



DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting of
Bay Area UASI Program
Approval Authority
Thursday, August 18, 2011
Closed Session – 9:00 a.m.
Regular Meeting – 10:30 a.m.
Alameda County Sheriff's Office OES
4985 Broder Blvd.
Dublin, CA

ROLL CALL

Anne Kronenberg, Approval Authority Chair, called the closed session to order at 9:00 a.m. All members were present including Brendan Murphy, the new CalEMA member (Scott Frizzie will be Mr. Murphy's alternate).

Chair Kronenberg called the regular meeting to order at 11:03 a.m. All members were presented. Craig Dzedzic, Interim General Manager was in attendance.

INTERVIEW OF CANDIDATES FOR THE UASI GENERAL MANAGER POSITION

The Approval Authority members interviewed candidates that submitted a resume for the UASI General Manager position. Anne Kronenberg announced that Craig Dzedzic was unanimously selected as the General Manager of the Bay Area UASI Program.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

(July 8, 2011)

Emily Harrison made a motion to approve the minutes of the special meeting of July 8, 2011; Teresa Reed seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

(July 14, 2011)

Rich Lucia made a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of July 14, 2011; Emily Harrison seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

UASI MASTER MOU

Emily Harrison made a motion that on page 4 item 3 and page 6 item 17 the following language be added: unless otherwise determined according to the process incorporated in the Bylaws. Teresa Reed seconded the motion.

There was discussion regarding the need to state the fiscal agent as San Francisco for the current MOU for the term of two years, the potential for future changes to the fiscal agent and concerns regarding any disruptions with such a change. It was pointed out that there is



sufficient language incorporated in the Bylaws to ensure that the time to make that change would be sufficient so that there isn't a disruption to the UASI operations.

Renee Domingo inquired if the fiscal agent could change during a grant year.

Anne Kronenberg stated that there is language that states that the current fiscal agent would finish out the grant cycle if another jurisdiction expressed interest in becoming the fiscal agent and the Approval Authority would start working on a new fiscal agent in the current grant cycle but to take over in a new grant cycle.

Emily Harrison withdrew her previous motion. She made a motion to add the language for page 4 item 3 and page 6 item 17 as, the City and County of San Francisco shall be the fiscal agent for the Bay Area for the term of this MOU notwithstanding another Approval Authority member may indicate its desire to serve as fiscal agent at any point in the term of the MOU and the process shall be conducted according to that in the Bylaws. Anne Kronenberg seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Anne Kronenberg stated that the Approval Authority will go through the MOU to make sure that they are consistent throughout the document on what they are agreeing to during the current meeting.

Ms. Harrison made a motion to add language to page 17 item (d): The City and County of San Francisco, as the Fiscal Agent will file a performance evaluation for the General Manager based upon the evaluation completed by the Approval Authority. Rich Lucia seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

Rich Lucia pointed out that on page 1 where the cities and counties are listed there should be a comma (,) after County of San Mateo and the word "and" should appear after County of Santa Clara. This change should be consistent throughout the document.

Mr. Lucia made a motion to add language to page 2, 1e. Attendance Requirement: that in the case of such a vote the "no show" entity will not be eligible to vote on that issue. Emily Harrison seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

Rich Lucia made a motion to change the language on page 3 (h.) as follows: remove the word unanimous and substitute with two-thirds vote (8 members). Renee Domingo seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

The Approval Authority approved the language on page 5 item 13 regarding CalEMA being a non-voting member.

There was some discussion regarding the length of the 2-year MOU.

Teresa Reed pointed out that on page 4 under item 3 the "City of Oakland obligations" should appear on a separate line from the fiscal agent sentence.



Emily Harrison made a motion to approve the MOU with the minor modifications that the Approval Authority made. Renee Domingo seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Anne Kronenberg stated that in terms of process the new MOU would go into effect December 1st. Staff will go through and clean the MOU and make sure that all changes are consistent throughout the document and then will send it out to all of the jurisdictions. It is up to each member to move the document through their approval bodies.

UASI BYLAWS

Emily Harrison discussed her concern that since the Advisory Group reports to the Approval Authority the Advisory Group meetings should be subject to the same open meeting requirements as the Approval Authority.

Anne Kronenberg stated that based on the Brown Act training the Approval Authority received it was clear that if the Advisory Group is called out in the Bylaws, the Advisory Group becomes a formal body.

(Public Comment)

Mike Sena expressed his concern that if the Advisory Group is a formal body then there is the inability to be flexible in conversations and discussions regarding multiple projects that the Advisory Group would like to provide advice on. He pointed out that subjecting the Advisory Group to the Brown Act will stifle full length discussions. One suggestion was to make the Advisory Group work under the General Manager's authority and that the Approval Authority provides them with the opportunity to speak to items of interest beyond the public comment time. The Advisory Group has concerns that there are some topics that they wouldn't be able to discuss in open session such topics that have to do with risk management, threat vulnerability information and they wouldn't want to have closed sessions on a regular basis.

Ken Kehmna pointed out that part of the Advisory Groups concern was trying to figure out what would or wouldn't make the Advisory Group subject to the Brown Act and that a legal opinion was needed.

There was much discussion regarding the Advisory Group being a group under the General Manager or the Approval Authority. The direct reporting relationship of the Advisory Group to the Approval Authority is important and there are various ways to deal with the group being flexible. It was recommended that the Advisory Group be left under the Approval Authority and later if it doesn't work it can be changed in the Bylaws. The Advisory Group agreed with the Approval Authority's decision.

