Bay Area UASI Program
Approval Authority Meeting
Thursday, September 13, 2012 10:00 a.m.
Alameda County Sheriff's Office OES
4985 Broder Blvd.
Dublin, CA 94568

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
DRAFT

1. Roll Call
San Francisco's Representative, Amiee Alden called the meeting to order at 10:05 am. Member Alden informed the public that Chair Kronenberg was running late due to a conference call with San Francisco's Public Safety Department. Joined by the Board and the public, Member Alden initiated a moment of silence for fallen California Highway Patrol Officer, Kenyon Youngstrom. Member Alden proceeded to take roll and Members Guzman, Harrison, Domingo, Godley, Collins, and Bolanos were present. Members Doyle and Aston were absent but their respective alternates, Dave Augustus and Christopher Helgren, were present. Vice Chair Lucia and Member Casten and their respective alternates were absent. Chair Kronenberg and Member Murphy arrived at 10:11 a.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes
Member Alden asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the August 9, 2012 meeting.

Motion: Approve the minutes from the August 9 Approval Authority meeting.

Moved: Member Guzman   **Seconded:** Member Bolanos
Vote: The motion passed unanimously

Member Alden asked if there were any additional topics to discuss or any changes. There were no comments, and the minutes were approved unanimously.

3. General Manager's Report

General Manager Craig Dziedzic reported on the Management Team Staff update, new office location and recommended an approval by the Board.

(a) Management Team Staff Update

Mr. Dziedzic indicated that two additional staff members were added to the Management Team. First he introduced Janell Myhre, who was selected as the Regional Program Manager. Ms. Myhre will be responsible for regional projects and will coordinate with project managers to develop and implement projects. Ms. Myhre previously worked in Santa Clara County as the Office of Emergency Services Director and has strong working relationships with emergency managers throughout the region.

Ms. Myhre commented that she was excited to work with the Management Team and hopes to continue applying her expertise in emergency management to the Bay Area region.

Mr. Dziedzic also reported that Tristan Levardo, who manages and oversees the grant management unit, received a permanent civil service appointment as the Chief Financial Officer for the Management Team. Mr. Dziedzic indicated that a CalEMA audit was performed and there were no audit findings under Mr. Levardo's management.

(b) New Office Location

Mr. Dziedzic reported that the Management Team has moved to 711 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 420. This site is now closer to City Hall, the Department of Emergency Management, and other partner buildings.

(c) Job Description for the Four Regional Hub Planners

Mr. Dziedzic stated that he would like to recommend to the Approval Authority the approval of the North Bay Hub Planner job description as a standard for the other Regional Hub Planners to ensure consistency within the Bay Area.

Mr. Dziedzic indicated that the Approval Authority approved the funding of four regional hub planners as an FY 2011 additional project. The total amount budgeted for the hub planners was $1,284,829, which occurred when CalEMA returned 3 percent of its eligible

20 percent grant holdback to the Bay Area UASI. The Approval Authority agreed that the funding was a one-time allocation for the period of June 1, 2012 through July 31, 2013.

The Board discussed whether it was necessary to hire an East Bay Hub planner and a West Bay Hub planner for the FY 2013 term. Chair Kronenberg stated that more discussion was needed regarding the clarity and the purpose of the Regional Hub planners' roles. Chair Kronenberg stated that since the North Bay has hired their planner and the South Bay is in the process of hiring a planner, the process of developing this job description should continue whether the West Bay or East Bay decide to hire hub planners or not. Chair Kronenberg stated that this matter should continue to be discussed at the next Approval Authority meeting and should end with a decision.

Chair Kronenberg asked the Board for any questions. Upon hearing none, she asked for public comment. Hearing no public comment, Chair Kronenberg moved to item 4.

4. Report from the Advisory Group

Mike Sena, the Chair of the Advisory Group, reported that the Advisory Group discussed the development of the proposal for the FY 2013 UASI proposal implementation guidance and process for the reallocation of funds at the August 23 Advisory Group meeting.

