



# Board of Directors MEETING MINUTES

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL  
INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

April 3, 2014

Grace E. Simons Lodge  
1025 Elysian Park Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90012

---

## Board Members Present:

**William "Bill" T Fujioka Chair**, CEO, County of Los Angeles  
**Kim Raney**, Police Chief, City of Covina, representing At Large Seat  
**Scott Pickwith**, Police Chief, City of La Verne, representing the Los Angeles County Police Chiefs Association  
**Donald "Don" Pedersen**, Police Chief, City of Culver City, representing At Large Seat  
**Mark R. Alexander**, City Manager, City of La Cañada Flintridge, representing the Contract Cities Association  
**Reginald "Reggie" Harrison**, Deputy City Manager, City of Long Beach  
**Gregory "Greg" L. Simay**, Assistant General Manager, City of Burbank Water & Power, representing At Large Seat  
**Bill Walker**, Fire Chief, City of Alhambra, representing the Los Angeles Area Fire Chiefs Association  
**Daryl L. Osby**, Fire Chief, County of Los Angeles  
**Gerry F. Miller**, Chief Legislative Analyst, City of Los Angeles  
**LeRoy J. Jackson**, City Manager, City of Torrance, representing At Large Seat  
**John Scott, Sheriff**, County of Los Angeles

---

## Representatives For Board Members Present:

**Patricia "Patty" J. Huber**, representing Miguel Santana, for the City of Los Angeles Chief Administrative Office  
**Sandy Jo MacArthur**, representing Charles "Charlie" L. Beck, Vice Chair, for the City of Los Angeles Police Department  
**Nancy L. Ramirez**, representing Steven K. "Steve" Zipperman, for the Los Angeles School Police Department

---

## Officers Present:

**Pat Mallon**, LA-RICS Executive Director  
**Rachelle Anema**, representing John Naimo, Interim Auditor-Controller, County of Los Angeles  
**Patricia Saucedo**, Board Secretary

---

## Absent:

**James G. Featherstone**, Interim Fire Chief, City of Los Angeles Fire Department  
**Dr. Mitchell H. Katz**, Director, DHS, County of Los Angeles  
**Mark J. Saladino**, Treasurer and Tax Collector, County of Los Angeles



**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. ANNOUNCE QUORUM – Roll Call**

Chair Bill Fujioka made an acknowledgement that a quorum was present.

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (1)**

1. Pat Mallon announced that the minutes from the Special Meeting of February 20, 2014 are still being edited and will be included in the May 7, 2014, Board meeting agenda for approval.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson, seconded by Alternate Board Member Patty Huber motioned to approve the March 6, 2014, Regular Meeting Minutes.

**Ayes:** 15 – Raney, Pickwith, Pedersen, Alexander, Harrison, Simay, Walker, Fujioka, Osby, Miller, Jackson, Scott, Huber, Mac Arthur, Ramirez

**MOTION APPROVED.**

**IV. CONSENT CALENDAR – (None)**

**V. REPORTS – (2–5)**

2. Committee Reports

- a. Legislative Committee – Daryl Osby

Chief Daryl Osby, Chair of Legislative Committee asked Vice Chair Olyvia Rodriguez to give a report to the Board.

Olyvia Rodriguez stated the Legislative Committee met on March 12, 2014 and unanimously approved a number of legislative recommendations for your Board's consideration and approval. A list of key congressional members and federal agencies for potential meetings and advocacy in DC as well as in Sacramento was provided and is included in today's Agenda Item 11.

