

MARIN EMERGENCY RADIO AUTHORITY

c/o Novato Fire Protection District
95 Rowland Way, Novato, CA 94945
PHONE: (415) 878-2690 FAX: (415) 878-2660
WWW.MERAONLINE.ORG

P.O.C. 2/26/14 Agenda Item B

PROJECT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 9, 2013

Draft: 11/21/13

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Cusimano at 3:00 p.m. on October 9, 2013 in Marin Civic Center, Room 410-B, San Rafael, CA.

Committee Members Present:

Central Marin Police Authority	Todd Cusimano
City of Larkspur	Robert Sinnott
City of Novato	Jim Berg
City of San Rafael	Diana Bishop
County Fire	Mark Brown
Marin County Sheriff	Robert Doyle
Novato Fire Protection District	Gerald McCarthy
City of Sausalito	Jennifer Tejada
Tiburon Fire Protection District	Richard Pearce
County of Marin	Matthew Hymel
Marin Transit	David Rzepinski

Committee Members Absent:

Town of Ross	Tom Gaffney
--------------	-------------

Staff Present:

MERA Executive Officer	Maureen Cassingham
MERA Special Project Manager	Dave Jeffries
MERA Special Project Admin. Assistant	Alex Anderson
MERA Operations Officer	Craig Tackabery

Guests Present:

Indie Politics/Price Campaign Solutions	Dan Mullen, Terry Price
---	-------------------------

B. Approval of Revised Project Oversight Committee Minutes – Meeting of July 10, 2013

M/S/P Berg/Rzepinski to approve the minutes from the July 10 meeting as presented.

AYES: All

NAYS: None

C. Acceptance of Project Oversight Subcommittee Meeting Notes from August 21, 2013

M/S/P Hymel/Tejada to amend minutes regarding discussion of Marin IJ editorial review board meeting and approve as amended.

AYES: All

NAYS: None

D. Member Outreach Update (Jeffries, Price and Mullen)

- 1) Report on Round One Presentations
- 2) Report on Round Two Presentations
- 3) Gen II Operations and Maintenance Update - Tackabery
- 4) Outreach Plan Update and Website #2
- 5) Newsletter
- 6) Outreach to School Districts
- 7) Presentations to Other Organizations – Post Member Presentations
- 8) Potentially Competing Ballot Measures
- 9) Citizen Group Outreach Plan
 - Video and PPT

Jeffries updated the Committee on the progress of Round One of MERA Member Next Generation Project Presentations. He said we will have 4-5 presentations remaining by the end of the week. He discussed the feedback we have received, noting there have been many common questions, some of which we will not be able to answer until the project is further developed. He said the focus should be on questions that require immediate action from the Committee.

Funding of MERA was a consistent theme in the feedback. Common questions included current and future operation and maintenance costs and funding of reserve MERA account for GEN III. Berg asked Tackabery how accurate he expects projections of MERA Next Generation operation and maintenance costs to be. Tackabery responded he and Cassingham have clear numbers to work with and projections should be accurate.

Jeffries continued discussion of questions raised during Round One of presentations. He noted some individuals questioned why multi-family unit dwellings per-parcel rate average was lower than single-unit per-parcel rate. There were also concerns regarding repeating mistakes made during implementation of MERA Gen I system. In some of the earlier presentations, concerns were raised about Motorola being the only vendor.

Jeffries explained there hadn't been too many surprises thus far in Round One of presentations and that MERA Staff will be working to have responses to as many questions as possible in Round Two of presentations. Cusimano commended Jeffries on a great job of handling presentations to date.

Jeffries discussed updating Project Outreach Plan for Round Two presentations, noting that, given that we plan on asking for resolutions of support from member agencies in February, decisions will need to be made by various MERA Committees up to and including the MERA Governing Board meeting in December. He said his current draft proposal suggests changing model used in Round One. His proposal would have local chiefs introduce Jeffries, who would then do bulk of presentation. Local chiefs would then ask for resolutions of support.

Jeffries introduced timeline for Round Two presentations. He said we will be finalizing Round One presentations in December and also reaching out to newly-elected council members and board members to give them an opportunity to see Round One presentation before finalizing process. He suggested that we begin Round Two with presentations to the Marin Managers Association and a Joint Police and Fire Chiefs meeting, and then roll out rest of presentations beginning in February. Jeffries gave an overview of the decisions the Committee will need to make to modify Project Outreach Plan for Round Two presentations, outlined in Report on Round Two Presentations prepared by Jeffries and included in agenda packet.

Chair Cusimano directed the Committee to review report prepared by Jeffries item by item and give direction on each item.