Emily Harrison made a motion to add language to item (e) on page 4 that: all meetings will be conducted subject to the same open meeting requirements as the Approval Authority meetings. Rich Lucia seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Harrison pointed out that language needed to reflect that the Approval Authority committed to monthly meetings on page 5.



Emily Harrison suggested that for (d) on page 11 language be added in the last sentence after “however” stating that the employing jurisdiction retains full responsibility of the Management Team member for disciplinary actions. Teresa Reed seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Harrison made a motion recommending that language be added to page 11 (e) stating that all new positions require approval by the Approval Authority including job descriptions, compensation and any changes to compensation other than normal business must also be approved by the Approval Authority. Renee Domingo seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

Teresa Reed stated that on page 8 lines 241-251 should be included in the Bylaws not the MOU as the policy is stated in the previous paragraph.

Anne Kronenberg made a motion to delete lines 241-251 on page 8 and replace with the following language: text messages related to the meeting agenda is prohibited. Rich Lucia seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Reed page 9 General Public Comment (b-f) is direction for the public rather than the Approval Authority.

The Approval Authority agreed to move items (b-f) onto the Approval Authority meeting agendas as rules of engagement for the public.

Rich Lucia pointed out that on page 2 there should be a comma (,) after County of San Mateo. He stated that on page 7 the underlining is not complete for Section 6.8 and Section 6.11.

Anne Kronenberg stated that although she lost on the issue, San Francisco is not happy that the Approval Authority will elect the chair as they believe the chair should be the Fiscal Agent.

Emily Harrison made a motion to approve the Bylaws as amended; Teresa Reed seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Teresa Reed asked the AA to reconsider the two-thirds (8 members) vote; she pointed out that if an agency is voted off due to not attending two or more meetings, the two-thirds voting number would no longer be 8 members. Teresa Reed made a motion to take the “8 members” language out of the MOU. Monica Fields seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

STATUS OF RFP FOR CONSULTANT TO CONDUCT BAY AREA UASI BEST PRACTICES AND PROCUREMENT PROCESS REVIEW

Emily Harrison stated that \$25,000 from 2009 funding was allocated to a Best Practices project and it did not elicit any bidders as the RFP amount was not sufficient for the scope of services. UASI Staff has identified additional funding of \$45,000 that could be used to conduct the review by the deadline



Anne Kronenberg inquired if this was still a priority project to move forward with; she pointed out that best practices can be found on websites or from the UASI conference. This request was originally in answer to the major internal problems with the Approval Authority and the way that things were conducted. However things have been changing for the better and she wanted to make sure that this issue was still relevant.

Emily Harrison confirmed that the Approval Authority has come a long way; changes have been made and are in the process of being made. She stated that in this particular case there were concerns about a process and the General Manager turned to an outside entity to get a second opinion. Even with all of the changes that were made there isn't a process to make sure that this wouldn't happen again. She recommended that maybe the Approval Authority could ask the General Manager to put together a policy and procedures manual and incorporate the lessons already learned.

Anne Kronenberg agreed that if the General Manager put together a policy and procedures manual it would be a more fiscally responsible choice.

Teresa Reed stated that the initial intent behind the RFP was a good intent; at the time there was no structure for the Management Team and how things were managed. The Approval Authority had asked for different reviews and based on the feedback from other reviews there were some biases behind those reviews. Ms. Reed stated that the Approval Authority had come a long way and that this would not be the best use of the funds. She pointed out that it is important that this policy is drawn up and a private contractor isn't needed to tell where things went wrong, the Approval Authority already knows this as those changes are being made. She recommended that the funds be used for something else but follow up with procedures and accountability with the Management Team.

Renee Domingo agreed that at the time this was a good intention with a purpose behind it however so much time has passed and it probably wasn't timely to do this anymore; the issues and deficiencies are known. She stated that she felt comfortable with a policy and procedures manual but she would like a date and time to be established for the completion. In the past there were practices in place that weren't always followed consistently but there wasn't a written policy. Ms. Domingo stated that there needs to be a written policy outlines specifically what the processes are going to be for the different RFP's and funding levels.

Anne Kronenberg stated that this item would be placed on the tracking tool.

Craig Dziedzic confirmed that a draft procurement policy would be on the October agenda to get feedback from the Approval Authority members.

Renee Domingo made a motion for the Management Team to come back within 60 days with a draft policy for procurement looking at best practices of other jurisdictions in the Bay Area and that the current project is defunded. Teresa Reed seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

LEGAL FEES FOR PSST LEASE CORRECTIVE ACTION



Teresa Serata stated that at the previous meeting staff was asked to go back and determine whether the FY2010 UASI funds could be eligible to provide funding for the request. After consulting with CalEMA it was determined that FY 2010 grant funds could be eligible for legal services for PSST Lease Corrective Action as Management and Administration (M&A) costs for FY 2010 grant. The following criteria for this project were discussed in regards to M&A in the grant guidelines:

- Scope of legal services.
- Reasonableness of costs.
- Compliance with the Personnel Cap.
- CalEMA Approval of the Budget Modification.
- Amendments to Subrecipient MOU.
- Consider Timelines.

Ms. Serata pointed out that staff was able to identify some funding. Due to the delays in hiring of grants management staff, an analysis was done and \$49,290 was identified as potential salary savings from the 2010 UASI grant.

Rich Lucia asked for clarification on legal costs incurred prior to CalEMA's approval being ineligible.

There is a short window of when legal costs are only eligible once CalEMA has given their approval.

Emily Harrison expressed her frustration with the report; she requested that all future reports from the staff have the recommendations on the front not at the end.

