



**Bay Area UASI Program  
Approval Authority Meeting**

Thursday, December 15, 2011

10:00 a.m.

Casa de la Vista

191 Avenue of the Palms, Treasure Island

San Francisco, CA

**Draft Minutes**

**1. ROLL CALL**

Chair Anne Kronenberg called the regular meeting to order at 10:12 a.m. General Manager Craig Dzedzic took roll and Approval Authority Chair Anne Kronenberg and Members Mark Aston, Daniel Mahoney, Carlos Bolanos, Sherrie Collins, Chris Godley, Bob Doyle, Renee Domingo, Sean Fawell, Emily Harrison, Richard Lucia, and Brendan Murphy were present. Robin Donoghue, Counsel for the Approval Authority was also present. Chair Kronenberg welcomed the new members and asked the Approval Authority and audience to introduce themselves. Chair Kronenberg also introduced Chuck Eaneff, who will be making a presentation and facilitate the afternoon discussion.

**2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**(October 13, 2011 and November 10, 2011)**

Chair Kronenberg asked for a motion to approve the minutes from October 13, 2011 and November 10, 2011. Member Emily Harrison mentioned that Item 3 from the November 10 Minutes should have included the BAUASI Management Team Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual as well as the Travel Policy. She stated that it would be helpful if the Travel Policy was included in the Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual. She also commended staff on the quality of the minutes.

Chair Kronenberg thanked Member Harrison and asked if there were any other issues. There was no comment or response from the public or members. Chair Kronenberg asked again for a motion to approve the October 13 and November 10 minutes. Member Daniel Mahoney motioned to approve, with the addition of Member Harrison's suggestion. Member Harrison seconded. Chair Kronenberg asked if there was any further discussion or changes. There was no comment or response. The minutes were approved.



### **3. DISCUSSION OF BAY AREA UASI HISTORY**

UASI General Manager, Craig Dziedzic, discussed the history of the Bay Area UASI. He began with background information about the Bay Area UASI, starting with a detailed account of the program's background leading to the legal authority of the Bay Area UASI.

The UASI grant was established to enhance regional preparedness in major metropolitan areas. From fiscal year 2003 through 2006, there were three separate UASI programs comprised of the core city and core counties in which the city was located and funds were awarded to the core city and county in each of the urban areas. In 2006, FEMA directed the Bay Area to consolidate into one super regional UASI comprised of ten counties: Solano, Sonoma, Alameda County, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz. The area also included the three major cities of San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland. In 2008, FEMA began using a risk-analysis methodology to allocate funds. The risk model considered the potential risk of terrorism to key critical infrastructure and economic security. In 2011, the Bay Area UASI footprint expanded to include the counties of Monterey and San Benito.

Craig Dziedzic then discussed the three areas of legal authority included in a one-page handout. He mentioned the organization, implementation, system, and goals for each of these areas to protect, prevent, and respond to major risks. The ultimate goal of these three areas is to create regional preparedness in high risk, high density urban areas. Mr. Dziedzic then discussed the National Preparedness Goal and Homeland Security Guidance to give context to the UASI's significance. He concluded that the UASI handles multiple grants (in addition to the UASI grant) including the Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPGP), the Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) Grant and the Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program (IECGP).

Member Kronenberg thanked Mr. Dziedzic for his report and commented that the grant programs continue to evolve, especially in regional programs. She mentioned that funding will be decreased, and mentioned an email sent by Mike Sena about Congressional action taken yesterday concerning 2012 funding. She concluded that the Board will need to do more with less, but will continue vital partnerships and loyalties. Chair Kronenberg then asked if there were any questions of Mr. Dziedzic or other Approval Authority members.

Member Lucia commented that the UASI has continued to improve each year and that the program is at a much better place than it has been at any prior point. He congratulated colleagues and UASI staff.

Chair Kronenberg asked if there were any additional comments from Approval Authority members. With no response, she then asked for any public comment. There being no response, Chair Kronenberg proceeded to the next agenda item.



