



**DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting of
Bay Area UASI Program
Approval Authority**

Wednesday, March 16, 2011 - 10:00 a.m.
San Francisco Department of Public Health
101 Grove Street
Conference Room 300
San Francisco, CA

Anne Kronenberg, Approval Authority Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Approval Authority members present: UASI Chair Anne Kronenberg, Monica Fields, Renee Domingo, Rich Lucia, Teresa Reed, Kirstin Hofmann, and Scott Frizzie.

Laura Phillips, General Manager, was in attendance.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Kirstin Hofmann made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting on March 1, 2011; Monica Fields seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

GENERAL MANAGERS REPORT

Laura Phillips, General Manager, stated that she didn't have much to report since she gave a report at the meeting on March 1st. She included financial documents for review on the RCPGP program to her report.

UASI PROJECT STATUS REPORTS

(CBRNE/Training & Exercise)

John Justice, UASI Project Manager for the CBRNE Working Group gave a briefing on the following:

- The Training/Exercise and CBRNE Working Group has been meeting for several years. One of the ongoing things that they have been tasked with each fiscal year is ranking and evaluating projects.
- CBRNE 2008: there were 11 CBRNE projects funded and all have been completed.
- CBRNE 2009: there were 10 approved (CBRNE) projects in which most have been completed to date; a few projects are awaiting procurement equipment. All projects are expected to be completed and done by the end of the project period which is June 30th.
- Golden Guardian: Redwood City, San Francisco, and Oakland played a major role. Positive feedback was received about this regional exercise, which was a joint effort between the UASI, US Coast Guard, and CalEMA Coastal Region for Training and Exercise.



- In October 2010, the Urban Shield exercise was held - 3,000 people were trained or involved in the exercise. In addition, there were 400 observers and evaluators. Urban Shield 2010 was funded by FY2009 funds and was used to increase capabilities and to include fire services. When Urban Shield started it was primarily a law enforcement event, but this year 15 fire agencies throughout the region (all hubs) were involved in the exercise.
- 2008 Training: All training courses funded by UASI FY 2008 have been completed and done.
- 2009 Training: Processed over 25 requests for course funding of which 14 were approved for funding. Almost all courses are done with the exception of a few that are currently underway.
- For FY10 an RFP was put out for the Training and Exercise Program which was done about a year ago. Negotiations are going on and should be brought to a close by the next meeting.

Laura Phillips complimented John Justice and the CBRNE Working Group for their work at prioritizing, collaborating and filling gaps with many stakeholders. She pointed out this Working Group was responsible for over \$4 million over the last two cycles that the group collaborated on. Ms. Phillips pointed out that the expansion of Urban Shield brought a lot of great compliments from FEMA, now that EMS, Fusion Center, and Fire are participating. This has been a great opportunity to validate the plans.

(Medical and Health Preparedness Initiative)

Michael Clark gave a report on the 2008 Statewide Patient Movement Plan, which is a program that the UASI partnered with the California Emergency Medical Services Authority (EMSA), the Emergency Medical Services Administrators Associations of California (EMSAAC), and the California Department of Public Health (CDPH). An operational guidance was developed on how to deal with medical evacuations of patients from hospitals, long-term care facilities, and other alternate care facilities. This project is wrapping up and with the assistance of the California EMS Authority will go through public comment and then to the EMS Commission for adoption and then it will become an addendum to the California Emergency Manual.

Mr. Clark discussed the start of the 2009 Enhancing the Regional Medical and Health System project. With the release of the California Public Health and Medical Emergency Operations Manual it was discovered that there is a gap in the system at the regional level and between the Operational Areas and the State in which many entities in the medical health/mutual aid system were handling things differently. Stakeholders such as the EMSA, California DPH, regional disaster coordinators and specialists, and operational area coordinators have determined that the most effective way is to create a standardized process for reporting and requesting resources as well as situation status reports.

Kirstin Hofmann asked if the contract with Cameron Bruce Associates ever came to the Approval Authority for approval before it was issued. Michael Clark stated that it had not come to the Approval Authority. Ms. Hofmann stated that this item needs to be on a future meeting agenda for the Approval Authority to retroactively approve it (as with the Donations Management project) as the Approval Authority is required to vote on any allocations made.



Anne Kronenberg stated that her understanding was that if the Approval Authority approved a general allocation in an area that the individual small contract does not need to come back.

Laura Phillips stated that the UASI consulted with the San Francisco City Attorney's Office and they said that the contract did not need to come back to the Approval Authority. There is the understanding that there has not been full consensus from the Approval Authority on what it means to fully do an allocation. Additionally there are the issues with how other jurisdictions weigh in on contracting process that will be completed with San Francisco. Language has been included and clarified in the Bylaws.

Kirstin Hofmann pointed out that the Approval Authority did receive a letter from the San Francisco City Attorney which spoke to the issue of Project Cornerstone. However the letter stated that if the Approval Authority is to appropriately make an allocation, if one has been made without the approval of the Approval Authority then something needs to be done to the current allocation. She is taking that recommendation very seriously.

Anne Kronenberg asked the contract amount. Michael Clark responded that the contract was for \$410,000. Ms. Kronenberg agreed to calendar this item for the next meeting.

(Donations Management)

Guy Bernardo, Program Manager, stated that Donations Management is one of two projects from the 2009 Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grants Planning Program. From those two projects, the UASI is now in the process of carrying out the contract for Donations Management. He stated that the project is currently on time and on budget. Mr. Bernardo pointed out that the draft regional plan for Donations Management has been released and is out for comment. The Steering Committee will be meeting next week and will give the Approval Authority feedback. The local templates are being processed by URS.

Kirstin Hofmann stated that this project didn't come back to the Approval Authority for approval of contracts entered into and the project is well underway. She requested that this contract come back to the Approval Authority for information regarding the RFP, the scores; she feels that the Approval Authority needs to affirm these dollars.

Ms. Kronenberg asked for clarification on how close the project is to being completed.

Guy Bernardo clarified that the project timeline began in July 2010 and is due to end May 31, 2011. He stated that when the May Approval Authority meeting was cancelled, the UASI had consulted with the San Francisco City Attorney on moving forward with the Donations contract and was advised that the parties to the contract, San Francisco and URS Corporation, were in agreement that it was most important to execute the contract and honor the timeline. Mr. Bernardo pointed out that it was the intention for this to be brought back to the Approval Authority; he apologized for this slipping from his radar after the process for the contract had already begun.