- b. Finance Committee – Stephen Sotomayor

Stephen Sotomayor, Chair of the Finance Committee reported that a Special Meeting was held on April 1, 2014, to consider some of the items that are being presented today. The motion put forward by the Finance Committee was that the LA-RICS JPA should recommend that we do adopt some form of deferment on the replacement fees and allow for member agencies to transition into the LA-RICS system as noted in Agenda Item 11. The proposed Scenario 12, allows for a four-year period which would defer a certain amount of fees for member agencies that wish to continue to capitalize from their infrastructure such as existing radio systems. The Finance Committee understood that a number of agencies operate in the T-Band and LA-RICS will be a hybrid system, which will offer both 700 mhz and T-Band, which will allow a lot of agencies to look at the use of their existing T-Band, but then eventually move on to a system that supports 700 mhz. Another question that the Finance Committee looked at was—what is the cost of the replacement of the system? At the end of the period, do we need to have \$78 million, cash on hand to buy a new system? Or, is it possible for us to look at different ways of Bond Financing at the end; and/or, to set aside 50 percent? One of the things that the Finance Committee recognized is that the initial cost of the system is going to be a driving factor of membership. And, a lot of us are going to ask, "What the upfront cost will be?" If there are ways to creatively look at the replacement cost to drive down that actual cost to a member agency, the price of the system starts to get better. If you look at the operations, we recognize that potentially maintenance agreements could be paid for under Grants and that the administration of the LMR system for the Authority could potentially be a grant-funded item which continues to drive down the cost. So actually,



it's a very optimistic look at it, to defer some of these costs. And, it would look for member agencies as a reduced costs of the LMR system which would be a great way to encourage increased membership; once again, more members the lower the cost. So we decided that we would hold another meeting before the next JPA meeting and look at that and come back with a recommendation on what year, potentially we could defer these costs and how much that replacement reserve should be.

Chairman Bill Fujioka stated, I think that has a lot of potential. The other thing I've said repeatedly is, it is my absolute goal to find a way to address some of the equipment costs. We just had a SHSGP Authority meeting and funds were identified that would come through LA-RICS, and I asked that we buy the dual band radios to possibly distribute those radios to a lot of the member cities. I think we are in a good position right now. But I know that some of our member cities are not in the same financial condition and they need the radios, they need help with their consoles. I think some of you may have heard at the SHSGP meeting, when it was determined that money would be used to buy radios. I instructed staff to work with the approval authority and with member cities to identify those who need radios now, especially the smaller cities. So that's my goal. I think we need to get clarification on our ability to use our grant funds. We need to pursue additional funds, because, if we could help a lot of our member cities buy their consoles and radios, it makes the decision an easier decision.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked, if we make that change or concur with that change does it dramatically change the financing development that we've sent out to the agency members?

Pat Mallon stated, Agenda Item 12 presents this for a decision by the Board today. We will send it out as an Addendum by the end of the week.

- c. Operations Committee – No Report
- d. Technical Committee – No Report

3. Director's Report – Pat Mallon

1. **LTE Project Status:**

- a. The contract and Amendment One allowing for the design phase to start was approved by your Board on March 6, 2014 and executed that day.
- b. A notice to proceed was executed on March 10, 2014 to allow the contractor, Motorola, to proceed with Phase 1, Detailed Design, with a contract value of \$16,435,292.
- c. As of today, the total contract value remains at \$175,583,275.
- d. Motorola is in the process of aggressively pursuing site assessments. I believe by Monday, they will complete all city and county sites. Unfortunately, at this juncture, we've only been allowed on two independent city sites. That is having a significant impact on us. We would encourage that the Board contact the constituents that you represent and stress the importance of allowing us to provide initial access to the site. We don't necessarily need to do test bores immediately. We understand that might require a Right of Entry. But we do need



to at least begin the design process. Otherwise, the alternative is to drop the site.