Rich Lucia asked what the timeframe would be between the Approval Authority's approval and CalEMA.

Teresa Serata stated that staff could make the request today to CalEMA and could request for it to be expedited; she stated that it typically doesn't take a long time and since she had already discussed this with them they are anticipating the change.

Emily Harrison inquired if the competitive bidding process didn't apply for legal services and whether the jurisdictions could just use the legal services that they had already retained.

Ms. Serata stated that a request would need to be made for sole source approval to the State.

Rich Lucia made a motion for staff to use FY09 funding (\$45,000) and FY10 funding (\$49,290) for legal services. Monica Reed seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

UASI LEGAL SERVICES RFQ

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated that the UASI Legal Services was modified from a Request for Proposal (RFP) to a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) based on the San Francisco City Attorney's recommendation. The City Attorney recommended that the UASI Approval Authority use the RFQ process to establish a qualified pool of candidates for services that are sought versus a RFP. She stated that the intention (if the Approval Authority approved the draft



RFQ) is to post the RFQ using San Francisco's procurement process on August 22, 2011. Some of the changes by doing an RFQ opposed to an RFP is that it is not necessary to do a pre-proposal conference and also there is the need for participation by a few select members of the Approval Authority to review the qualification letters that come in. She is seeking support from the Approval Authority and any changes and modifications would be made.

Anne Kronenberg stated that her experience with RFQ's has been to establish a contractor pool of all qualified candidates and then choose an attorney based on their expertise on a subject.

Emily Harrison stated that she appreciated the information on how the RFP was changed to an RFQ. From a process standpoint she is concerned that the advice of the San Francisco City Attorney could possibly change an assignment of the Approval Authority without the Approval Authority knowing about it. She hopes that in the future this (assignment change) doesn't happen again.

Anne Kronenberg stated that the City Attorney was on bereavement leave for a period of time and her team is so small that it was difficult to turn work around. The City Attorney didn't have a chance to review the document until after the Approval Authority's July meeting; she pointed out that San Francisco looks to the San Francisco City Attorney for advice on how San Francisco completes these processes.

Ms. Harrison's concern with the RFQ specifically is that the Approval Authority was looking for one person to stay with the body onsite throughout the meetings and the projects instead of having different people based on different questions.

Ms. Kronenberg stated that if it is the desire of the Approval Authority, one person could be selected and contracted with from the pool of qualified people.

Emily Harrison expressed her concern with the direction being turned and feels that the RFP should go out.

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated that she had submitted the RFP to the City Attorney; it is a matter of the City's process being that legal counsel must approve an RFP for a department before it is posted on the City's website.

Ms. Kronenberg pointed out that the dilemma is that San Francisco's legal counsel didn't approve the RFP as she stated that it be an RFQ.

Ms. Harrison apologized to Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon as she shouldn't have to answer for the reasons Katie Porter decided on changing the RFP to an RFQ as Ms. Porter should have attended the meeting. Ms. Harrison expressed her frustration that the Approval Authority will have to wait a longer time because someone who isn't in attendance at the meeting decided to go in a different direction.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon explained that the intention with the RFQ is that the Approval Authority will enter into a contract with an attorney. The AA will still have the opportunity to review the proposed qualified attorneys and will be able to select the attorney for the AA. Attorney services are not normally contracted as a project; the intention is that there will be an



ongoing contract with an attorney for multiple years. The RFQ states that the intention is to enter into a contract from the date the contract is signed through the date of 2014 with options to renew the contract. This attorney will be hired by the City and County of San Francisco for the Approval Authority through this process.

Anne Kronenberg stated that she didn't talk to Ms. Porter about this but believes that this process is a little faster as it doesn't have the pre-RFP conference.

Renee Domingo pointed out that the RFQ has all of the requirements listed of an RFP.

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated that staff is seeking direction from the Approval Authority, whether they want to meet with the potential attorneys or just interview the top 5. There is some flexibility based on the needs of the Approval Authority. The intention is to sign a contract for the Approval Authority.

Emily Harrison stated that if the RFQ is a way of moving forward she doesn't want to stand in the way of that. She requested that in the future staff incorporate all background into reports.

Ms. Domingo pointed out that there were a lot of typos in the document and the document needs to be consistent and accurate to state RFQ throughout.

Teresa Reed made a motion to move forward with the RFQ; Rich Lucia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Approval Authority agreed:

- To use the same personnel committee (Anne Kronenberg, Rich Lucia and Emily Harrison) to review candidates and then will bring forward a reasonable number of candidates to the whole Approval Authority for interviews.
- No pre-submission RFQ conference.
- The oral interview scheduled should state "to be determined".

(The Approval Authority took a break from 12:38 p.m. – 12:47 p.m.)

BAY AREA UASI REVISED TRAVEL POLICY

Anne Kronenberg stated that the Approval Authority had waited for a travel policy for a long time; she thanked Mr. Dziedzic for a great draft travel policy.

Craig Dziedzic stated that the draft travel policy was based upon Santa Clara's travel policy looking at the reasonable person standard and the definition of official business for travel. The draft travel policy encompasses Member Domingo's concerns that after staff has traveled to a conference they should come back and educate the group and explain the relevance of the travel. It also encompasses the fiscal agent's authorization form and procedure as well as what is compensated which comes from the latest update of the Controller's travel policy. He explained the process for obtaining authorization and approval for travel as well as the reimbursement costs associated with the travel. Mr. Dziedzic pointed out that the CFO will determine the need and will be responsible to authorize the Management Team's travel. Members of the Approval Authority and Working Groups will need approval first from their own



jurisdictions and then for approval from the CFO. The Grants Management Team will review the reimbursement expenses. He stated that there is a Q & A section but more information can be addressed if needed as this is just a draft.