Ms. Kronenberg confirmed that the Approval Authority will review this contract retroactively. She is happy that Mr. Bernardo is managing the project and that it is at the point where it is right now. Ms. Kronenberg pointed out that after what happened in Japan, Donations Management is a huge issue around any emergency.



Mr. Bernardo stated that there will be a regional plan going forward to the State for the Approval Authority's adoption around May as well as some local plan templates for the counties and large cities.

Renee Domingo commented that she is happy that the plan is on time and within budget. She has concerns that the UASI Management Team continues to usurp the authority of the Approval Authority. She asked what was the point of having an Approval Authority if contracts were going to be awarded without their approval. Ms. Domingo questioned if URS was the most qualified and if there were better consultants in the area. She pointed out that there have been issues and questions with URS continuing to always receive all of the contracts for the Bay Area UASI; this issue has come up in the past at the end of 2009. She would like to see any correspondence that came from the San Francisco City Attorney's Office stating that it is okay not to come back to the Approval Authority for approval for that contract. Ms. Domingo pointed out that in the document it states that it was approved by the Approval Authority in November 2009, which is a misrepresentation; she asked for clarification.

Guy Bernardo stated that he thinks terms are getting confused. He clarified that in 2009 the allocation for the Donations Management contract was approved, which is the money for this contract. The Donations Management planning effort began in 2010. An RFP was put out so that it could go through a competitive process, a number of different companies submitted proposals. The written proposals were vetted by a team of subject matter experts. Oral presentations and financial proposals were given by the two finalists and evaluated. In March 2010 when Mr. Bernardo came to give an update to the Approval Authority on the Donations Management process, the UASI had already gone through the written proposal evaluation, the oral scoring and were awaiting the financial management report. At this point a final selection had not yet been made it was after this date in March that the UASI made a selection and went ahead and entered into negotiations with URS. It should be noted that the two finalists were very close; it was a matter of the detail of the deliverables and who was going to produce the best product. Around March 26th, URS was selected and notified and from that point forward the UASI began working to negotiate the contract to exactly what was needed in the scope; went into a contract with URS in July.

Laura Phillips stated that RCPGP is a different grant. In the current MOU, the language states contracts come back to the Approval Authority if the fiscal agent is going to be the City and County of San Francisco. She stated that RCPGP was complex as it considered the other 10 counties for catastrophic planning and beyond the footprint; San Francisco was going to be the fiscal agent with risks and a 25% match. Ms. Phillips pointed out that there is a separate charter process that included FEMA and other state representatives overseeing this charter process. She stated that it is very complex in how decisions are made, but it's clear in the chartering documents. Ms. Phillips stated that the new MOU and Bylaws there will be sufficient language and clarity on what comes back and what it means when San Francisco is the fiscal agent.

Kirstin Hofmann pointed out that the existing MOU is still in place and this is the one the Approval Authority must abide by. She stated that the Subcommittee is working hard on the new MOU and Bylaws language and is hoping to address a lot of the issues discussed. However until there is a new MOU in place, and regardless of funding stream, RCPGP is governed by this current document. She stated that it was clear that the San Francisco City



Attorney's Office does not represent the interests of the Approval Authority. So when Mr. Bernado discussed the San Francisco City Attorney's Office stating that to go ahead and execute, that doesn't represent the Approval Authority's interests. She is not going to accept this as an executed contract. She does not want contractors setting timelines and deadlines for the Approval Authority and its jurisdictions. She doesn't think it's appropriate for them to push for signed and executed contracts.

Anne Kronenberg clarified that in regards to the San Francisco City Attorney's Office, this issue has come up in the last six months. At the time when Laura Phillips and Guy Bernardo went to seek advice from the City Attorney's Office there wasn't clarity and the City Attorney's Office did a lot of work on the legality of things. She understands Ms. Hofmann's comments but stated that this did happen a year ago.

Renee Domingo expressed her concern that the Approval Authority is not getting information until they ask for it. She pointed out that the Approval Authority should have received a report or update regarding the advice of the Approval Authority and the contracts entered into without the approval of the Approval Authority. Ms. Domingo stated that everything that the Approval Authority finds out is because they asked for it or through research, subpoenaing records, and through public information requests when the UASI Management Team is supposed to be serving the UASI Approval Authority and its regional members. She stated that she has a problem with this; it's like the tail wagging the dog. She would like to stop all of the nonsense and that the current MOU be followed which is very clear. It states that anything involving allocations, reallocations or anything involved with funding come back to the Approval Authority and that excuses are used regarding timelines and project complications and that business is done the way it is supposed to be done.

Laura Phillips asked Mr. Bernardo how often does the RCPT Team meet, which was established by the charter with FEMA and if any concerns were ever raised at the meetings.

Guy Bernardo stated that the RCPT Team meets every other meeting and often the same day as the Advisory Group; they receive updates. No concerns were ever raised at the meetings.

Kirstin Hofmann pointed out that she had voiced concerns and objected to the rushed timeline due to a lack of staff support.

UASI INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS PILOT PROJECT

Anne Kronenberg discussed the past Approval Authority meeting in which Member Reed presented two letters at the meeting that she wanted addressed prior to today's meeting, in which a response was sent. Additionally, Mayor Reed sent a letter asking some questions which were answered as well. Ms. Kronenberg pointed out that all materials are available at today's meeting.

Ms. Kronenberg pointed out that at the last meeting it was called to her attention that the wording had been changed on the agenda. Member Reed stated that because \$6.2 million was allocated to Alameda County and the SF City Attorney had said that the Approval Authority had to approve the allocation before it could be reallocated back to the cities. After the March 1 meeting, Ms. Kronenberg spoke with the San Francisco City Attorney to get legal advice on this



issue. The City Attorney told Ms. Kronenberg that the allocation to Alameda was never approved by the Approval Authority. The Approval Authority needs to take action on the \$6.2 million dollar UASI 09 allocation. Katie Porter (SFCA) drafted the language on today's agenda. For discussion and possible action: "Allocate \$2 million to Oakland for grant eligible interoperability projects; \$2 million to San Jose for grant eligible interoperability projects and \$2.2 million to Alameda for Project Cornerstone. This \$2.2 million had originally been "tagged" for San Francisco money but San Francisco is committed to putting that in Project Cornerstone so that there is a pilot project. She pointed out that there has been a lot of material presented including a letter from Bill McCammon who clarified his discussions with Motorola that there can be a pilot project for \$2.2 million and what this project would look like. So the proposal is for FY UASI 09 Interoperable funding.