- e. On Wednesday, March 26, 2014, I met with Bill D'Agostino, the General Manager of FirstNet. The purpose of that meeting was to receive direction as to what FirstNet would support to the LA-RICS project. Unfortunately at this point, they are still in the information gather stage. I learned that:
  - i. FirstNet is not ready to commit to provision of Evolved Packet Core services within our grant performance period. They said we should move forward with the second Core here within our region. That item is on your Board's agenda for today.
  - ii. Same thing with the Home Subscriber Services at this juncture. Again, LA-RICS should move forward independently.
  - iii. FirstNet is not in a position to adopt maintenance responsibilities at this point, so we need to plan on performing all maintenance responsibilities, including both primary and secondary cores, HSS as well as all site locations (eNodeBs).
  - iv. Lastly, FirstNet is not ready to move forward with any commercial provider Roaming agreements. We should move forward accordingly.
- f. We have been meeting with representatives from NTIA, Max Fainberg, Amy Michem, and Andy Spurgeon over the past two days.
  - i. We are pleased to say that NTIA is in full support of the PSBN project here in Los Angeles. They are familiar with our timeframe and are very concerned about our ability to build it out within the grant performance period. We've had a number of discussions with them about any flexibility that they might have on an extension. And to put it shortly, they say it's not going to happen.

I would like to introduce Max Fainberg, Amy Michem and Andy Spurgeon. I believe Max would like to address your Board with a few comments

Max Fainberg stated, thank you for having us chat with you this morning. We are all pleased to meet with you all. Thanks to Pat and the team that he has assembled on the LA-RICS Project side; a great group of folks that are minding the ship, in terms of the project itself. We had an opportunity to meet with the some of the vendors that will be involved in making the project a reality and we're generally pleased with what we see, the enthusiasm of the team and the experience that everybody brings to the project.

My role in a nut shell is two-fold. One is to help awardees navigate the federal regulations, keep them in line with the goals and the priorities of the project, keep them within the rules of the program. That's one side; the other side is to keep an eye out for waste of broadband funds. So all of that is done, all of the project implementation work is done against the back-drop of a congress that is very divided. The only thing in fact that a lot of the folks can agree on is that we have to be very careful with the money that is spent and not everyone agrees on how



the money gets spent. Everybody agrees that the money that does get spent, must get spent where it should. And, the money that is spent should have a very positive outcome for the folks whether they be in Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, Iowa, or Florida—the money should do what it is supposed to do. So, that said, with the LA-RICS project, everyone back home and here in this room recognizes it is a very ambitious project. You are looking at 231 sites across a very large geographic area and not a lot of time.

With all projects that involve construction, there are things that we can control and things that we cannot control. What we cannot control right now is the calendar and the time. There is zero opportunity for an extension on the funding. And, one of our goals for our site visit is to come out here and make sure that the project team was aware that there really is no chance for any extension. So, at the end of the federal government's fiscal year, September 30, 2015, any unspent money evaporates and cannot be extended. Frankly, we were talking about this to Pat before; there is very little appetite within the Department of Commerce and NTIA to try to change that right now, because we are at the tail end of the BTOP program. From a political standpoint, it is probably difficult to expend political capital towards the end of a program. The emphasis really is what's on the future. There is very little appetite for going back and try to change that. And frankly, no one believes that we can do that. So we wanted to make sure that that message got sent to the project team and make sure that that message got funneled up to the Board. We think that there may be some folks that don't quite believe that. Well we're here to tell you that that's true.

In fact, as of the end of September 2015, we evaporate, we go away. We have a lot of work to do between now and then, 231 sites. When you start looking at the numbers, 231 sites, we're about 17 months out from that date right now and there are all sorts of clearances that we have to get before construction can start. Some of them we can control, some of them we cannot. There are things on the federal side that we can try and do. We can try to smooth the relationship with federal agencies that have a say in whether they are going to allow construction at any given site or not. We can open doors, we can get people to return phone calls; we are generally very good at that.

There are things that we have to rely on LA-RICS for, such as adopting a funding plan and providing a creditable implementation plan. Those two pieces are, from our perspective, "Gating Factors." equal to the environmental process that Andy heads up for all of our projects. Without adoption of the funding plan you cannot begin construction. So assuming that that happens in the next few weeks, we're now into May—we're down to 16 months, or 231 sites, when you do the math. You're looking at 15 sites a month, two sites a day. It's really hard to do. Hopefully there is recognition of that. The other thing is that, this goes back to the implementation plan, if it is going to be something less than 231 sites, what is critical? What can we say, we only got part of it done but what we did get done is meaningful. Worst case scenario for us is that we pump a lot of money into this project, September 30, 2015, comes around and the project looks like Swiss cheese, it has holes all over the place, and it's not a meaningful or helpful system to you or to the firefighters or police who will use it, nor to the citizens of LA County and City of LA and independent cities.