Mr. Sena and the Advisory Group reviewed the proposal implementation guidance and provided the following recommendations:

- The UASI project proposals will be submitted to the Management Team.
- Vetting will take place at the workgroup level for a more streamlined process, which will then be forwarded to the Hubs.
- The Hubs will review the projects, list them according to priority, and note if those projects that can be completed within 6 months.

The Advisory Group recommended further discussion regarding the allocation methodology and development of a funding appendix to the FY 2013 proposal implementation guidance.

Mr. Sena also reported that the Assistant General Manager, Catherine Spaulding, presented updated processes and a form for project change requests. He indicated that Ms. Spaulding will discuss this in agenda item 6. The Advisory Group recommended that the project

change process, with the recommended modifications provided by the Advisory Group, be submitted to the Approval Authority for review.

Member Collins indicated that in previous years, the Management Team held workshops to inform project managers, planners, and providers about information they would need to include in project proposals for FY 2012. She asked if the Management Team would hold a couple of regional workshops to provide the opportunity for other agencies to participate. Member Collins stated that the workshops would help inform agencies about acceptable information or project details the UASI requires for acceptable FY13 project proposals.

Mr. Dziedzic responded that the Management Team planned to develop workshops to help agencies with project proposal details as well as grant workshops in various hub jurisdictions.

Chair Kronenberg asked if the Approval Authority would approve the proposal implementation guidance. Once the Advisory Group receives the FY 13 funding allocations, the Group will make recommendations about how funds should be allocated and return to the Board for approval of these recommendations.

Mr. Sena concurred and added that the Advisory Group would meet and discuss options to be presented to the Approval Authority as soon as the FY13 fund allocation was received. The Advisory Group will then give recommendations to the Approval Authority regarding how the funds should be distributed between Sustainment Projects, Core Cities, and Hubs in a fair and transparent way.

Chair Kronenberg asked the Board for any questions. Upon hearing none, she asked for public comment. Hearing no public comment, Chair Kronenberg entertained a motion.

Motion: Approve the Advisory Group's report for the FY 13 Grant process guidance and project changes as presented.

Moved: Member Collins   **Seconded:** Member Godley
Vote: The motion passed unanimously

Chair Kronenberg moved to item 5.

5. FY 2013 Proposal Implementation Guidance

Catherine Spaulding, Assistant General Manager, reported on the process for vetting, prioritizing, and selecting project proposals for the working groups and hubs in FY13.

She described the summary table which details the implementation guidance process and the criteria that the working groups will use to evaluate FY13 projects. Ms. Spaulding requested that the Approval Authority approve the proposed implementation guidance process. She also requested that the Management Team work with the Advisory Group to develop priorities for regional projects for Approval Authority review.

Member Harrison suggested that projects needs to be coordinated at the operational area level before the project list goes to the Management Team to ensure that the Approval Authority has the knowledge of the submitted projects. Once the projects are submitted, the Approval Authority can comment regarding those projects according to operational area priorities.

Chair Kronenberg suggested the inclusion of Member Harrison's recommendation into the proposal implementation guidance as an added task. Mr. Dziedzic noted that the Management Team would do so.

Member Godley stated that since the Management Team is seeking input from the Approval Authority regarding regional priorities for FY13 projects, he suggested that the Management Team collaborate with the Advisory Group in developing regional priorities and placing priorities into the grant guidance.

Chair Kronenberg asked the Management Team to provide suggestions of regional priorities at the next Approval Authority.

Chair Kronenberg asked the Board for any questions. Upon hearing none, she asked for public comment. Hearing no public comment, Chair Kronenberg entertained a motion.

Motion: Approval of the implementation guidance with the incorporation of Member Harrison's addition.

Moved: Member Bolanos   **Seconded:** Member Harrison
Vote: The motion passed unanimously

Chair Kronenberg moved to item 6.

6. Project Change Request Processes

Ms. Spaulding reported that the Management Team is seeking to clarify and improve processes when sub-recipient jurisdictions request changes to projects. Such project requests include changes to project timelines, budgets, and/or scope of work.

She stated that this item is presented to promote transparency and consistency in grant operations.

The Management Team would like sub-recipient jurisdictions to complete and submit a form for all project change requests. Ms. Spaulding requested that the person directly responsible for the project's implementation at the jurisdictional level complete the form and route it through the appropriate Management Team Project Manager.