Teresa Reed stated that she wanted to clear some things up. She pointed out that back when the Approval Authority reconvened after the "summer break" (two cancelled meetings) this item came back that the \$6.2 million that was allocated to San Francisco, Oakland and San Jose was reallocated to Alameda County for Project Cornerstone, this is why the Approval Authority has been having these discussions over the last 6 months and in a meeting today. She stated that the money was reallocated to Alameda County. The letter from the San Francisco City Attorney stated that if that allocation was to hold true, the Approval Authority would have to vote on that reallocation.

Ms. Kronenberg stated that was correct but since the reallocation was never approved by the Approval Authority it's like that pot of money is still sitting there so the Approval Authority can approve it for whatever projects they want. An allocation needs to be approved at today's meeting.

Ms. Reed agreed that an allocation has not been approved. She pointed out that at the January meeting a motion was placed on the floor in regards to approving an allocation to Alameda County or to offer some options for that. She believes at the last meeting, Ms. Kronenberg stated that the motion wasn't deferred; it was just that the Approval Authority didn't like the motion. She referred back to the minutes of the January 10th meeting on page 26 it states, "Teresa Reed made a motion to defer agenda item 8 to next meeting; Rich Lucia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously." Ms. Reed stated that just for the record the motion was deferred to the next meeting.

Anne Kronenberg stated that Ms. Reed was correct however since that meeting was her first meeting she had misinterpreted what happened; she had stated this as well as that meeting.

Teresa Reed stated that she just wants to make sure that the information is in the record correctly. She stated that she wanted to make a substitute motion after clarification was received from Bill McCammon regarding the EBRCSA invoice and his letter written to Ms. Phillips regarding his conversation with Motorola.

Bill McCammon, Executive Director of EBRCSA, stated that he had discussed the Project Cornerstone budget at the last meeting. He stated that the supporting document showed that there was a contract approved by EBRCSA for \$5.588 million for the pilot project, Project Cornerstone, with Motorola. The contract includes: Evolved Packet Core (EPC) which is the master site, 10 eNode B's, 300 USB Dongle's, 30 Spares, and 1 year maintenance and



operations service. EBRCSA was invoiced by Motorola as part of the payment milestones in the contract, \$500,000 per invoice. The total amount of invoices paid was \$2,041,916; \$41,000 of this was for a bond. After this two change orders were initiated to do site evaluations and microwave backhaul structural analysis one for \$114,000 and the other for \$23,400. While payment has been authorized EBRCSA has not been billed for these orders yet; so these are still outstanding. A contract with Andy Seybold Inc. to do coverage testing of the network once it was up which was for \$184,000; paid \$33,000.

Mr. McCammon stated that they had received more equipment than what was paid for at this point under the contract. Motorola is working with EBRCSA to get the coverage testing up and the system up and working as fast as they could. The first thing Motorola did was to install the EPC at the master site in Dublin and then began looking at the different sites to determine which site was ready to start installing eNodeB's. To date the Evolved Packet Core is installed and done, three of the eNodeB's have been installed and the fourth, which is going into the City of Concord, is in the process of installation now. Mr. McCammon stated that when it was brought to their attention that there was an interest by the UASI to go back and renegotiate a closure to this contract, EBRCSA went back to talk to Motorola. Motorola went back and looked at the amount of money that they spent on design work, installation work and on actual hard equipment purchases. Motorola proposed that if EBRCSA was to move forward with this and close out the contract out that they would build out the fourth site in Concord and provide maintenance and service for the system for one year. At the end of this time, when the assets are distributed which the BTOP grant always intended to forward the four enodeB's and Motorola would retain the core and then EBRCSA would close the project. He pointed out that the intent has always been to roll this into the BTOP grant.

Teresa Reed wanted to make a substitution and moved that the Approval Authority allocate Project Cornerstone funds in alignment with the original Approval Authority approved allocation which was \$2 million to Oakland, \$2 million to San Jose and \$2 million to San Francisco with acknowledgement that San Francisco has agreed to give its share to Alameda County and the East Bay Regional Communications Authority to cover costs associated with Project Cornerstone.

Anne Kronenberg inquired if the original \$6.2 million that wasn't approved was allocated under the term "Project Cornerstone".

Laura Phillips stated that the allocation was for a pilot project in the Bay Area for broadband. The "Cornerstone" name was recommended by the FCC around August.

Ms. Kronenberg made an amendment to make the language consistent with the original allocation language to replace "Project Cornerstone" with broadband pilot. She also clarified that it was for \$6 million and not \$6.2 million.

Rich Lucia stated that he understands from Mr. McCammon that there is a desire from Motorola and EBRCSA to work this out. He inquired would EBRCSA be on the hook for the extra money since they will only be receiving \$2 million instead of \$2.2 million.

Bill McCammon stated that once the contract is closed out it won't be a problem.



Anne Kronenberg wanted clarification on where the \$6.2 million figure came from.

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon explained that in the MOU for Alameda County \$6 million had been identified for the broadband pilots and an additional \$200,000 in interoperable communications dollars put towards the project for site guidance and any ancillary costs to the contract with Motorola. The allocation that was made in the original MOU contract with Alameda County and the City and County of San Francisco as the fiscal agent was for \$6.2 million; \$6 million was accounted for in the original broadband allocation and \$200,000 for ancillary costs associated with the Cornerstone Project.

Ms. Kronenberg asked whether the \$200,000 was ever approved by the Approval Authority. Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon stated that this was never approved by the Approval Authority. Ms. Kronenberg recommended including the \$200,000 in the motion to keep everything clean since it was \$6.2 million that went to Alameda.