So we are here to find out if there is a creditable implementation plan that plans for something less than 231 as the goal. We're leaving with some concern about what the reaction is going to be back in DC. We have to go back and say, we



didn't see an implementation plan. I think that there is a recognition that one has to be developed, but we don't know what the priorities are, not yet. We do believe that they got the message about no extension. But, the implementation plan and the funding plan are still hanging out there. The way that you allow for transition into Phase 2 is a control that the LA-RICS Board has over waste of broadband fund abuse. They cannot spend money on construction if you don't let them past that milestone. In the same way, NTIA has some tools at its disposal to avoid waste, fraud, and abuse. And, those tools, like yours will wait until certain milestones happen before we'll agree to move forward with funding. We have to manage that. That is where it's a discomfort on our return trip because we know that there is a lot of work that has to be done. We are looking for a very measured path forward, and are hoping that it will come soon. We are looking to you to coming back with an implementation plan that the folks back in DC can feel good about and to continue to be enthusiastic about this project.

Chairman Bill Fujioka stated you mentioned the ability to make phone calls and open doors for us. We do have issues with FirstNet. You have heard that we've been asking a number of questions that have a significant impact on our plan. I asked Pat what's the timeline for getting that answer? That's not happening right now, that's where you can help. When it comes to waste, fraud, and abuse, we live that. I appreciate that reminder. Are you going to address that?

Amy Michem, we're here from NTIA so we can't address FirstNet questions, but we do coordinate closely with FirstNet. What we would say from our agency's perspective is that we would want you to move forward and not wait for any answers from FirstNet at this time.

Bill Fujioka, I understand that. I just heard the offer. I was going to avail myself or us as a group of that offer and it does create an obstacle. We are trying to achieve, I can't think of any other urban area that has 88 cities and the number of police and fire agencies that we have, it is an enormous undertaking. It is something that we are committed to doing, something that we will do. This grant and NTIA could move, but we'll still be here. We'll still need an interoperable communication system. We feel that to do so, we would hope that we'd have a strong partnership with the federal government, with your agency. We understand deadlines, we all live with deadlines. But our real deadline is making sure that we have an interoperable communication system here. Even after NTIA moves on or this grant moves on, we're going to get there. What we had hoped to have is a message of partnership. I didn't completely hear that. We know the clock is ticking, we know what we have to do, we are going to strive to achieve that, and we are going to move forward to the best of our ability. We've talked about an alternative plan; we'll be communicating that with you. I heard that request this week. Given the importance, with all due respect, we'll be absolutely responsive, we need a little bit of time, and we will get that for you. When it is all said and done, this region will have an interoperable system one way or the other.

Amy Michem stated, and obviously that is our goal too. I would also say, you have a unique opportunity here to lead the country in an interoperable communication system. We are excited to see you embrace that opportunity and we're excited to see you get the system built. And, in that respect, we do see you as full partners.



Bill Fujioka stated, when HR 3630 came down, we have systems here, a system called ICIS that is solely on T-Band. Most of us have systems on T-Band. Some of us are on VHF, some of us on 700 MHz, but a lot of us are there. And that came down very, very quickly. We didn't have the luxury of time to say, let's think about you taking T-Band and going into this plan. It's the discussion I have with federal government to say, when HR 3630 came, we said what's going on? The came back to say, here is your timeline for migrating off of it. In our world, in public safety, especially during a five-year recession, this 2021 is tomorrow. It is not a whole lot of time. However, getting our system completed is still our goal. Thank you very much for your comments. We'll continue to work with you and we'll make progress on this.