#### **4. BROWN ACT TRAINING**

Robin Paige Donoghue from the law firm Meyers Nave presented an overview of California state law on open meetings and other key concepts in the Brown Act. She stated that the Brown Act is of the utmost importance to the legislature and continues to be adjusted each year. The media in particular is aware of the provisions of the Brown Act, as are many public citizen and watchdog groups. She commented that it is particularly important to be aware of the provisions because there are a range of penalties if the Brown Act is violated, ranging from civil action to criminal penalties.

Meetings Subject to the Brown Act:

She began the discussion by reviewing meetings that are subject to the Brown Act. Since legislative meetings are subject to the Brown Act, the Bay Area UASI Approval Authority which conducts, publicizes, and discusses information in between meetings (except for the Working Groups) must comply with the Brown Act. She described that all meetings must be made accessible to the public through a posted Agenda (at the office or online). She discussed the rules for email communications between members stating that in order to comply with the Brown Act all discussions should be sent through the General Manager, so that information can be conveyed to everybody at an open meeting.

An individual from the audience asked how one recovers from an email communication violation after the fact. Robin Donoghue responded that the best way to recover from a violation is to disclose the information at the next meeting and place it on the agenda if information needs to be addressed. She stated that it is possible to resolve violations after the fact if responded to correctly.

Robin Donoghue addressed the rules for members who need to attend a meeting by video conferencing. She stated that it must be placed on the agenda and resources must be made available for attendees.

Chair Kronenberg asked Ms. Donoghue to clarify if all participants need to be in the same physical location for a meeting. Ms. Donoghue confirmed that the Approval Authority may use video conferencing for meetings. Member Harrison commented that Chair Kronenberg's confusion on the matter was due to the MOU specification for BayRICS that forbids the use of video conferencing to conduct meetings.

An individual from the audience asked if a phone call can be used if a person needed to report in remotely. Robin Donoghue answered that this would be possible only if call-ins were listed on the agenda. She added that the caller would need to be on speaker phone if the individual on the phone was a member of the body.



#### Posting of the Agenda:

Robin Donoghue next discussed protocols for Agendas. The Brown Act requires members to post materials seventy-two hours before the meeting date. She added that materials should be distributed to members at the same time that they are distributed to the public.

Chair Kronenberg commented that the Approval Authority has tried to go paperless by posting all Agenda items and material on the website, and then making it known to members and public at same time. Robin Donoghue responded that this method is fine, but if someone does not have access to the Internet, then a hard copy must be provided. She indicated that information also needs to be posted at the place of business, where it is accessible twenty-four hours a day.

#### Special Meetings:

Ms. Donoghue described other requirements for various types of meetings: Special Meetings, which only require twenty-four hours' notice, are called to address one limited issue and Emergency Meetings, which require one-hour notice or less. She also discussed the right of the public to comment at meetings and indicated that this must be included in a regular meeting during the appropriate time for general questions or comment. Further, when preparing agendas, it is important to give the public sufficient notice of what will be discussed at the meeting. She suggested that members be as concise as possible in agendas, so the public can determine if the topics are of interest to them.

#### Closed Sessions:

A Closed Session is held for issues of pending litigation, anticipated litigation, real estate negotiations, labor and personnel exemptions, and security exemptions. The Council must be present at all closed sessions. Safe Harbor language must be used in the agenda to describe the session to be considered as proper notice. Certain actions require a reporting out function after the closed session but some closed sessions can be adjourned by reporting that the Board took a specific action.

Chair Kronenberg asked if the Board needed to take a vote in order to go into closed session. Robin Donoghue answered that the Board is not required to according to the Brown Act, unless it is included in specific by-laws.

#### Penalties:

Robin Donoghue next described penalties for Brown Act violations as a misdemeanor under the penal code. However, inadvertent violations may be resolved before a civil action is filed. Ms.



Donoghue then asked for questions.

#### Ad hoc Committees:

Member Harrison asked if ad hoc committees are subject to the Brown Act if limited in purpose and having fewer members than the number for a quorum. Robin Donoghue suggested that individuals on these ad hoc committees should be clear about their limited function and avoid lifetime ad hoc committees. She suggested that any ad hoc committee required beyond a thirty-day period be converted into a Standing Committee.