Teresa Reed stated that the original allocation was for \$6 million so the \$200,000 should be a separate motion.

Monica Fields supported the idea to include \$200,000 in the original motion.

Teresa Reed stated that discussions have been about the allocation for \$6.2 million; the money that was in question was \$6 million (\$2 million for Oakland, \$2 million for San Francisco, and \$2 million for San Jose).

Anne Kronenberg stated that the San Francisco City Attorney felt that one motion was the correct way to go. She is willing to use the language that Ms. Reed recommended

Rich Lucia stated that having one motion or two separate motions is fine with him.

Renee Domingo concurred with member Lucia and stated that if there was a more clarifying motion that encompasses everything it might address everyone's concerns.

Ms. Reed recommended that the Approval Authority accept the motion as it was as the original allocation was for \$6 million. It would not be clean if all of a sudden there would be an allocation for \$6.2 million; it would be best for the record to address the \$200,000 in a separate motion. She is willing to support the motion for \$200,000 but feels that they are two separate issues.

Ms. Kronenberg stated that since the original proposal (on the agenda) stated \$6.2 million the Approval Authority had the authority under Roberts Rules to do two separate motions if that is the wish.

Teresa Reed made a motion that the Approval Authority allocate broadband pilot project funds in alignment with the original Approval Authority approved allocation which was \$2 million to Oakland, \$2 million to San Jose and \$2 million to San Francisco with acknowledgement that San Francisco has agreed to secede its share to Alameda County and the East Bay Regional Communications Authority to cover costs associated with the broadband pilot project. Kirstin Hofmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.



Anne Kronenberg made a motion to appropriate \$200,000 from UASI FY09 for Alameda County for Project Cornerstone, which is consistent with the \$6.2 million. Renee Domingo seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Kronenberg stated that it's nice to have this issue behind them. She thanked everyone for their support and help in getting clarity on this item.

Teresa Reed thanked everyone for their patience and diligence with clearing up this matter. She stated that part of the problem has been where the relationship with the Approval Authority and the Management Team has gone. She is hoping that in moving forward that the relationship can move into something more formal and more professional. It has been months that the Approval Authority has been asking these very questions and even at the last meeting there was a huge discussion about not understanding the questions, but the response to the questions were answered without any additional conversation. It appears that the Approval Authority has to ask for everything and getting information from the Management Team has been difficult. Ms. Reed hopes that in moving forward this is an area that will improve and that the Approval Authority will have a better working relationship with the Management Team. In order for the Approval Authority to have information necessary to vote on these areas it is important that the Management Team give that information in the beginning rather than just throwing something out there and making the Approval Authority do the research themselves as to what is the best use of taxpayers' dollars or if the process is going correctly or not. With the passing of the reallocation she understands that there are timelines; she asked for Ms. Kronenberg to direct the Management Team to assist San Jose and Oakland so that their projects would get through the process.

Anne Kronenberg stated that at the last meeting she had received reassurance from the Management Team that they would assist San Jose and Oakland. She believes that everyone wants these projects to be successful and wants San Jose and Oakland to spend the money on these interoperable projects because if not the money will go back to the federal government. The Management Team will work to ensure that San Jose and Oakland are successful in spending this money within the timelines.

UASI INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated at the Approval Authority meeting on January 10th she presented a staff report on the UASI's involvement in interoperability communications at the local, regional, state and federal level. At the end of the presentation she was asked by Member Reed to come back to the Approval Authority's next regularly scheduled meeting to give a presentation on the status of the interoperable communications investments that the UASI has made beginning in FY06 – FY09 particularly relating to the voice interoperability projects. She has completed a comprehensive staff report in terms of the work that has been done and is ongoing in the 10-county region.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon stated that

- The BayRICS investments made from the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) FY 06-09 includes grant funding streams in addition to the UASI, the UASI has managed Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) grant funds, COPS Technology grant funds, and Interoperable Emergency Communication Grant Program (IECGP) funds.



The IECGP Grant is managed through San Francisco as the fiscal agent and is intended to support the 22 Capital Bay Area Planning counties, which is a smaller grant and tends to be spread out.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon stated that the UASI has invested over \$54 million into the 10 Bay Area Counties in interoperable communications:

- Santa Clara County and the South Bay are primarily on a microwave infrastructure which they are currently building their Phase 3 of their microwave network.
- EBRCSA, Alameda County and Contra Costa (East Bay contingent) is working very diligently on a P25 voice system.
- The San Mateo County, part of the West Bay, is also investing in an interoperable radio communitiatIP25 voice system.
- Oakland is building an 800 MHz system.
- Invested significantly in BayLOOP, which isn't voice but microwave, backhaul used for voice.
- Invested \$1.5 million into underground radios for BART which directly affects the Eastern - Western partners.
- Invested significant amounts of money into Information Sharing which is the COPLINK and ARIES projects - now touching all 10 counties and beyond; branched out to cover San Benito County, Monterey County and Santa Cruz through the South Bay Information Sharing project.
- Made other smaller investments in command vehicles, portable radios, MDT's and in a regional RFP with Federal Engineering, which was intended to support the investments moving forward for the entire region for 700 MHz conventional overlay.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon commended Jeff Blau, Interoperable Program Manager, for all of his work and effort he put into this because there is a great deal of tracking that goes on into making sure that all of the projects are still moving forward, on track and on budget.

Renee Domingo thanked Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon and Jeff Blau for putting together the report and stated that she hoped the Approval Authority would receive regular reports whether it is quarterly or biannual basis on interoperable communications. She thinks it shows that the region has made great and significant progress towards interoperability and that everyone is moving forward.

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated that is the intention and that everybody is working very hard in response to the comments that have been received and would like to set up a regular reporting schedule.

Teresa Reed asked for clarification on the project percentages and on project completion.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon explained that the percentages are of the total funding amounts. All of the projects are in various stages getting close to completion; the problem is the projects are of such large magnitude that the projects are being phased.

Ms. Reed requested that an additional column be added the next time a report is given showing the movement of each project.