Ms. Spaulding discussed and clarified policies and procedures related to project change requests which include changes in timeline, budget, and scope.

The Bay Area UASI Grants and Projects Policies and Procedures Manual states that the General Manager must evaluate project scope change requests for consistency with the original project goals and objectives as stated in the project proposal, the Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy, and DHS grant requirements. If these requests are not consistent with the above criteria, they may be denied in order to maintain compliance and fidelity to previously vetted and approved spending.

Member Harrison expressed concern regarding the General Manager's discretion in the denial process when scope changes occur without an appeal process.

Member Domingo proposed adding an appeal process to the By-laws if the sub-recipient or jurisdiction is dissatisfied with the General Manager's decision.

Member Godley suggested that the appropriate verbiage be written into the By-laws specifically stating that if a jurisdiction disagrees with the General Manager or Management Team's decision, then it can be appealed to an Approval Authority member.

Ms. Spaulding stated that the Management Team seeks to confirm with the Approval Authority that if funding becomes available due to a jurisdiction no longer being able to, or interested in, implementing project goals and objectives as originally stated and/or the expenditures for a project are lower than originally budgeted, then the Management Team can return unused funds to the hubs so "next-in-line" projects can be funded. Projects should be funded in order of priority as funds become available for FY13. Ms. Spaulding stated that by mutual agreement, a hub may decide to adjust the order or adjust the cost allocated to projects. Ms. Spaulding explained that when a project funded by a core city or sustainment allocation needs to be re-evaluated, the next-in-line project to be funded should be from that core city or sustainment program. Core cities and sustainment programs may also be able to adjust the order or cost allocated to projects.

Member Godley indicated that the hubs are not a standing committee, but rather an assembly that meets early in the grant period only for the project proposal process.   He asked whether this new process might be administratively burdensome.

Ms. Spaulding indicated that she shares his concern and hopes it will not be administratively burdensome for the hubs when the funding of next in line projects is required. If there is already a prioritized list of projects, then such funding decisions can be easily made. Communication from the Management Team to the hubs can be done via email. Also, since a short performance period is anticipated, any unspent funds will be found earlier through periodic monitoring so hubs have enough time to discuss these funds if needed.

The Management Team seeks to clarify with the Approval Authority that unused funds may be allocated towards new purposes within that same project only if all of the following conditions are met as determined by the General Manager:

- The original allocation was made to fund a part of a project and funding subsequently became available due to the fact that costs of the project were less than originally anticipated; and
- The new purposes are clearly defined in the original project proposal that had been vetted and approved by the Approval Authority

Ms. Spaulding concluded that the Management Team recommends that the Approval Authority approve the implementation of the processes stated previously so that all UASI funds are regionally vetted and funded in order of priority. Ms. Spaulding proposed that these procedures be implemented as soon as the Approval Authority has approved the new projects for FY13 (estimated March 2013).

Mr. Dziedzic indicated that the Management Team will receive well-defined projects due to the changes made to the implementation guidelines, and he hopes this will facilitate a seamless re-allocation process.

Chair Kronenberg asked if there was a motion to approve the staff report on project change requests.

Chair Kronenberg asked the Board for any questions. Upon hearing none, she asked for public comment. Hearing no public comment, Chair Kronenberg called for a motion

Motion: Approval of the staff report on the project change requests and incorporate the new procedures into the By-laws and operating procedures.

Moved: Member Godley   **Seconded:** Member Harrison
Vote: The motion passed unanimously

Chair Kronenberg moved to item 6.

7. Grant Expenditure Reports on the FY 2009 UASI Grant

Mr. Levardo gave an update regarding the FY 2009 UASI Grant. CalEMA has granted an extension to the performance period and reporting deadline from March 30 to November 30, 2012. This final extension allows the city core allocations for Oakland and San Francisco to be spent as well as extend the contract for the Public Information and Warning Project with Filler Security Strategies. Mr. Levardo stated that all the claims for San Francisco have been processed. A balance of $159K remains since final claims are pending from the contract with Filler Security Strategies and the MOU with Oakland. Mr. Levardo indicated that once the final claims have been received from those projects, the process of liquidating remaining allocations will bring a final and full expenditure for FY09 UASI grant to the awarded amount of $32.5M.