Rich Lucia pointed out that the Federal GSA rate is higher than Alameda County's reimbursement rate. He asked for clarification on employees traveling on a UASI funded trip when the GSA rate is higher than their jurisdiction. Mr. Lucia stated that there needs to be a policy for addressing the GSA rates as they may be different from the jurisdictions rates especially when the policy of a jurisdiction could be to use the lowest government rate for hotels which could still exceed the GSA rate.

Mr. Dziezic stated that it would be fiscally prudent and wise to use the lower amount when there is a disparity between the reimbursement rates.

Anne Kronenberg inquired if there was some flexibility when using federal grant funds to pay for hotels, if the grant guidelines stated that the GSA rates must be used.

Rich Lucia suggested that there be a reimbursement rate of a certain amount however there needs to be a policy that if the bill is higher than that reimbursement rate the difference would be the responsibility of the person traveling or that person's jurisdiction.

Anne Kronenberg asked for clarification on page 4 regarding the number of people traveling; it seems a total of 13 people traveling to the same destination is a lot of people.

Craig Dziezic explained that this is looking at the prudent persons traveling and the purpose of traveling. He pointed out that the number was selected based on the fact that the membership will be expanding to 11 members; no more than 3 people from the Management Team can travel to the same destination but up to 11 people from the Approval Authority, the Advisory Group, and subject matter experts that have direct and necessary interests in traveling on official business. Mr. Dziezic stated that this number could be made lower if necessary.

Ms. Kronenberg confirmed that this was for flexibility to allow Approval Authority members and Advisory members the opportunity to travel.

Emily Harrison stated that the level of authority to approve international and intercontinental travel that was given to the General Manager and the CFO should be with the Approval Authority members and there should be a number stating how many can travel.

Mr. Dziezic pointed out that international travel requires CalEMA's approval as well.

Ms. Harrison gave the following recommendations, in which the Approval Authority agreed to:

- The Management Team is not a big organization so much final authority was designated to the CFO it would be good to have the General Manager approve all out of state travel.
- The standard should be that only two Management Team members travel within the state instead of five.
- On page 6 under the Chief Financial Officer's responsibility the sentence, "*has final approval authority as to the appropriateness and reasonableness of reimbursement requests*" be deleted; these duties should be that of the General Manager.



- The information needs to be changed on page 7 under International Travel and travel to Non-Continental Destinations to encompass all recommendations.

Anne Kronenberg stated that she was thrilled to see a travel policy and liked the Q&A section in the document.

Emily Harrison stated that the document was very thorough and thoughtful. She liked how it looked at situations from various points.

Renee Domingo suggested that a sample of a completed travel and expense authorization form as well as a sample written travel request. In the past there have been some challenges with the Management Team and others not understanding clearly the format.

Emily Harrison asked for clarification on if a staff member holds a position on a national board or committee what the process for travel would be in this instance.

Craig Dzedzic stated that this was not addressed but could be added to the policy.

Ms. Harrison stated that the Approval Authority should know when staff from the Management Team is involved in a national office that involves travel.

Anne Kronenberg suggested that staff make the recommended changes that the Approval Authority requested and bring the travel policy back for a vote at the September meeting. In the meantime if the Approval Authority members have any other ideas or suggestions they should be sent to Mr. Dzedzic to incorporate by the September meeting.

(The Approval Authority members took a break from 1:10 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.)

INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS PROJECT

Jeff Blau gave a PowerPoint presentation on the progress made with interoperable projects:

- The Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy that interoperability falls under is Goal 3: Strengthen Communications and Interoperable Communications.

(Two-way Radio Strategy)

- Mission critical – no single point of failure.
- Project 25 is the standard that gives interoperability between systems.
- 700/800 MHz frequency band – keeping the systems at these two frequencies while building the system helps to keep the costs of subscriber equipment down, which helps to avoid purchasing the higher priced multi-band radio.
- System of systems approach – This approach is best since it would have been difficult to get 10 counties and 3 cities to agree on one vendor; all radios will be able to operate on each other's systems which is not the case today with the older system.
- UASI to provide Infrastructure only which means backhaul (microwave radio) and land mobile radio (LMR), which means the P25 trunk system.
- The subscriber equipment (portables and mobiles) would be purchased with non-UASI funding which would be the responsibility of each individual agency going on to these systems.



- Subscribing agencies would have multiple vendors to choose from.

(P25 Infrastructure Funding)

- Shows the progress of how far the system is in achieving the funding for their system.
- Bayloop, BART Under, Oakland P25, EBRCS, and SMRIC are the systems that are under contract and have total costs available. SVRCS, Marin County, and San Francisco are not under contract yet and their total costs were estimated based on information provided by those three subrecipients.
- The BAUASI column showed dollars that came from UASI, COPS, and PSIC as well as the agencies match from 2006 – 2011 as COPS and PSIC required matches.
- The Other Funding column represents dollars that either came prior to 2006 or from other funding sources.

(BayLoop)

- The current status right now is that there are 19 communications sites within 7 counties.
- The current status is that the Marin Emergency Radio Authority (MERA) system is using BayLoop to support their system; Solana County replaced their microwave and moved onto BayLoop; and San Francisco Airport had their trunk system connected back to the City of San Francisco's master site.
- Final acceptance is schedule for this Fall. Final testing is being conducted now.
- BayLoop needs to be turned over the BayRICS JPA once the Network Administrator on the system is decided (temporarily San Francisco has been filling this position).
- There were 7 counties involved that received equipment. San Francisco issued 7 MOU's and one is still outstanding.