Kirstin Hofmann thanked Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon and pointed out that the total dollars spent is a lot and that's why there is a vested interest in additional details. She stated that she is interested in the vendor and the vendor selection process for the projects.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon stated that she would provide this information in the next staff report. She pointed out that it is important to acknowledge the fact that all of the entities go through local procurement practices and processes; they put their own RFP's out and they go through their own cities or counties procurement practice. Due to the magnitude of the contracts they are usually phased based on the investments. The UASI gives a portion of what is needed and the entities secure funding through other grant sources, general fund, or fees.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon pointed out that the UASI does not participate in the vendor selection process with the exception of Federal Engineering; this contract was done through the UASI and the City and County of San Francisco as the fiscal agent.

Renee Domingo asked for clarification on roaming agreements in terms of the region in the event of a disaster.

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon explained that the UASI is currently working on a regional fleetmapping which basically maps all of the radios and frequencies. A fleetmapping project is being worked on at the regional level. Contra Costa County has taken the lead on this project and the City and County of San Francisco is providing a great deal of support because they actually have a radio system up and running. There is a taskforce or subcommittee formed from the BayRICS group which meets every other month. Michelle Geddes from San Francisco has taken the lead on pulling that together and is currently having conference calls discussing the fleetmapping project. San Francisco just finished their local fleetmapping effort and is now working on how to transcend that into San Mateo County down into the northern part of Santa Clara County. The East Bay Regional Communications Systems Authority will work closely with Santa Clara County as they do their fleetmapping effort. So it is absolutely a conversation that is ongoing. The Work Group meetings are scheduled each month with the next meeting scheduled for March 30th. Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon stated that she would make sure that the Approval Authority receives a copy of the minutes from these meetings.

Renee Domingo requested that Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon provide a non-technical report of her verbal presentation.

Laura Phillips pointed out that there has been a lot of participation in the monthly groups and there have been several meetings. She stated that each Approval Authority member has someone from their jurisdiction attending these meetings and engaged in the processes, who can relay back the discussions and information from the meetings. Ms. Phillips recommended that each member make sure that there is an interface between them and who was appointed to represent their jurisdiction.

Ms. Domingo stated that she always refers to her technical person first and she asked about roaming agreements because the last they knew of was that there was a draft roaming agreement but there has not been any action taken.



Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated that there was a draft roaming agreement that the group has recently picked back up at the last meeting. There have been a lot of e-mail conversations going back and forth, so this is moving forward.

Laura Phillips pointed out that the agreement was one of the first out there in the industry but at the same time technical people are saying that they need to do the fleetmapping first and they don't know how to apply the agreement.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon fits very much with the regional processes that are being worked on at the Capital Bay Area as well as the State. The National Emergency Communications Plan (NECP) goals are being tested. This year Goal 2 is being tested which is at the county level in which each county has to prove their level of interoperability. Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon stated that last year NECP Goal 1 was at the UASI level and the UASI provided data and participated in the testing. This year she will be working to support the ten counties that are a part of the 58 counties in the state that need to provide interoperability compliance and conformance.

NORTH BAY INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS FY2010 ALLOCATION

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated that this item is before the Approval Authority as a step in the right direction in terms of getting the Approval Authority's participation before it gets too far ahead. She pointed out that in 2010 the UASI went through the hub process for planning projects for the investment justifications. She gave the following briefing on the North Bay Interoperability Project:

- The four North Bay counties of Solano, Sonoma, Napa, and Marin signed an MOU internally amongst the four counties agreeing to work together on interoperable communications projects.
- They submitted a project last year for the 2010 grant application process which was approved by their hub and the Approval Authority for \$1,238,402 for a North Bay interoperable communications project.
- The North Bay was intending on taking the results that came back from the Federal Engineering process (this was the process the UASI was engaged in during the time the projects were put together) and likely make the initial investment into a 700 MHz conventional overlay system for interoperable communications in the four North counties, which was approved by the Approval Authority. This was submitted under the larger umbrella of a regional interoperable solution.
- When the Federal Engineering project came back with the information specific to those four counties it was determined that for those four counties to participate in the 700 MHz overlay it would be significantly more expensive than the \$1.2 million that had been identified for them and likely significantly more expensive based on the economic standing of those four counties to continue moving forward to continue making these local investments.
- These four counties have come back to the UASI and asked that the direction of that allocated funding is changed to break it a part still to work towards regional interoperability but at a more basic level. They have asked for the one project at \$1.2 million to become three projects as follows: The County of Sonoma will have a \$194,000 project, Solano County will have \$305,000 project, and Marin County will have a \$739,402 project to begin the build out of a conventional overlay. At this point, Napa County does not accept UASI funds due to internal processes.



- In the staff report there is a description of the projects that they would like to have funded. The North Bay Planning Hub, the UASI Advisory Group, and all of the participating partners have reviewed and support this change.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon is seeking the support of the Approval Authority to change the direction of funding from one single investment to three investments still all supporting regional interoperability for the North Bay.

Scott Frizzie asked for clarification about Napa's involvement.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon explained that Napa is in support of this change and still very much involved in the planning and will be funding what they can with their own internal general fund dollars. Napa will be working off Marin County's conventional overlay project and is working with Marin.

Kirstin Hofmann inquired if there was an agreement in place between Napa and Marin or the other counties since they will be sharing the overlay.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon clarified that there is an MOU that the four counties signed stating that they are working on regional interoperability. She is the facilitator for the North Bay Planning Hub process and pointed out that Napa has a representative that attends all of the meetings. They are very interested in the planning that is being done and she has been working with them to get to a point where they can accept UASI dollars through an MOU between the UASI and them.

Laura Phillips stated that Napa doesn't meet some of the federal requirements to accept UASI funds and she is not sure if they want this to change; they also don't accept state funds. In the past Marin has accepted funds for Napa and executed the project. Despite this factor, Napa is very much involved in the project.

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon explained that the UASI is supporting Napa and providing them with whatever they need to make the internal decision.

Renee Domingo supports what the North Bay Hub is recommending as they know what is best for their jurisdiction. She asked whether this particular solution was short-term or long-term as she understands part of the issue is economics.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon stated that this is a short-term fix for a long-term solution. This will give Solano County and Sonoma County operability as well as basic interoperability which is very important to them and given the economics of the situation it's critical. Marin County has operability so this will begin the pact for interoperability. The Marin County project will certainly allow them to have interoperability across the Bay as well as the rest of the three North Bay Counties.