Mr. Levardo reported that Project B – Interoperable Communications ranked first as the highest investment at $13.6M followed by Project G – Regional Collaboration at $8M. The lowest investment went to Medical and Public Health Preparedness at $96K. Mr. Levardo indicated that his team will render the full and final FY 2009 UASI grant report to CalEMA by November 30, 2012.

8. Public Information and Warning System Project Status Update

Josh Filler provided a presentation on the Public Information and Warning (PI&W) system regarding the following items:

- The background and purpose of the Public and Information and Warning system
- Deliverables, project cost, and project prioritization
- The focus, mission and outreach of the Public and Information and Warning system
- The goals, objectives, and the implementation of the strategy

Member Godley stated that the public warning project resembled interoperable communications. This project could become part of BayRICS if they can develop a capacity to take on a new project or program, since the BayRICS Board has an established governance structure that is operationally orientated and has a funding mechanism.

Member Godley indicated that since BayRICS' governance is well structured, it can create a regional team or a region wide system that can help local jurisdictions develop public warning capability with interoperable communications and avoid adopting the Integrated Public Alert Warning system.

Chair Kronenberg expressed concern that although the $2.5 million PI&W project cost may not seem like a large amount when compared to the $100 million cost for interoperable communications projects, it is still an overwhelming amount for the region to fund.

Mr. Filler indicated that if the Public Information and Warning system was handled by a single individual whose sole responsibility is to implement the system and manage any issues that arise, it would be less overwhelming.

Member Harrison stated that if the system were to be funded, she suggested having additional personnel to be primarily responsible for increasing operational area capacity.

Chair Kronenberg asked the Board for any questions. Upon hearing none, she asked for public comment. Hearing no public comment, Chair Kronenberg asked if there was a motion to approve the staff report on project change requests.

Motion: Approval of the report on the Public Information and Warning system.

Moved: Member Domingo   **Seconded:** Member Collins
Vote: The motion passed unanimously

Chair Kronenberg moved to item 9.

9. Presentation of UASI "Grants at a Glance" documents

Ms. Spaulding reported regarding the document entitled "UASI Grants at a Glance," that provides a breakdown of performance period timelines for each of the current UASI grant years.

Ms. Spaulding also reported on the second document, titled "Pre-performance Timeline for FY12 and FY13 UASI," which provides a breakdown of the current timeline estimates for the pre-performance period of the FY12 and FY13 UASI performance timeline.
These estimates are highly subject to change based on when DHS issues grant guidance, but are working estimates.

The Management Team hopes these documents serve as useful reference tools.

Member Godley asked for clarification as to the reason why the term 'grant effectiveness date' was previously used regarding the project timeline changes as opposed to 'grant performance period,' 'sub-grantee,' or 'sub-recipient performance period.'

Ms. Spaulding apologized for not using consistent terminology and the correct terminology would be the 'performance period.'

Chair Kronenberg asked the Board for any questions. Upon hearing none, she asked for public comment. Hearing no public comment, Chair Kronenberg moved to item 10.

10. The Metrics Project Status

Captain Kelly Seitz from the Santa Clara County Fire Department provided a status report regarding the Bay Area UASI Metrics Program. The report highlighted the background of the Metrics program, frequently asked questions, and a brief sampling of the Metrics website.

Chair Kronenberg asked if each county and city operational area was responsible for updating the system with new inventory.

Mr. Seitz indicated that the information in the Metrics System was received by mutual aid coordinators from fire, law and emergency management departments from throughout the Bay Area UASI counties and cities. These coordinators are called the 'gatekeepers' and are the highest level in the operational area. These gatekeepers conduct outreach and locate the point of contacts within the cities and/or counties that have information regarding new inventory. Mr. Seitz stated that an automated system sends emails to the individual city's point-of-contact, who is responsible for maintaining inventory information. If a gatekeeper does not receive a response, they reach out to the city and update the automated system with the new point-of-contact information and any new information regarding the inventory.