Discussion of Item One on Round Two Presentations with recommended action of decision to support as proposed. Pearce recommended consolidating some slides to shorten the presentation, if possible. Berg asked how long Round Two presentation will be. Jeffries responded he envisioned a 10-15 minute presentation. Committee agreed upon recommended action.

Discussion of Item Two on confirming details of Parcel Tax, including exemptions and numbers of parcels of each type with recommended action of referring to Finance Committee and requesting response to Project Staff and Executive Board prior to November, 2013 meeting. Committee agreed upon recommended action.

Discussion of Item Three on confirming Bond Timeline, when bonds would be sold and when funds would be available for project (assuming Parcel Tax passes) with recommended action of referring to Finance Committee and requesting response to Project Staff and Executive Board prior to November, 2013 meeting. Cassingham said that some of this work has been done and incorporated into the project schedule. Jeffries said that he wants to ensure that, when the Governing Board adjourns in December, Project Staff has a full slate of finalized decisions that staff can use to fine-tune Round Two presentations. Committee agreed upon recommended action.

Discussion of Item Four on development of Project Timeline thru 2018 (assuming Parcel Tax passes) with recommended action of referring to Operations Officer and requesting response to Project Staff and Executive Board prior to November, 2013 meeting. Berg asked for clarification as to whether or not this item included the schedule from the Project Outreach Plan. Jeffries responded that the objective was to ensure we had a clear timeline of project implementation, assuming parcel tax passes in 2014. Tackaberry noted that there is a detailed project implementation schedule outlined in the AECOMM report. Committee agreed upon recommended action.

Discussion of Item Five on development of Gen II Operating and Maintenance Cost estimate with recommended action of referring to Operations Officer and requesting response to Project Staff and Executive Board prior to November, 2013 meeting. Jeffries said that the development of the operating and maintenance costs estimates for the project is in process. Pearce noted that costs can fluctuate. Tackaberry responded the operations team is making some basic assumptions in order to come up with the most accurate estimate possible. Jeffries added that he has been clear in Round One presentations that it is challenging to accurately estimate costs of a system years in advance of implementation, but that we will provide most accurate estimates possible. Committee agreed upon recommended action.

Discussion of Item Six on development of a Draft Round Two Staff Report with recommended action of referring to Project Staff for response to Executive Board prior to November, 2013 meeting. Committee agreed upon recommended action.

Discussion of Item Seven on development of a draft resolution with recommended action of referring to MERA Counsel for draft resolution sent to Project Staff and Executive Board prior to November, 2013 meeting. Hymel asked if the draft resolution will be succinct with not a lot of details that will need to be changed. Jeffries responded that the draft resolution will be simple and straightforward. Price suggested that Hymel be included in process of developing language for draft resolution. Committee agreed upon recommended action with addition of requesting Hymel to work in conjunction with MERA Counsel in developing draft resolution.

Discussion of Item Eight on development of Draft Agenda Language with recommended action of referring to Project Staff for response to Executive Board prior to November, 2013 meeting. Committee agreed upon recommended action.

Discussion of Item Nine on development of Citizen Oversight Committee Proposal with recommended action of assigning a POC sub-committee to develop a proposal. It was noted that proposal needs to be provided to MERA Counsel for resolution language, as well as Project Staff and Executive Board prior to November, 2013 meeting. Jeffries said that, given that the idea of Citizen Oversight Committee was included in polling and Round One Presentation, a decision needs to be made as to whether or not to include a proposal for a Citizen Oversight Committee prior to roll out of Round Two presentations. Mullen noted it is important to include written acknowledgement of the Citizen Oversight

Committee in ballot language if the Governing Board ultimately decides to include. Pearce and Berg asked how a Citizen Oversight Committee would be organized and structured. Jeffries and Price responded that the particular details and set up of the Citizen Oversight Committee could be determined at a later date. Mullen noted that oversight committees have typically been used in Marin County to oversee financial allocations. Hymel asked if the Citizen Oversight Committee would be advisory to the Board of Supervisors or MERA. Cassingham replied she believed that the committee would advise MERA, but that it was an important point that needed to be clarified. Tackabery and Bishop agreed to be on subcommittee to develop proposal. Committee agreed upon recommended action and that Tackabery and Bishop would form Project Oversight subcommittee to develop proposal.

Discussion of Item Ten on development of Draft Power Point Presentation with recommended action of referring to Project Staff for response to Executive Board prior to November, 2013 meeting. Committee agreed upon recommended action.