Renee Domingo made a motion to support the modification to the FY2010 Allocation of Interoperable Communications funding within the North Bay Planning. Rich Lucia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.



UASI FY 2011 ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY

Teresa Serata stated that at the last meeting the Approval Authority requested a special Advisory Group meeting to be held to discuss the UASI allocation methodology; this meeting was held on March 8th with call-in capabilities to allow for everyone to participate. The Management Team provided additional information and clarification regarding the allocation formula. Ms. Serata stated that two recommendations came out of this meeting. Chief Ken Kehmna, an Advisory Committee member will give the report.

Chief Ken Kehmna apologized to the Approval Authority for not being able to meet their request of exploring different allocation formulas. He stated that the Advisory Group members were certainly motivated and gave it an attempt; however it was just too difficult to do in the short timeframe. The Risk Analysis software utilized to determine the funding is a very complex system. It relies on two key pieces of information that the Advisory Group didn't have access to. He pointed out that in order for the Advisory Group to make a recommendation that they felt was valid it is critical that they have access to the information that they feel is necessary to have a dialogue to make educated, realistic, justifiable recommendations to the Approval Authority. Chief Kehmna discussed the conclusions of the Advisory Group:

- Given the Advisory Group's limited access to information used in the formula by the Risk Analysis Center software, it would be difficult if not impossible to make a justifiable recommendation for change at this time.
- Any argument that they would have attempted to make would have been subject to a great amount of debate and speculation. The relative fairness of the formula would have been difficult to assert given the likelihood of it becoming the subject of considerable debate.
- Additionally, with investment justifications due on March 25, 2011, made the timeline extremely short and a difficult task.

Chief Kehmna discussed the Advisory Groups recommendations:

1. Allow the Bay Area UASI Management Team to employ the same formula and utilize the same allocation process as was used in the distribution of funds for the FY 2010 allocation for the distribution of the 2011 Bay Area UASI grant funds.
2. Create a subcommittee or subgroup of the UASI Advisory Group having a security access level appropriate so they can weigh the information regarding critical infrastructure deemed classified so that they may discuss the various components utilized in the current allocation methodology. They may not necessarily require "secret" level clearance this was just an example of a way to see the information necessary to understand the formula. There may be other ways for select members of the Advisory Group to work with Digital Sandbox to be able to see the information.
3. The Approval Authority should immediately direct the subcommittee to consider alternatives to the current strategy and if necessary, make recommendations for the 2012 allocation of UASI funds. Unfortunately the timeline was just too short for the Advisory Group to make changes now.

Kirstin Hofmann thanked Chief Kehmna, the Advisory Group members, and the Management Team. She stated that the report was very concise and helpful to have a conclusion and recommendations. She pointed out that since they weren't able to meet the Approval



Authority's request to come back with a couple of alternatives; she is interested in knowing what might have made it easier to address this request.

Ken Kehmna stated that it was a matter of process than anything else. In order for the Advisory Group to have been prepared to answer the question, this conversation would have needed to have been going on for some time to truly understand the formula. He needs to be able to work with the staff that does understand it and can interpret it in a way that he can understand so that he can actually make a recommendation. Given additional time of about a calendar year is appropriate for the Advisory Group to really weigh in on this issue. The kind of dialogue that he needs in order to make really good recommendation is going to take several meetings. When you attempt to pull together a core group of people in a short amount of time, people's schedules conflict. Chief Kehmna stated that changes can be made in moving forward such as strengthening the role of the Advisory Group and the reporting relationship to the Approval Authority. He feels the Advisory Group is a tool that is not utilized to the full extent that can be offered. He is hoping that as the MOU moves forward there will be some clarification. He pointed out that he works well with direction but sometimes he isn't sure what they are being asked to do.

Kirstin Hofmann stated that one duty of the Advisory Group is to bring forth their expertise and recommendations to the Approval Authority as it is helpful for them to forth. She stated that if the Advisory Group needs a year, she is in support of whatever they need.

Chief Kehmna stated that he learns at the meetings even though he can't attend them all. He pointed out that the meetings are an opportunity to learn and have dialogue with people who understand what is being discussed. He stated that he supports longer Advisory Group meetings with more agenda items that come from the Approval Authority in which they can report back.

Renee Domingo thanked Deputy Chief Kehmna for his comments about how he would like for the Approval Authority to utilize the Advisory Group to a higher extent than in the past; she feels this would be beneficial to the entire region.

Kirstin Hofmann stated that with the schedule for the Advisory Group, the Approval Authority can come up with items for the Advisory Group to discuss. She would like to see regular reports from the Advisory Group at each Approval Authority meeting as this is a way to receive vital feedback.

Anne Kronenberg agreed that the Advisory Group report should be a regular agenda item for Approval Authority meetings.

Scott Frizzie expressed his concern about the timetable, however he likes the idea of the Approval Authority providing direction to the Advisory Group. He asked whether the Advisory Group could be given a task and be able to get it done in time prior to the next Approval Authority meetings.

Chief Kehmna stated that it depends on the item but this is the type of dialogue that should take place moving forward. He stated that he feels the timeframe will allow for the Advisory Group to



have discussions and provide feedback; however there may be some things that require more time.

Laura Phillips stated that she appreciates people participating in the Special Advisory Group meeting as there was only the one item for discussion. She stated that although Chief Kehmna is apologetic there was a lot of great effort and more of an understanding for the process, capabilities and the tool. She pointed out that the Advisory Group and Approval Authority meetings are scheduled one month apart.

Teresa Reed thanked Chief Kehmna for his report. She also wanted to make a motion to accept his recommendations and instruct the Subcommittee to immediately begin considering alternatives for allocation formulas for UASI 2012 funding.

Anne Kronenberg stated that she supports Ms. Reed's motion however the item on today's agenda was for discussion only. She stated that it would be placed as an action item on the next agenda.

Teresa Serata stated that the Advisory Group decided to schedule a meeting on March 30th from 9am – Noon to start working on this particular project to develop their objectives and deliverables.

Ms. Kronenberg stated that it would be good for the Approval Authority to make the specific request so that it gives some more official status to the Advisory Group.