(Oakland P25 System)

- Current status is that Oakland has 2 of their 3 sites simulcast
- 7 of the 10 channels are in use. One site (stand alone site) has 3 channels in operation and the fourth site is a single channel.
- There are 2200 public safety subscribers in operation.
- The target completion for the full 3 site Simulcast Design is December 2011.

(East Bay Regional Communications System – EBRCS)

- This is a two county system.
- 20 of the 36 sites have been installed.
- West Contra Costa cell and the East Alameda County cell are scheduled to be operational by the first quarter of 2012.
- The remaining sites are scheduled for completion by the Summer of 2012.

(BART Underground P25 System)

- This is a 2 redundant site system located in the East Bay and the other on the Peninsula.
- This is scheduled for completion in Fall 2011.

Emily Harrison inquired about the BART's system as she wasn't aware that the UASI had funded anything for BART.



Jeff Blau explained that the BART P25 Underground system is a regional system as they have underground in the East Bay, San Francisco and parts of Northern San Mateo County.

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon explained that in 2009 BART's request came through the Interoperability Working Group in which the Working Group recommended the project to the Approval Authority. The 2009 funding wasn't done through the Hub but through the Working Groups. BART is a part of the Working Group and has participated at the Working Group meetings for some time. Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon explained that the intention was more for the first responders from Oakland and San Francisco to have communications capability. BART was supporting these needs.

(San Mateo Interoperable Radio Communications – SMIRC)

- San Mateo County is building a 20 site system in which 8 sites have been completed.
- Four sites will be completed with UASI 2010 funding.
- Two additional sites will be completed using UASI 2011 funding.
- This will bring them to 14 sites; 6 sites remaining to complete their system.

Renee Domingo inquired about the number of users for San Mateo.

Jeff Blau stated that he didn't have the number of subscribers for San Mateo but would provide that information to the Approval Authority later.

(Emergency Communications – ECOMM – Microwave)

- Attaches 41 sites
- Every city has at least something riding on ECOMM at this time
- San Jose, Morgan Hill, Gilroy, and Los Altos having all of their public safety communications systems being supported by ECOMM.
- Two smaller projects underway are the South and North County Tactical Channels, which will be supported by ECOMM.
- Starting to deploy some Ethernet applications.

(Marin County P25 Conventional Overlay)

- Starting out with a trunk system with conventional P25 700 MHz channels.
- Using channels from the list of 32 National 700 MHz interoperability channels.
- This system will be 9 sites with one call channel simulcast throughout all 9 sites.
- The other sites will have a multi-channel based station with up to 12 of the 32 channels available for use.
- A vendor has been selected.
- Equipment has been ordered.
- The expected completion date is January 2012,

(San Francisco P25 Mutual Aid Interoperability)

- San Francisco has built a 4 site, 6 channel system.
- The normal operational system that is used day-to-day is at least 8 sites and 23 channels.
- This system is specifically trying to accomplish providing P25 mutual aid interoperable system that could be patched to the existing system. When mutual aid came into



San Francisco users with 700/800 MHz P25 radios would be able to operate and communicate.

- The system was accepted and is ready for use.
- Some P25 capable subscribers are being procured.

Renee Domingo inquired if the system was complete, the number of subscribers and if the plan for San Francisco was to eventually lead to P25.

Mr. Blau stated that the system has been complete for some time but doesn't have many subscribers on it yet. In the event that mutual aid is in San Francisco they would be able to communicate. He didn't know how many subscribers there would be for the system but pointed out that this system would not be used day-to-day as there are only 6 channels on it; San Francisco will still remain on their old system with 23 channels on it. However in the event of a major disaster or terrorist attack this would be another resource available to use for mutual aid. He confirmed that San Francisco's plan is to move to P25; this is just the start. The next move would be to expand this to all 8 sites and then migrate the 23 channels over. He pointed out that no funding has yet been identified.

(Bay Area UASI Grant Funding Summary)

- Shows funding received from the COPS grant, PSIC grant and the three years that the IECGP grant was around. The IECGP grant is gone and will not be funded in 2011.
- 100% of the COPS and PSIC grants went towards interoperability communications.

(Bay Area UASI Interoperability Equipment Funding Summary)

- Shows the amounts by year of dollars that went towards interoperable equipment.
- As the UASI grant awards have increased from \$22 million to \$34 million from 2007 on the amount going to P25 radio systems has decreased.
- The Interoperability Working Group would love to see more dollars go towards the projects so that the projects could get done quicker.

Renee Domingo inquired if the decrease in equipment was due to the move to the planning hubs in 2010 and 2011.

Jeff Blau stated that the Hubs may have been part of the reason but there were decreases in 2008 and 2009 as well.

Emily Harrison stated that due to resources dwindling, projects costing \$60 - \$80 million to complete, and BayRICS is on the scene with the BTOP broadband it is a terrible environment to try to figure out what to do with the Bay Area's commitment to their radio systems and how to use available funding for broadband systems. She pointed out that this was a dilemma that the Approval Authority and the region would have to face.

Jeff Blau referenced page 4, "Funding Needed" column. He pointed out:

- Oakland would like to purchase an interface device which would cost about \$200,000, which would complete their infrastructure purchase.
- EBRCS needs another \$2 million identified to complete their infrastructure build.



- San Mateo needs \$11.5 million.
- The South Bay needs \$42.3 million.
- Marin needs \$38.8 million
- San Francisco needs \$34.5 million.