Member Harrison asked if board alternates should be counted in the number of total voting individuals in a quorum. Robin Donoghue answered that for the purposes of a quorum; only those members who would vote (i.e. eleven) are counted towards the total amount.

#### Minutes:

Chair Kronenberg asked about minute requirements and the level of detail in those minutes. Robin Donoghue answered that the Brown Act does not require a particular level of detail if meetings are taped.

#### Record Retention:

An audience member asked about record retention policies and Ms. Donoghue indicated that each agency has a record retention schedule and policy, but typically it is three to five years. She will follow up on specifics for the UASI with Craig Dziedzic.

#### Public Comment:

Member Lucia asked about the policies and procedures for public comment. Robin Donoghue answered that while the Board can ask the public to fill out a card to make a comment, the law states that one cannot require an individual to identify him/herself. She concluded that it is important to ask for general public comment before a motion is made. She suggested that Board enforce the procedure in order to comply with the Brown Act.

Member Brendan Murphy clarified with Robin Donoghue that under the Brown Act, the Board cannot require individuals to identify themselves while commenting during the public comment period. Robin Donoghue confirmed Member Murphy's understanding of the requirement.

#### Conflict of Interest Statements:

Chair Kronenberg asked Robin Donoghue about Conflict of Interest statements and if the Board



was required to complete these forms. Ms. Donoghue confirmed that the board must fill it out The Form 700. Additionally, she indicated that a new state form was being released and would be effective January 1, 2012. Further, she indicated that there were various other local forms and requirements for Board members.

Chair Kronenberg then followed up on her previous question by asking if older members needed to fill out new forms (before April) due to the Board's recent reorganization. Robin Donoghue responded that as long as the Board follows the annual statement due date, then an additional statement would not need to be filed. Chair Kronenberg then stated that staff would be sending out an electronic form for new members to fill out.

Quorum Requirements:

Member Chris Godley asked for clarification on the number of members of the Board and the number needed for a quorum. Chair Kronenberg clarified that a quorum is six, then asked for other questions. There was no response, so she proceeded to thank Robin Donoghue for her legal counsel and discussion on the Brown Act.

Chair Kronenberg then called for a five-minute break.

## **5. ELECTION OF 2012 UASI OFFICERS**

Chair Kronenberg called the regular meeting back to order at 11:15 a.m. She asked for nominations for the Chair of the Bay Area UASI Approval Authority.

Member Harrison nominated Member Renee Domingo as the Chair and Member Godley offered a second.

Member Bolanos asked for clarification on open nominations and the particular positions for which the Board was voting. Chair Kronenberg answered that nominations would be open for as long as Members wished. With that, Member Bolanos nominated Chair Kronenberg and Member Lucia seconded the nomination. Chair Kronenberg asked for additional nominations. With no response or discussion from the Board, Chair Kronenberg asked Member Domingo if she would like to make a statement.

Member Domingo stated that she would be honored to take on the role as Chair of the Approval Authority and would be committed to continuing to work on regional collaboration. She stated that she would allow the organization to grow and have many new opportunities, even during these challenging times. She welcomed the opportunity and believed her candidacy would change the leadership structure of the Chair position.



Chair Kronenberg presented her statement and commented on the changes to the Approval Authority over the past year. Since last January, the Board has been reorganized to be more efficient and the professionalism of the staff has increased. She also commented that San Francisco is currently the Fiscal Agent for the Bay Area UASI and staff members are San Francisco employees. She stated that she would be honored to be the Chair and commended Ms. Domingo on the respect she has for her.

Chair Kronenberg asked for public comment and additional comment from the Board. With no response, Chair Kronenberg then called for an open vote at the pleasure of the Board.

Roll call was held: Member Godley voting for Domingo, Member Collins for Kronenberg, Member Bolanos for Kronenberg, Member Mahoney for Kronenberg, Member Aston for Kronenberg, Member Lucia for Kronenberg, Member Harrison for Domingo, Member Fawell for Kronenberg, and Member Doyle for Kronenberg. Since the majority voted for current Chair Anne Kronenberg, Ms. Kronenberg will remain the Chair of the UASI Approval Authority.