Max Fainberg stated, I just want to add to what Amy said, this is a great opportunity. We look at this as a great opportunity. One hundred fifty four million dollars doesn't come around too often. Our goal really is to help you do that. In the absences of clear cut direction from FirstNet or from anyone else, about what the future is going to be three years down from an interoperability communications standpoint, the message that I tried to tell Pat and his team is— build it for LA-RICS right now. Don't worry about problems that you might have two or three years down the road, because if you don't build the network, none of it matters. The best way to ensure that you don't have to deal with the stuff in the future, operating costs and what FirstNet is going to want you to do, is to do nothing. That would be a missed opportunity.

Board Member Greg Simay stated, part of the success story of LA-RICS, in spite of the curve balls that have been thrown at the organization, it made lemonade out of having to do multiple procurement processes, and actually reduced the final costs by several hundred millions of dollars, by tighter specs and just by continuing to ride that learning curve. And, there have been serious discussions with other local agencies with LA-RICS to leverage their fiber optics and the initiative that many agencies have done. So potentially, once it gets off the ground there is going to be a kind of leveraging of all the public utility resources available. My question is simply, eventually I know that mission critical voice will be integrated with broadband including the one to many communications for situational awareness. What is the latest assessment when that can occur? And, how does that mesh with the current deadline that congress has set on getting off the T-Band?

Max Fainberg stated, I'm not really sure how to answer that at this point. Bill Fujioka noted, that's a real difficult question to answer.

**2. LMR Current Status:**

- a. We are continuing to work with Motorola to identify site-specific issues. We have identified a number of alternate sites.
- b. We have included those alternate sites into the environmental assessment and it will be included into the Environmental Impact Report
- c. The delivery of equipment that was approved by this Board back in August or September is moving forward. We do have one action item on the agenda today regarding a Site Access Agreement for City of LA, the Valley Dispatch Center.



- d. As for the LMR contract status:
  - i. Amendments 1, 3 and 4 have been approved by your Board.
  - ii. Amendment 2 was done under your delegation of authority. To date, \$31,056,008 has been committed to the project.
  - iii. The Total Maximum Contract Sum, with Amendments 1 through 4 is \$282,829,472.
  - iv. An Amendment 5, is on your agenda today.

**3. SITE ACCESS AGREEMENTS:**

- a. As previously reported, we are continuing our outreach effort with cities. It is crucial that we get access to the sites for the LTE system or we are going to have to drop them. And, unfortunately at this point, there seems to be some posturing from some of the independent cities to wait until a funding plan is approved before they make that determination. And, it is really putting us into a bind, as you've heard from our friends from NTIA.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson commented, regarding the Torrance sites, our concern isn't the funding plan in our city as an independent city. It is that we have no lease agreement. We've had no work on the agreement itself. It seems non-functional to give you access to sites when we're probably not going to be able to enter into a lease agreement or license agreement on.

Pat Mallon stated, we are following up with meetings specifically with Torrance. What we would ask for at this point, is regardless of whether there is going to be the decision about the site access agreement. Board Member LeRoy Jackson stated, you've had three months, there have been no meetings. We've exchanged language. And, if you wish to do it, you need to move up your priorities on meeting and working out these agreements with Torrance. Pat Mallon stated he would.

Board Member Mark Alexander stated, the difficulty that you are having on meeting with some of the cities on the site, is it just to do an inspection on the site? Pat Mallon stated, "That would be our first request. That we'd be allowed to visit the site. Not to do any test borings, or anything like that; but to at least begin the planning process on where, on the site, it would be. One of the questions that's been asked by Torrance is, where exactly is it going to be on the site? And we can't answer that question until we get out there and do a site assessment." Board Member Mark Alexander stated, "I'm not quite sure what the problem is with the cities that are not allowing you to do the site inspection. As you know, my city allowed you to come on to the site and do the inspection. There was no issue. So I am hoping we could reach some resolution on that and the cities allow access."



4. Project Manager's Report – Pat Mallon

Pat Mallon stated, included in your package also is the Project Management Report from the Jacob's team, as well as the Motorola Team as Agenda Item 4.

5. Grant Status Report – Pat Mallon

No change in status from that reported to you last month.