Mr. Blau stated that he knows up until this point in time everybody received interoperable dollars. The Approval Authority may make a decision in going forward that the limited dollars go towards systems not built as opposed to using the money for other purposes.

Ms. Harrison pointed out that the BayRICS JPA will want money for the broadband so it's not a question of dedicating the money in one pot but how to allocate between two real public safety communications needs.

UASI QUARTERLY REPORTS

Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program (IECGP)

Teresa Serata gave a briefing on the IECGP financial reports:

- Shared with the 22 county capital bay planning area.
- The jurisdictions receiving an allocation with these dollars must provide a match.
- Status of expenditures are almost done, information from Sacramento and San Francisco have been received so reimbursements to those jurisdictions will be made shortly.
- Alpine County is still in the process of waiting for equipment to be delivered and should be completed by September 15th.
- Jeff Blau has been in contact with Alpine County on an almost daily basis to ensure that they complete their project within the performance period.

Teresa Reed asked for clarification about the deadline for Alpine County as well as a "Plan B" if things don't work out in time.

Jeff Blau explained that Alpine County has given the UASI assurances that the project will get done in time. He stated that they are building a communications site that is 9800 feet which can't be accessed during the winter time so all of the work has to be done by early October, late December. Mr. Blau explained that most of the equipment will be delivered in August and pointed out that if Alpine County doesn't meet their deadlines they will lose their funding.

Teresa Serata stated that there were three performance periods that the UASI is working with in regards to equipment.

Rich Lucia inquired about how the Alpine site benefits the Bay Area.

Jeff Blau explained that with the Capital Bay Area project, CalEMA decided that the IECGP grant would be for the 22 counties within the Capital Bay Planning Area. Alpine County is one of the 22 counties that brought their project forward. In the past all of the money went to planning. Mr. Blau pointed out that there is about \$1.2 million that has to be divided between the 22 counties and with all of the other funding that the Bay Area already gets, this funding was left for the smaller counties.



Emily Harrison asked for clarification regarding the decision to include the 22 counties in the planning areas.

Brendan Murphy confirmed that the California Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee (CalSIEC) made the decision to include the 22 counties.

Teresa Reed expressed concern for Alpine County not being able to meet their deadlines for the allocation for 09.

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated that the delay for Alpine County is fully weather related as there was a more extreme weather system than anticipated and the snow didn't thaw as quickly as expected. She pointed out that Alpine County remains in regular contact with CalSIEC and Jeff Blau and is very aware of the timelines.

Teresa Serata stated that she and other grants management staff are in regular contact with Alpine County and they have been assured that Alpine will meet the deadlines. She pointed out that in 2008 there was extra funding that wasn't spent on a statewide basis and the State asked the UASI if a project could be funded quickly to spend the money in which Alpine County stepped up to do that. This has been a multiple funding cycle project for Alpine County. The snow was the only reason for the delay in this project.

Renee Domingo asked if once Alpine County's project was completed would it be able to tie into the Bay Area.

Jeff Blau stated that it would be P25 up there and would tie more into Placer County and maybe Sacramento. If BayLoop continues reaching out and there is that connectivity then it would tie in for that area.

Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) Grant

Teresa Serata gave a briefing on the PSIC grant financial reports:

- This particular grant requires a match.
- Alameda has received two extensions; extensions are only allowed on a case by case project by project basis.
- San Francisco is in the process of completing all of their projects; the close is August 24th.
- The East Bay will ask for an extension for two projects in Contra Costa and Alameda.

Jeff Blau gave an update on the East Bay's projects:

- Contra Costa County purchased dispatch equipment for 17 positions going to four different dispatch centers.
- East Bay Regional Communications System (EBRCS) is getting a new version of software for the master site controller installed shortly and as soon as that done they will be able to complete the project of the consoles.
- Alameda County's funding is going towards site improvements for four sites: one site is completed, two sites will be completed by mid-September and the last site will be done in early October.



- The UASI has received the first reimbursement request from them in the amount of a little over \$300,000 in the request along with providing over \$900,000 for match consideration.

APPROVAL OF REMAINING FY2010 RCPGP BUDGET

Mary Landers discussed the four RCPGP projects and the grant budget in which the Approval Authority had requested additional information:

- The Regional Logistics Planning Project is for regional and local logistics plans with a focus on prepositioning commodities and resources in the event of a regional disaster.
- The Regional Restoration of Lifelines Project is to develop a regional database which will include a regional public utilities database with contact information for all of the jurisdictions in the region.
- The Regional Training and Exercise Project is a plan to develop a regional training plan annex and a regional exercise and evaluation plan annex specific to plans previously developed in 2008 and 2009.
- The Regional Public Outreach and Community Preparedness Project is to establish plan-specific Public Outreach and Community Preparedness programs, activities and messaging on a region-wide basis.

Project A – Regional/Local Recovery Project Plan

- Oakland, San Francisco, Marin and Santa Clara each have planners.
- ABAG submitted a proposal to be the Regional Recovery Framework Consultant.
- SPUR submitted a proposal for a Transportation Recovery/Management Strategy consultant for \$50,000.
- The Regional Logistics Plan and Regional Restoration of Lifelines consultant the amounts were split into half after all of the other plans' funding was laid out.

Project B – Regional Catastrophic Incident Training/Exercise Project Plan

- Three jurisdictions had planners.
- There was a regional exercise and a regional training and exercise planning consultant.
- Overtime/backfill for the regional exercises.