Chair Kronenberg thanked the Members of the Board and opened nominations for Vice-Chair.

Member Mahoney nominated Member Lucia for Vice-Chair and Member Doyle seconded the nomination. Chair Kronenberg asked for further nominations. With no response, Member Lucia made a statement for his Vice-Chair candidacy. Hearing no other nominations, Chair Kronenberg polled the membership. Voting was unanimous in favor of Member Lucia as Vice-Chair.

Chair Kronenberg noted that the meeting was ahead of schedule and lunch had not yet arrived, so the meeting proceeded to the next Agenda Item.

## **6. MISSION AND GOALS FOR 2012**

Chair Kronenberg introduced Chuck Eaneff of the Naval Postgraduate School, Center for Homeland Defense and Security. Mr. Eaneff introduced himself and provided information on his background. He also described the structure of the Naval Postgraduate School.

Mr. Eaneff began the discussion by defining the mission of the Bay Area UASI and explained that making decisions about the Bay Area UASI mission and goals will require a multi-disciplinary understanding of language and perspectives.

Following this short overview, lunch was delivered and the Board took a brief break.

## **LUNCH BREAK**



Chair Kronenberg resumed the regular meeting after the lunch break, and asked facilitator Chuck Eaneff to review the mission and goals of the Bay Area UASI.

Chuck Eaneff began by outlining the following areas:

- a) Presidential Policy Directive
- b) DHS: Preparedness Goals
- c) National Preparedness Goals
- d) FEMA Grant Administration
- e) UASI Program

He stressed the importance of emergency management in filling a federal need by implementing local and regional programs that build a larger system which in turn affects Homeland Security at the federal level. He suggested that grants that articulate how programs that fill a federal need not already addressed by FEMA receive funding and are not cut or are cut minimally. He noted that FEMA particularly likes performance grants.

Chuck Eaneff pointed out that the framework he presented narrowed from the Presidential Policy Directive to the UASI Program in regards to terrorism, which represents larger trends in fund allocations.

Mr. Eaneff then facilitated the discussion about drafting the UASI mission statement with the understanding that the Bay Area UASI not only concerns itself with the UASI grant and the National Preparedness Goals, but also the Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program and other programs focused on regional all-hazard preparedness.

Craig Dziedzic elaborated on the Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPGP) by stating that it focuses on regional all-hazard preparedness through integrated planning. He continued by explaining the Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program (IECGP) and Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) Grant, and described the direction and expenditures which had been decided by the Approval Authority.

Advanced Recovery:

Member Lucia asked about the word “recovery” as it related to the Mission Statement and if it fit within the definition of the UASI. Chair Kronenberg indicated, that in the past, the Board had not done much work on recovery, but she hoped that in the future it would be an important component of the Bay Area UASI. She further described that the National Preparedness Framework will be implemented in January 2012 and that FEMA will be focusing on the Resilient Community and the recovery period after major natural disasters by developing a plan and framework. This new framework is referred to as Advanced Recovery, and the Board





should be thinking about ways to quickly recover in the community.

Member Godley commented that the five areas of focus for National Preparedness Goals are: economic recovery, health and social services, housing and infrastructure systems, and natural and cultural resources, all in relation to recovery.

Chuck Eaneff summarized that the previous statements pertain to preparing to recover and asked the Approval Authority if advanced recovery should be incorporated into the Mission Statement.

Chair Kronenberg suggested that advanced recovery is something the Board should be working on, especially since the grant guidelines will include this preparedness goal. She continued that this would allow the Bay Area UASI to be ready to address this need. Member Lucia expressed agreement with Chair Kronenberg's suggestion, but pointed out that it will be challenge to add another component due to reduced funding.

Member Aston asked how advanced recovery differs from advanced mitigation. Chair Kronenberg responded that, while the terms are similar, the difference between advanced recovery and advanced mitigation is that advanced recovery offers more opportunity to prepare for a disaster by putting a framework in place. In sum, recovery efforts should start the same day as the response effort so both recovery and response teams know what to do.

Chuck Eaneff commented on the discussion by using FEMA call centers as an example of advanced recovery. He stated that when a disaster strikes, staffing will be on demand and advanced preparation will shorten the time between the disaster declaration and the ability of staff to aid recovery.