Chair Kronenberg requested a list that includes all the regional points of contact since it will help the cities and counties see who is providing the information.
Chair Kronenberg requested more information regarding the current status of where the operational areas stand regarding the points of contact and the current inventory information.

Member Domingo asked for more information regarding how the consulting firm will help the operational areas as well as the core cities use this website. She also requested to know if the responsibility for updating the system shifts from a single person to the operational area or jurisdiction.

Chair Kronenberg asked the Board for any questions. Upon hearing none, she asked for public comment. Hearing no public comment, Chair Kronenberg moved to item 11.

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

Barry Fraser, interim General Manager for the BayRICS JPA, reported on the status of the BayRICS JPA. Mr. Fraser indicated that the BayRICS Authority held its regular monthly Board of Directors meeting on Thursday September 6, 2012. The BayRICS Board was expected to: endorse a regional "Fleetmap" – a radio coordination to program P-25 radios for mutual aid so that the radios can be used across jurisdictions; consider the selection of a permanent general manager; and approve a plan to issue a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for technical consulting services.

Mr. Fraser also gave an update and overview of the following:

- Regional and State Planning
- 700MHz Spectrum Waiver, Spectrum Act, and FirstNet Update
- FCC Spectrum Transition Order

Chair Kronenberg asked the Board for any questions. Upon hearing none, she asked for public comment. Hearing no public comment, Chair Kronenberg moved to item 12.

12. Extension for Funding

Chair Kronenberg reported that Barry Fraser has been the interim General Manager for the BayRICS JPA and was funded through the UASI 2010 grant for one year. Alameda County has agreed to be the agency that will hire the general manager for the BayRICS JPA.

Chair Kronenberg recommended that the Approval Authority approve extending the salary funding for the Interim General Manager of the BayRICS JPA for a limited time period until another funding source is identified.

Member Harrison requested an end date to the extension.

Chair Kronenberg indicated that an end date for the extension be March 15, 2013.

Chair Kronenberg asked the Board for any questions. Upon hearing none, she asked for public comment. Hearing no public comment, Chair Kronenberg called for a motion.

Motion: Approval of a possible extension to fund the salary of the interim General Manager of the BayRICS JPA till March 15, 2013.

Moved: Member Harrison   **Seconded:** Member Godley
Vote: The motion passed unanimously

Chair Kronenberg moved to item 13.

13. California Homeland Security Consortium Projects

Member Collins made a presentation on the California Homeland Security Consortium, which included a synopsis of projects as well as some project presentations. She introduced all the Naval Postgraduate School researchers who worked on the consortium projects as well as Sam Walker, Chairman of the California Homeland Security Consortium and Monterey County's representative to the Fire Chief's association, to make the presentation.

Sam Walker gave a presentation on the following:

- Objective, roles and responsibilities of DHS, California Homeland Security Consortium, and the Naval Postgraduate School
- Demonstrate a model for cooperation between Federal, State, Regional, and Academic resources to improve emergency response capability
- Operational Model
- Project Summaries and Deliverables

Member Collins stated that the deliverables of the projects are assets and resources for the Bay Area UASI.

Chair Kronenberg asked the Board for any questions. Upon hearing none, she asked for public comment. Hearing no public comment, Chair Kronenberg moved to item 14.

14. Tracking Tool

Chair Kronenberg asked the Board for any comments or questions. Upon hearing none, Chair Kronenberg asked for public comment. Hearing none, Chair Kronenberg moved to item 15.

15. Announcements-Good of the Order

CalEMA member, Brendan Murphy, announced that CalEMA's former alternate, Scott Frizzie, had been appointed Chief Deputy Director for the Board of State and Community Corrections and that Regional Administrator Jim Brown will be the new alternate.

Chair Kronenberg asked the Board for further announcements or comments. Upon hearing none, Chair Kronenberg asked for public comment. Chair Kronenberg moved to item 16.

16. Future Agenda Items

Chair Kronenberg asked for additional future agenda items. There were none.

Chair Kronenberg moved to item 17.

17. General Public Comment

Chair Kronenberg asked for general public comment.

 The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.