Project C – Regional Public Outreach and Community Preparedness Project Plan

- There are four jurisdictions with planners.
- Consultant for Messaging and Outreach

Mary Landers stated that the staff recommendation is that the Approval Authority adopts the budget allocations as described. The RCPT Advisory Group will be meeting on August 25 to discuss all of the RCPGP items and to develop a scope of work that will allow them to write an RFP, and then staff will come back to the Approval Authority with greater information about the funding necessary for the Logistics planning and the other planning consultants.

Renee Domingo asked for clarification on what is envisioned for the Logistics planning project.



Mary Landers explained that Logistics is a very broad topic but it does have to do with repositioning equipment, supplies, and materials that may be needed in the event of a regional catastrophic disaster. Based on the recommendations of the RCPT Advisory Group, staff will create a scope and will come back to the Approval Authority with the ideas and approach that will be taken. Staff is seeking to get ideas from representatives from all of the counties and cities as well as the Approval Authority.

Ms. Domingo asked if staff was going to make sure that this time CalEMA Coastal region and MARAC were included in the RCPT meetings.

Ms. Landers stated that she will see to it that there is a broad representation.

Member Domingo stated that since this will encompass repositioning of resources it is important to check with FEMA and the State to determine what things they already have repositioned, which will help with planning.

Teresa Reed asked for clarification on the RCPGP budget in regards to the last budget that was submitted.

Mary Landers explained that the numbers on the grant budget are basically the same with some exceptions. One of the exceptions is Santa Clara County has added one full time employee; there was a proposal that came forward to add this employee. There is a different format but it is the same basic information. Administrative perspective when the application is submitted to the state, there has to be a budget developed that describes what is planned. Some numbers are subject to change based on what the RFP states and staff will bring that information back to the Approval Authority.

Anne Kronenberg stated that at a past Approval Authority she believed that the members were requesting additional detail about the projects such as what is the Logistics Planning Project and how will it look.

Renee Domingo stated that any projects over \$200,000 the Approval Authority members wanted more detail and also more information on sponsorship such as how does one become a sponsor for a project and the difference between the sponsors.

Ms. Kronenberg stated that sponsorship is one of the pending agenda items.

Teresa Serata explained that the Approval Authority instructed staff to come back to the Approval Authority with more information on projects more than \$500,000. Ms. Serata pointed out that Kirstin Hofmann requested any funding available for additional resources for San Jose and Santa Clara for them to be able to have a planner to use as well as a planner per the request of Chris Godley. There was a proposal made during the hub process for FY 2011 UASI dollars in which Santa Clara County had requested \$150,000 for an exercise for two counties. The UASI has not done any work regarding executive sponsors because projects of a larger amount need to go back to the RCPT to see what their recommendations are on how to use the dollars for those projects.



Teresa Reed asked for clarification on salaries allocated in the budget for the UASI Management Team and the salaries in M&A.

Ms. Serata confirmed that the budget was all inclusive of these salaries.

Rich Lucia asked for clarification on the RCPT representatives as well as their role in regards to deciding consultants for projects.

Teresa Serata explained that the RCPT is comprised of representatives from each of the identified cities and counties that are specifically identified in the grant guidelines. She stated that each of the jurisdictions can decide to take the lead on a specific project which would include responsibilities such as scoping out the RFP, identifying the gaps and needs for the project; the jurisdiction doesn't get the funding and may have to use their own funding for staff support.

Rich Lucia stated that he was trying to get a sense of what \$900,000 of work looks like.

Ms. Serata stated that it would be plans; she gave the example that Alameda County would have a logistics plan specific to Alameda County but tied to a State plan as an annex to the Regional Emergency Coordination Plan (RECP). The Coastal OES and the MARAC would be responsible for these plans and in the event of a major catastrophic plan these plans would be called upon. All of these plans are driven by FEMA.

Emily Harrison stated that there should be time where staff checks in with the Approval Authority added to each of the timelines for the various phases of the project. She stated that a lot is happening in a short period of time. A Check in with the Approval Authority is imperative and needs to be in writing on the schedule. A point in time before a launch of the money showing in specificity what the money will be spent on. Currently she has a book of plans on a shelf that haven't been validated and she is hoping that she is not going to get another book.

Teresa agreed to include the timeline for staff to check in as well as a list of deliverable dates and steps of the progress for the AA to feel comfortable with the process and the product.

There was much discussion about the budget and the match totals. Anne Kronenberg recommended that the discussion regarding RCPGP be postponed until the September Approval Authority meeting.

Rich Lucia made a motion to approve the allocation of \$275,000 to Santa Clara for the Regional RCPGP Planner (\$125,000) and to conduct regional exercises (\$150,000) as well as \$218,000 for Oakland. Renee Domingo seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

Renee Domingo requested that when the Management Team comes back to the Approval Authority she would like to see within the project timelines for when a briefing will be given to the Approval Authority; she would like to see the Management Team come back when the regional goals and objectives have been recommended by the Advisory Group that they come back to the Approval Authority for approval of the scope of work before an RFP is issued.



REPORT OUT FROM ADVISORY GROUP

Mike Sena, Deputy Director of the Northern California Regional Intelligence Center (NCRIC) thanked Chief Ken Kehmna for his work as the Chair of the Advisory Group but due to his recent promotion will not be able to Chair the group anymore. At the Advisory Meeting on July 28th Mr. Sena was voted the Chairperson of the Advisory Group and Ed Barberini will be his alternate.

