MOU is signed, Alameda will start the sole source process for CSTI to conduct earthquake classes.

Under the Public Information Community Outreach, there are two proposals- GR5 through the City of San Rafael and the Disaster Justice project through the City of Oakland. The two proposals include project timelines and once the projects are completed, Ms. McKenna will provide a sustainability plan and deliverable report.

Chair Lucia asked for comments or discussion. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia asked for public comment. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia moved to item 10.

10. Report from the Bay Area Regional Interoperable Communications System Joint Powers Authority (BayRICS JPA)

Chair Lucia stated that since Barry Fraser is out of town, David Kozicki will be representing on Mr. Fraser's behalf.

David Kozicki reported that Barry Fraser is in Colorado at a meeting with various federal partners working on high speed broadband for public safety. The Payroll Tax Extension gave Public Safety an additional 10 MHz of spectrum, doubling the available spectrum and opening \$7 billion in funding for future programs. The Federal Government is calling the program First Net and the JPA is in a position to be one of the earliest adopters to these types of systems.

Mr. Kozicki asked the Board if they had questions regarding BayWEB or BayRICS.

Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia asked for public comment. Upon hearing none, Chair Lucia moved to item 11.

11. Tracking Tool

General Manager Craig Dziedzic stated that many projects have been completed and the only pending projects are: (1) an item proposed by Anne Kronenberg to reformat the minutes of the Approval Authority meetings; and (2) Member Collins requested to have a presentation in the September meeting regarding the Homeland Security Consortium



project. Mr. Dziejdzic asked if the Board had additional items to add to the tracking tool to let him know.

Member Harrison asked how the legislative ad hoc committee will report. She suggested adding the reports to the Tracking Tool.

Mr. Dziejdzic responded that the Management Team will consult with the Chair and add the committee reports as an on-going agenda item.

12. Announcements-Good of the Order

Chair Lucia asked if the Board had any announcements for the good of the order.

Member Harrison asked if the South Bay could meet after the meeting.

Mr. Dziejdzic stated that the Management Team has tentatively scheduled the April Approval Authority meeting in San Mateo County. He asked Chair Lucia if the meeting will be held in San Mateo or in Dublin.

Member Bolanos stated that the parking availability would be about the same as in Dublin.

Chair Lucia stated that they will reserve the same room in Dublin for the April meeting.

14. General Public Comment

Chair Lucia asked the general public for comments. Upon hearing none, the meeting was adjourned at 11:50am.