Member Murphy indicated that the idea of advanced recovery will carry over to continuity of operations and government. This new initiative focuses on what to do after a disaster and comes down to the idea of communities bouncing back more quickly. Further, it increases the organization's capacity as Emergency Management teams think about how communities can succeed after a disaster.

Chuck Eaneff asked if the Board should address this initiative or whether it should stay with emergency managers within the Bay Area. Chair Kronenberg stated that it was an opportunity for the Board to develop recovery language in advance, so during a response, recovery can begin as well. Mr. Eaneff again asked if the Approval Authority wanted to focus on recovery.

Member Lucia indicated that the Approval Authority may not have an option if this new component is in the grant guidelines and Member Harrison agreed. She further indicated that FEMA will want the Approval Authority to address multiple issues, but the Board will only have



a specific amount of money and prioritization will be required. Member Godley commented that the Approval Authority is the only regional body with the power to take action. He continued that the ultimate goal of terrorism is to disrupt society and unless action is taken to recover from such an event, the terrorists win. So, Member Godley suggested the Approval Authority incorporate recovery in the Mission Statement.

#### Grants and Terrorism Nexus:

Member Bolanos then suggested that if a nexus to terrorism is required (especially since the UASI program is a terrorism grant), then recovery should be in the Mission Statement. However, he was also concerned that adding another component to the Mission Statement might cause the group's focus to be lost and transform it into a disaster preparedness group. Member Fawell indicated that he thought the Board should focus more on deferred prevention and the state of terrorism. Member Harrison pointed out that the Bay Area UASI deals with other types of grants, which allows for regional collaboration. She agreed that terrorism grants should be used for terrorism efforts, but that other grants and programs could focus on other areas.

Chair Kronenberg reminded the Approval Authority that they had discussed the group's name in previous meetings because the Board is much broader than just the UASI. The conclusion of that discussion was the difficulty in renaming the group.

Chuck Eaneff summarized the points made by the Board; that advanced recovery may be a good idea for acts of terrorism but there are concerns about how funds will be restricted and how that will affect programming.

Member Lucia pointed out the primary areas outlined in the grant requirements: risk management planning, information analysis, infrastructure protection capabilities, enhanced communication and interoperable communications, CBRNE protection and first response, decontamination, medical and public health preparedness, emergency planning and citizen preparedness, recovery capabilities, regional exercises, and training and administration. Member Harrison commented that the Approval Authority has previously determined how the funds were allocated. Member Fawell indicated that the UASI has achieved a great deal in these categories and they should be maintained, but also indicated that this can also become limiting to the organization.

Chuck Eaneff asked again if recovery should be included in the Mission Statement. Member Harrison stated that recovery should be in the mission statement, but the amount allocated to this was another issue. At this point, the Board agreed that "recovery" should stay in the Mission Statement. Member Fawell stated that sustainability was also important when considering grants and projects, so it should be included in the Mission Statement. Mr. Eaneff



suggested keeping “recovery” and adding “sustains” and “improves capacity.” The Board agreed.

Member Harrison suggested that the original mission statement was too long. After additional discussion, the Board agreed upon: “The Bay Area Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) sustains and improves capacity of the Bay Area to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist incidents or related catastrophic events.” The other language from the statement was determined to be part of the goals and objectives.

Member Fawell suggested that the UASI should define its role in the event of widespread destruction from terrorism. Member Godley stated that he would agree to Member Fawell’s suggestion if the Approval Authority only concerned itself with UASI Grants, but pointed out that the Board is responsible for five other grants not related to terrorism. Member Fawell continued that the Board should not deviate from terrorism issues because the same tools used for a terrorist event can also be used in a natural disaster. Chair Kronenberg asked Member Fawell to clarify if the mission statement should include “or catastrophic events.” Member Fawell answered that the Mission Statement should specify their recovery intent.

Chuck Eaneff added that law enforcement believes that efforts made to prepare for terrorism threat can be used to address all other preparedness efforts, such as disasters. He continued that other disciplines may have trouble restricting funds strictly to terrorism and asked if the Board should focus the nexus of the mission to terrorism.