Mr. Sena gave a briefing on what was discussed at the Advisory Group meeting on July 28th:

- The new UASI Training Program, which Alameda County is taking over, it is a very robust program. It is a regional project incorporating partners throughout the Bay Area including the NCRIC, Oakland and others that want to have input and support the effort. This looks like a great training program for everyone in the region for response to terrorist incidents, prevention and coordinating these efforts. The Advisory Group was asked to support this program and help with coordination of the training in which they will be involved on a regular basis.
- The Bay Area Risk Management Program – some members from the NCRIC and other jurisdictions in the Bay Area participated in some training on the Digital Sandbox tool. Mark Eastus presented the plan for the next phase of the Bay Area Risk Management Program. The training was well received. The next step is to review a matrix of all of the sites of potential vulnerability in the Bay Area. The collection of data will be processed over the next couple of months. On September 1st people will be able to review the data in the system, make recommendations and adjustments to the risk matrix and include correct data in which the NCRIC is the repository. The next step is to go out to all of the jurisdictions to fill in more gaps and data and evaluate the data
- The role of the Advisory Group, whether a body of the Approval Authority or the GM, the AG discussed how to make it work either way. As indicated earlier in the meeting, they will remain as indicated in the proposed bylaws and will work with the Management Team to ensure Brown Act compliance.
- The next Advisory Group meeting is August 25th and Mr. Sena will be working with the UASI Approval Authority and his NCRIC administrative staff to meet any requirements of the Brown Act.

Mr. Sena pointed out that there are representatives from every agency from Monterey to Sonoma and looks forward to receiving as much advice as possible.

Emily Harrison stated that she had the privilege of attending the two-day training that Mark Eastus put together and it was excellent especially for a new Approval Authority member. She urged Monterey and Sonoma representatives to take advantage of such trainings as she now understand what is going on in terms of how priorities are put together. She stated that there is an excellent Management Team. Additionally the Bay Area has come a long way in terms of incorporating the Bay Area's risk into how resources are allocated. The next step is to take down the silos and look across the Bay Area as to how risk is addressed. She appreciated the fact that she had the opportunity to participate.

BAYRICS JPA

Anne Kronenberg stated that the BayRICS Joint Powers Authority had its first meeting on August 8, 2011. Rich Lucia was selected as the Chair of the JPA, Emily Harrison was chosen



as the Treasurer, Michelle McGurk was selected as the Vice Chair and Dennis Smiley was chosen as the Secretary. She stated that it was an excellent first meeting and this is monumental that the JPA Group has been set up.

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

Anne Kronenberg stated that the draft procurement policy was added to the Tracking Tool to come back to the Approval Authority in October. The MOU and Bylaws will be added to be approved by each of the 11 members of the new Approval Authority.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – GOOD OF THE ORDER

Emily Harrison announced that there will be a BayRICS JPA meeting on August 22nd at 9 a.m. at 4985 Broder Blvd. in Dublin.

Ms. Harrison recognized Member Reed for her work on the Approval Authority as it will be her last meeting and she had mentored Ms. Harrison as she came on to the Approval Authority. Member Reed set a standard for persistent questioning that will never be achieved by any other member. Ms. Harrison stated that although Chris Godley would do a great job in her place, she honored Member Reed and was losing more than a member but a really good friend and mentor; she wished Member Reed luck.

Anne Kronenberg echoed Ms. Harrison's sentiments on behalf of the Approval Authority and wished Teresa Reed good luck; she thanked her for her dedication

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Richard Rodriguez, Deputy Regional Administrator for CalEMA Coastal Region, extending an invitation to the UASI and the Approval Authority members to attend the next Mutual Aid Regional Advisory Committee (MARAC) meeting. He presented a letter from Jim Brown, CalEMA Regional Administrator, to Anne Kronenberg regarding the MARAC meeting on September 14th to share information regarding upcoming Regional Catastrophic Planning Grant Program projects.

Anne Kronenberg made a motion to go to back into Closed Session to continue agenda item #2 Interview of the Candidates for the UASI General Manager Position. Rich Lucia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Kronenberg stated that the Approval Authority members will adjourn from the Closed Session into the regular meeting and will possibly have an announcement regarding the General Manager position.

The Approval Authority members were in closed session from 2:26 p.m. – 2:51 p.m.

Anne Kronenberg explained that the Approval Authority had just met to discuss an appointment for the UASI General Manager. She thanked everyone that applied for the position as there



were quite a few applications and many qualified people. After discussing this in closed session the Approval Authority offered the position to Craig Dziedzic; moving him from interim into a permanent position. Ms. Kronenberg stated that this was no reflection on Ms. Serata's good work and that they hoped that she would continue her work. The Approval Authority really appreciated the work that Mr. Dziedzic has done to change things around in the last couple of months and tried to move the Approval Authority forward in a direction that they feel they need to be going.

Reed stated that in the first interview Mr. Dziedzic made some comments and promises about what he was going to do and he kept to his word. The Approval Authority has seen the changes made with the Management Team and to the work that has been produced. The Approval Authority thanked Mr. Dziedzic for jumping in to the "deep end" and it definitely showed that he knew what was needed. She congratulated Mr. Dziedzic.

Emily Harrison stated that he would be truly successful if he continued to work as a team with the Approval Authority which includes the General Manager's strategy and vision but also to help carry out what the Approval Authority wants to see happen for the region. She felt that the Approval Authority felt that Mr. Dziedzic was the best partner and they look forward to working with him.

Craig Dziedzic accepted the position and thanked the Approval Authority. He stated that he looked forward to working with the Approval Authority as a team and also within the Bay Area UASI region as there is a great team approach. He thanked the Management Team for helping him along and he looks forward to working with everyone.

Anne Kronenberg reminded everyone about the September 14th MARAC meeting and suggested that maybe Mr. Dziedzic would attend this important meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.