Ken Kehmna agreed that this would be a good step. He asked that there be some discussions regarding the scope or the security level that will be necessary for this subcommittee. He pointed out that the security level process is a fairly lengthy process. Chief Kehmna stated that in speaking to some of his colleagues, they aren't convinced that it is absolutely necessary to do the kind of work that they need to do. He asked that this item is moved to the next meeting for discussion and potential action.

Teresa Reed stated that she understood that the Approval Authority was to discuss alternative allocation methods for the hubs however there were no alternatives. She thinks that the Approval Authority should be able to make a motion to accept the recommendation so that they can go ahead and start with the meeting on the 30th.

Anne Kronenberg stated that in the future all items should be placed on the agenda as "Discussion and Possible Action" so that there is the ability to make a motion. It is her understanding from years in public service that legally in order to take action on an item it has to be calendared in advance for action.

Ken Kehmna asked that the Approval Authority consider the makeup of that subcommittee since it will be a select group that will have access to information for making decisions, instead of just leaving it up to those that volunteer.

Rich Lucia suggested that there be a list of people who are interested and their disciplines so that the membership isn't imposed on someone who might not have the time to participate.



Chief Kehmna stated that it would be good to have a list of the Advisory Group members and the jurisdiction that they represent then forming a subcommittee from this group would be appropriate.

Teresa Serata recommended that the Advisory Group still be able to have its meeting and then come back with a list of membership, objective and a list of recommendations on how to handle this project.

Renee Domingo asked for clarification on whether recommendation 'A' from the UASI Management Team is the same as Deputy Chief Kehmna's number one recommendation.

Ms. Serata clarified that the UASI Management Team's recommendation was based upon Chief Kehmna's recommendation. She pointed out that she had presented the formula at the last meeting the weight is different but the allocation formula for the hubs was the same as the 2010 percentages.

SCOPE OF LEGAL SERVICES FOR THE UASI

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated that it was requested at the last meeting that the Management Team clarify with CalEMA whether or not legal services would be an allowable expenditure of UASI dollars. She stated that clarification was received that confirmed this would be allowed under UASI Management and Administration (M&A) dollars. The UASI developed a scope of work for the Approval Authority to be included in an RFP that would be issued through the City and County of San Francisco's procurement department as San Francisco is the fiscal agent for the UASI grant, therefore the M&A expenditures are allocated to San Francisco for processing purposes. Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon stated that UASI has worked with the San Francisco City Attorney's Office and researched various other legal services documents from other cities with the understanding that the Approval Authority is not a JPA but a group of individuals that come together to make decisions on homeland security funding. She stated that the legal services scope is to provide the Approval Authority with advice and San Francisco as the fiscal agent of the funds would maintain the oversight of the fiscal paperwork and MOU's.

Kirstin Hofmann thanked Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon for her report and asked if there was a dollar amount of costs for the legal services.

Ms. Tannehill-Plamondon stated that the fiscal piece was separated out as this was a significant amount invested into legal services over the years from the San Francisco City Attorney; the San Francisco City Attorney's hourly rate is about \$214. She stated that the Approval Authority could set a threshold or wait to see what is reasonable when proposals come back.

Ms. Hofmann stated that this item was for discussion only but would like for staff to come back with a set dollar threshold and to place this item is on the agenda for the next meeting.

Anne Kronenberg clarified that the UASI staff should provide recommendations at the next meeting on thresholds based on the information from the San Francisco City Attorney that was given regarding services that they have provided in the past and based on information that the Approval Authority members have given on what they would like to see in the future.



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

Anne Kronenberg stated that at the last meeting the tracking tool was introduced and staff has updated the tool based on the comments received at the last meeting and removed completed items. She wanted to make sure that members were comfortable with the tool and that the outstanding items are captured. She stated that it is very helpful to her and she wanted to make sure that it is in a useful format and meeting the Approval Authority members' needs.

Rich Lucia agreed that this was a valuable tool and would like to see it continue.

Kirstin Hofmann stated that it might be helpful to have a separate section for standing regular items and a section for special requests.

Anne Kronenberg stated that this was doable and requested that UASI staff come up with a draft format and send to the Approval Authority members ahead of the next meeting so they have an opportunity to react to it.

UASI APPROVAL AUTHORITY MEMBERS ALTERNATES

Anne Kronenberg stated that there was a preliminary discussion at the last meeting and people were asked to go back and talk to their jurisdictions and to come back with ideas and discuss whether or not the Approval Authority wants alternates and if that alternate can vote in the members' absence.

Teresa Reed stated that it is important to have designated alternates for the Approval Authority. There have been times especially during the special meetings where it was difficult to calendar. There were discussions regarding an individual not being aware of the issues; it is the expectation of the city to make sure that the alternate will be more than equipped to play a vital role. She supports having alternates.

Kirstin Hofmann agreed with Member Reed and thinks it is appropriate to have alternates and that it is up to the jurisdictions to appoint the alternate.

Ms. Kronenberg stated that if by chance the Chair is not available, she doesn't think it is appropriate for the Chair's alternate to chair the meeting but rather another regular member should act as the Chair.

Rich Lucia stated that there should be a structure or list for who is the Chair in the absence of the regular acting Chair.

Kirstin Hofmann recommended that Approval Authority members should identify an alternate in writing by the next meeting.

Heather Tannehill-Plamondon stated that UASI staff would send out a letter requesting the name of the alternate.

Scott Frizzie asked for clarification on when the "alternate" policy would be in effect.



Ms. Kronenberg stated that members should respond in writing to UASI staff before the next meeting as to whom their alternate is and as soon as this item is approved it is in effect.

Teresa Reed made a motion that each of the representatives of the Approval Authority designate an alternate and that the position of Chair be filled, when needed, by a standing member of the Approval Authority. Monica Fields and Kirstin Hofmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Reed requested that the alternate language be included in the Bylaws.

BROADBAND TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM – BAYWEB PROJECT

Rich Lucia stated that when the BTOP grant began, Sheriff Ahern participated as sponsor. There has been a lot of work, energy and dollars (not UASI dollars) put into the program for such things as putting together a governance structure and putting together draft JPA documents. It has been suggested that the UASI be a co-executive sponsor with Sheriff Ahern, who agrees with this concept. Mr. Lucia pointed out that he is bringing this item to the Approval Authority for discussion and action.