Member Mark Aston pointed out that since the Bay Area UASI processed grants other than homeland security grants, their mission statement should address that. He added that prevention and protection are critical components. Further, if we are prepared to respond to a terrorist event, then we are also prepared for other catastrophic events. This should be central for the allocation of grant funds.

Member Fawell stressed the importance of defining the word “related” in terms of a catastrophic event because prevention will be a key element in planning. Member Harrison suggested removing “related”. Member Brendan Murphy suggested the “or” in the original mission statement should become an “and,” making the statement “from terrorist incidents and catastrophic events.” This echoed Member Fawell and Member Harrison’s suggestions to include all methods of planning.

Member Murphy suggested that the Board keep its primary focus on terrorism since the money they do receive is solely for terrorism. The other grants the UASI is concerned with can be directed towards their separate, specific purposes.

Member Lucia agreed with Member Murphy that the goals should clarify the specific purposes



of each grant and that UASI grant funds should be used solely for terrorism. If the group creates a more open-ended mission statement then the program could include catastrophic events. By doing this, however, the Board should clearly define the specifics in the UASI goals and objectives.

Member Daniel Mahoney stated that focusing the mission statement on terrorism would allow members to more easily choose competing projects, especially with dwindling monetary resources.

#### Mission Statement:

Chuck Eaneff read the mission statement as edited by the Approval Authority: “The Bay Area Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) sustains and improves regional capacity to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist incidents and catastrophic events.”

#### Goals:

Member Lucia suggested defining funding sources in their written goals and clarifying their mission through the funding sources. Member Aston suggested erasing the second “bay area” on the mission and changing word to “regions.” Chuck Eaneff read the mission statement: “The Bay Area Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) sustains and improves regional capacity to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist incidents and catastrophic events.”

Chair Kronenberg encouraged the Board to start drafting some of the goals because of the limited time remaining. She reminded the Board that these are broad, long-term goals rather than action statements. The Board suggested that the first goal say “UASI grant funding will be used to prevent, protect and recover from acts of terrorism.”

Teresa Serata, Director of Strategy and Compliance for the UASI Management Team, suggested that the statement include “mitigate” because the FY 2011 grant guidelines defined the grant program as such. Hearing this, Chair Kronenberg restated the goal with the added changes: “UASI grant funding will be used to enhance and sustain capacity to prevent, protect against, mitigate and respond to acts of terrorism”

Member Domingo commented that it should say “enhance and sustain” and added “regional capacity”, to state: “UASI grant funding will be used to enhance and sustain regional capacity to prevent, protect against, mitigate and respond to acts of terrorism.”



POETE:

Teresa Serata informed the Board that the UASI grant staff use the acronym POETE to articulate funding categories. She continued that the grant guidelines will refer to POETE and suggested the “O in organization” be added into the goal so it is universally understood by the organization. Chair Kronenberg agreed with Ms. Serata and added “organization” to this goal.

Chuck Eaneff read the goal: “The UASI Grant funding will be used to enhance and sustain the regional capacity to prevent, protect, respond, recover, and mitigate terrorism by providing planning, organization, equipment, training, and exercises” and received consensus from the Board.

Sustainability:

Member Fawell suggested that the next goal should concern sustainability, specifically projects that have not yet been completed and continue to be of substantial relevance. In response, Member Lucia suggested the wording: “To the extent possible, the Approval Authority will seek and consider funding for sustaining existing projects for completion and sustaining projects.” Chair Kronenberg echoed the sentiment that completing current projects is important and Mr. Eaneff reminded the Approval Authority that Craig Dziedzic is responsible for putting these goals into action.

Member Lucia suggested that the goal should read: “To the extent possible, the UASI approval authority will seek to utilize existing and new grant funding for the purpose of completion of existing projects and sustaining all UASI funded projects.” He stressed that a project cannot just exist, it must be sustained. The Board suggested adding “projects, programs and systems” to the goal.