Discussion of Item Eleven on development of Gen II Operating and Maintenance Funding Mechanism with recommended action of referring to Finance Committee to address Lando Formula and fees for Non-MERA members and provide initial response to Project Staff and Executive Board prior to November, 2013 meeting. Jeffries said he believed it was important that we be committed to taking a look at funding mechanism, but noted that a new plan would not need to be put in place until Gen II comes online in 2018. Cassingham noted that it is imperative that the capital costs of the project be our primary focus. Hymel said that all agencies will be better off if capital costs are taken care of with passage of parcel tax. He added that operation and maintenance costs for all agencies will be lower if MERA adds member agencies in Gen II system. Committee agreed to direct Project Staff to suggest language regarding addressing Lando Formula and fees for Non-MERA members to Finance Committee in order to provide initial response prior to Executive Board prior to November, 2013 meeting.

Tackabery said that he and his team are continuing to work on the Gen II Operations and Maintenance cost estimates. They have completed a first round and got feedback from Cassingham and are in the process of revising. He plans to have a completed draft in advance of the Executive Board meeting in November.

Mullen introduced the Outreach Plan Update and Website #2 noting that, with almost all Round One presentations completed, it was a good time to reevaluate and plan ahead for outreach during Round Two of presentations. He added that there has been quite a bit of controversy over projects like Plan Bay Area and suggests that we alter the Project Outreach Plan to begin social media and public outreach before conclusion of Round Two Presentations. Mullen suggested making Project Manager Jeffries and Administrative Assistant Anderson more available to do public presentations and begin public outreach online. Tejada said she thought we had previously decided to use social media and believes it is a good idea to engage on social media and start sooner than later. Mullen explained that he and Price would set up a structure and follow-up with Anderson to get social media outreach started. Cassingham said that the Executive Board and

Governing Board will need to make final decision on accelerating the public information and altering Project Outreach Plan. Price responded that he and Mullen are looking for direction from Project Oversight Committee to recommend plan of action and seek approval from the Executive Board and Governing Board. Mullen and Price will work with Cassingham to provide detailed plan and cost estimates for Governing Board to approve altering Project Outreach Plan.

Jeffries said that the next MERA newsletter will be sent out around the start of November. The next issue will include announcements of the Executive Board and Governing Board meetings, a recap of the Round One Presentations, and some MERA success stories. Price suggested including responses to some of the most frequently asked questions during Round One presentations. Anderson noted Project Staff is continuing to look for additional contacts to add to the MERA email database.

Jeffries shared that he, Hymel, Cassingham, and Tackabery met with Marin County Superintendent of Schools Mary Jane Burke on October 7, 2013. Dr. Burke is supportive of system and willing to be a signatory on ballot measure if need be. She did express some frustration over discussions of school system involvement in Gen I. Hymel noted if the parcel tax does pass, the school system would not have to pay capital costs and they would only need to pay for ongoing operation and maintenance costs. There may be an opportunity to bring on school system as a MERA member agency and is something that should be discussed further.

Mullen discussed outreach to other organizations beyond MERA agencies prior to end of Round Two presentations. Pearce said he thought it was a good idea to reach out to Rotary Clubs and other organizations that would welcome more information on MERA. Cassingham again noted that altering Project Outreach Plan would require final decision by Executive Board and Governing Board.

Mullen said other potentially competing ballot measures may include the nine county Save the Bay issue which is looking at a roughly equivalent parcel tax measure in 2014. Cassingham relayed that Superintendent Burke offered to help assess what schools may be doing in terms of upcoming ballot measures. Hymel said there will probably be upcoming parcel tax measures for schools in 2014, which may include measures from Novato school district and an organization called Marin Kids. Sinnott noted that Ross Valley will have a parcel tax for paramedic services on November 2014 ballot.

Price said that a Citizen Group will need to work to get the ballot measure passed, noting that MERA officials cannot be involved officially in forming the group or advocacy of the ballot measure. He said in his past experience with other parcel tax measures, he has worked on his own time to help interested individuals file the proper paperwork and form Citizen Group to work on the campaign to pass the ballot measure. He suggested identification of a few key individuals to get the Citizen Group started. Cassingham explained that MERA counsel will be preparing a memo to outline what MERA members can do on an official basis and the difference between education and advocacy.

E. Update on County Counsel's Review of NBS Parcel Tax Study Report Mechanism

Tackabery said his team is continuing to work on the update and that there a few different options in the government code to go with. He is working with County Counsel and MERA General Counsel and will provide another update once more details are available.

F. Next Meeting

The time and location of the next meeting is to be determined.

J. Open Time for Items Not on Agenda

None.

K. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

Minutes prepared by:



Alex Anderson,
MERA Special Project Administrative Assistant