Anne Kronenberg stated that the three mayors of the three major cities sent a letter to Mr. Strickland on March 4th and subsequent to that had a meeting in person with him making the recommendation. He informed them that it is not the NTIA that would have to approve the UASI being an executive sponsor, this was a regional decision. The San Francisco City Attorney stated they had some concerns but that the UASI could become an executive sponsor. The City Attorney reminded that the Approval Authority is not a legal entity so it is not a legal bound body but it is bound by an MOU; this is the reason that the Approval Authority could not have been the chief sponsor back when Alameda was. Ms. Kronenberg pointed out to keep in mind what the roles are as there are specific roles which are somewhat limited. She clarified that if a decision is made today it must be unanimous; each member must vote in favor of the motion per the MOU section 1H.

Renee Domingo stated that she supported the motion as it makes sense since the Management Team has been operating and providing services without the approval of the Approval Authority. She would like to approve staff continuing to do the work without there being a violation of federal grant guidelines.

Rich Lucia confirmed that it is the intent that there will only be co-executive sponsors until the JPA is in place.

Anne Kronenberg speaking on behalf of San Francisco and Mayor Lee stated that they see this as an interim step and are very committed to getting a JPA in place for the region; this is not seen as a replacement to a JPA. She pointed out that this is an interim step until the JPA and BOOM agreements are executed.

Teresa Reed asked for clarification on how critical the vote for the item was as she would like to know more about what this truly means.



Ms. Kronenberg stated that the recommendation came from the three Mayors and it was their desire to move forward with this. She thinks that since there is work being done towards a JPA this would help clean some things up and clarify some things.

Mr. Lucia stated that the JPA process is moving along at a fairly consistent rate, the longer that the Approval Authority waits, the less time for the partnership to perform. He stated that it is not critical but should have some time to be co-sponsors.

Renee Domingo asked for clarification as to if the management team would no longer be participating with the BTOP program once the UASI was no longer an executive co-sponsor. She stated that her concern in moving this forward is continuing to have Bay Area UASI funding and staff working on this project without the approval of the Approval Authority.

Anne Kronenberg stated that the wording for the motion only means that the UASI would be the co-executive sponsor for the 1-6 months that it takes for a JPA to be put into place.

Rich Lucia stated that there have been different ideas discussed. He clarified that once the JPA is formed, as a governmental entity they can apply for UASI funds and/or hire UASI staff.

Laura Phillips stated that in regards to co-mingling, the UASI had stepped away from BTOP; the Alameda County staff has been doing the work and has been making sure that if something overlaps with the CALSIEC or Capital Bay Area, the UASI has been assisting in that type of coordination.

Anne Kronenberg stated that her desire is to move forward and that the UASI could be a source of additional funding if needed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Deanna Santana, Deputy City Manager of the City of San Jose, thanked Member Reed for asking some additional questions. The City of San Jose is on record with moving forward as a co-executive sponsor; the City does have faith that the Approval Authority will do the right thing. Ms. Santana believes that the questions come down to monetary and frequent reporting from the UASI staff. She referenced a letter that was co-signed by Mayor Reed and Executive Director Jeff Smith that was delivered to NTIA last night (she provided copies at the meeting). She stated that it was a report out on the public records specifically the e-mails that San Jose has been reviewing from the UASI staff. There are several misrepresentations and inappropriate activities related to this project. San Jose will continue to go through the public records and e-mails and will continue to bring them to the NTIA's attention.

Rich Lucia made a motion to make the UASI co-executive sponsor with Sheriff Ahern with the stipulation that there once there is a JPA the UASI will no longer act as the co-executive sponsor. Renee seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – GOOD OF THE ORDER

Teresa Reed stated that in regards to the MOU extension; the extension had been approved by San Jose.



Anne Kronenberg stated that Renee Domingo pointed out that the tracking tool didn't show Oakland as having approved the extension and they were one of the first to do so. Ms. Kronenberg requested that the tracking tool be revised to show this.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Anne Kronenberg stated that there are already a number of items that were added to the April 22nd meeting agenda.

Kirstin Hofmann reminded about the following future agenda items:

- RFP for Cornerstone/ BTOP.
- The ability to vote and allocate dollars on the Review.
- The need to consider an additional extension of the current MOU.

Ms. Reed asked for Jada Jackson to report on the action designated as moving forward.

The following items were requested in today's meeting:

- Request for information back regarding Donations Management contracts for retroactive approval.
- Request for information back regarding the Medical & Health Preparedness contracts
- Request for the Advisory Group to come up with recommendations and a scope for 2012 at their meeting on March 30th and report back to the Approval Authority.
- Discussion and Possible Action on the Advisory Groups Recommendations.
- Request for regular reports from the Advisory Group – regular standing agenda item.
- Vote to approve the Allocation Formula.
- Vote on hub allocations.
- Legal Services with a scope of work and a dollar threshold in the RFP
- Additional column on Interoperability Project spreadsheet showing the phase and/or completion of the projects as well as vendor information (This is due next quarterly report).
- All Items should be listed on the agenda as “Discussion & Possible Action”.
- Nontechnical fleetmapping report.
- List of Advisory Group members and the jurisdictions they represent.
- Revised Tracking tool to show standing regular items separate from special requests; draft should be sent out early for member comment.
- Staff to send a letter out requesting alternates for the Approval Authority members.
- Add San Jose & Oakland as being approved for the 6 month extension.

Laura Phillips asked for clarification on the level of detail Ms. Hofmann wanted for the procurement information for contracts. Kirstin Hofmann clarified that vendor information would be helpful as a start. Member Hofmann agreed that this information could be given during the next quarterly report.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Ken Kehmna asked if there would be a separate agenda item for the establishment of a standard report from the Advisory Group.



Ms. Kronenberg clarified that the reports from the Advisory Group will become a standing item on the Approval Authority agendas.

Kirstin Hofmann made a motion to move into Closed Session; Teresa Reed seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Anne Kronenberg stated that there will be a special meeting held on April 22, 2011. She thanked everyone for attending the meeting and for all of the hard work on putting together the reports.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:24 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION

The meeting was called to order at 12:30 and adjourned at 2:00 p.m.