Member Domingo pointed out that the Board would need to quantify and determine what projects are high priority, high risk, and high threat, especially because there are existing projects that are no longer a priority at this time. Member Lucia then added that including “to the extent possible” would allow the Board to make that determination. Member Harrison mentioned that if there was a project in progress, but all agreed it was not successful, there would need to be a mechanism to discontinue it. Chuck Eaneff clarified that the Board will either sustain the project or complete it, and that the ultimate goal is to not disregard important projects.

Member Fawell asked about the process for project completion or discontinuation. Member Lucia indicated that there has always been an unwritten assumption that once a project is funded by the Approval Authority, it becomes the responsibility of the project’s Program Manager to ensure completion. He encouraged the Board to focus on accountability and



efficient planning of grant funds.

In response, Member Harrison suggested that the goal state: “The Bay Area UASI will protect its investment in a top priority protocol” and suggested the Board find an appropriate wording articulating that a project sustains its investments and important projects and programs.

Member Domingo suggested adding a caveat to this goal in accordance with the Approval Authority review and prioritization process to allow the Board discretion to review the status of programs to ensure they are still valid after a set period of time. Then, Member Lucia suggested the wording: “To the extent possible, the UASI Approval Authority will prioritize existing and new projects in order to protect its investments and to sustain and complete those projects that are chosen”. He added that prioritization will be applied first, sustained projects second, and completing projects third. Chuck Eaneff read the second goal: “To the extent possible, the UASI will prioritize its investments in order to sustain and complete projects, programs, and systems” and received consensus from the board.

Chair Kronenberg suggested crafting one more goal that describes enhancing regional collaboration to leverage funding and achieve optimal results with the dollars available. Member Domingo suggested adding “funding and resources” to Chair Kronenberg’s goal. Member Domingo stated that collaborative efforts are not solely about funding. Chuck Eaneff read the goal “Enhance regional collaboration by leveraging funding and resources to achieve optimal results with the dollars available.” He then suggested removing “dollars available.”

Chair Kronenberg thought it was important to leave in “dollars available” because the statement should address the issue of decreased funding. She then stated that it could be changed to available funding. Mr. Eaneff then reiterated the last goal “Enhance regional collaboration by leveraging available funding and resources to achieve optimal results” and received consensus from the Board.

Chuck Eaneff commended the Board on their ability to speak across different disciplines, especially in regards to terrorism and in front of staff. He stated that the staff will have much to discuss after listening to the discussion. He suggested that General Manager Craig Dzedzic ask for staff input so that they can consider it at the next meeting.

Chair Kronenberg asked for any additional suggestions for goals and asked for feedback from UASI staff about the goals and mission statement. She indicated that an electronic copy of the mission statement and goals would be sent out to everyone. Mr. Eaneff praised the Board for achieving a consensus on the mission statement and goals.

Member Kronenberg thanked Chuck Eaneff for facilitating the session and asked the public for comments on the particular mission or goals. Upon hearing no response, she asked the



Approval Authority members if they had anything further to discuss.

Member Collins indicated that the overarching goals should correlate with the Homeland Security Strategy Draft. If not, she suggested that the Board discuss it with the Advisory Group and apply any changes.

Chair Kronenberg encouraged all Members of the Board and staff to review the strategy prior to the next meeting. She concluded that any suggestion or improvement from the staff will be considered in the next draft of goals.

Chair Kronenberg thanked all Approval Authority Members for their contributions and noted that there will be a few slight changes to the alternate memberships, mostly regarding those individuals not yet appointed. Member Harrison stated that Ken Kehmna would, for the time being, remain the alternate for Santa Clara County.

Chair Kronenberg informed the audience that Assistant Fire Chief Monica Fields had recently retired, so a new alternate for San Francisco will be appointed. She will follow up with staff when she has more information. She also mentioned that Heather Tannenhill-Plamondon has taken a new job in San Mateo County and is no longer on the UASI Management Team.

Member Harrison thanked Amiee Alden and her sub-committee for putting together the retreat and thanked the staff who helped prepare the binders.

Chair Kronenberg asked the general public for comment and announced that the next Approval Authority meeting will be on January 12<sup>th</sup>, at 10 a.m. at the Dublin OES building in Alameda County.

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.