6. Independent Auditor's Report FY 2013-14 – County of Los Angeles Auditor-Controller Staff – Rachelle Anema; and, Michael De Castro and Helen Chu of Bazillo Cobb Associates

Pat Mallon stated, Agenda Item #6 is the Audit that was done and is part of the annual assessment. The Auditors will come forth to give us a quick update on the report.

Rachelle Anema stated, we know you have a busy morning so we'll try to keep our comments brief. One correction to the agenda, the agenda indicates that we're presenting the fiscal year 2013-14 audit, we are actually reporting on the fiscal year 2012-13 audit. And also, Connie Yee is on the agenda as presenting from the Auditor-Controller, she was unable to attend. I'm Rachelle Anema from Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller's Office, and I'm here to answer any questions you may have. Also, I have with me, Michael De Castro and Helen Chu from Bazillo Cobb Associates. A little background, as you know the Auditor-Controller is a fiscal agent for the Authority, and one of our roles is to secure an audit of the Authority's financial statements and provided a single audit on an annual basis. The Auditors are here to go over the results to the audit and a little background to the process of the audit.

Michael De Castro, Bazillo Cobb Associates, provided a brief presentation of the results of their financial statement audit of LA-RICS for the period ending June 30, 2013. On pages 1 through 3 of the report, that is our independent auditor's report. And I'm pleased to present that our report provides the financial statements on page 7 and 8 are fairly presented. And, in our world, it's unqualified or an unmodified opinion, which is the highest level of assurance that one can receive on the financial statements. On pages 4 through 6 of the report, there is a management discussion and an analysis, and that provides a narrative overview of the Authority's financial activities for the period. To give a reader a little bit more detail on the financial activity. In addition, we've also included on pages 16 and 17, required supplemental information for readers of the financial statements that has a statement of revenues, expenditures, and changes in fund balance, and budgeted actual information. In addition to our financial statement audit, we are required under government auditing standards to also issue a report on internal control of financial reporting. And we've done that on pages 19 and 20 of the report. We found no weaknesses in internal control or deficiencies in internal controls. As you know, LA-RICS receives federal grant monies. As a result of that, we are required under government auditing standards to do substantive compliance testing of grant expenditures. And that report is presented on pages 21 and 22. On page 23 of the report, it details a schedule of federal expenditures or federal awards that we've audited, one being the NTIA grant and the other the Homeland Security grant. And, I'm happy to report that based on our substantive testing of those expenditures, that we've found the Authority to be in compliance with those grant requirements. Bill Fujioka stated, you should've raised your hand when the NTIA team was here. (laughter) So with that, that presents our report to you.



Board Member Mark Alexander stated, I have a question for Pat on the BTOP Grant. We've heard a lot this morning about the deadline and by the way, thank you Mr. Chair for your response to the NTIA folks. I concur with your comments. My question is, on that grant, I know that we're working against that deadline, but does the requirement of the grant have us complete the project by September? Or, just draw down the funds? Pat Mallon stated, all activities have to be completed by the end of September 2015. Truc Moore also added, "Not just complete the project, it's also submitting the invoicing, getting reimbursed for that invoicing, and passing their checklist of items that are required." Mark Alexander continued, "Mr. Chair I'm wondering if a different approach might be to, as opposed to trying to seek an extension which obviously they're not willing to give, but maybe changing the approach, by asking for consideration of a drawdown on the funds. I think we can spend the \$150 million?" Pat Mallon stated, "We have asked for, in essence, an advanced drawdown, an advance of payments because we have a rather small revolving funding considering the level of activity that is going to be required. We would go through that cushion that the County set aside for us quickly. We can clearly spend that between the LMR and the LTE project. So we have had discussion with NTIA about giving us an advance on those so that we would have the cash on hand. That is a process that the Office of Management Budget has to approve." Bill Fujioka stated, "That is one "ask" that we have, which will be going to pursue." They also, implied that as an alternative, if you can't build out the whole system, you build out a smaller system equally effective. The alternative is to identify geographic area, build out that system the same time that would work, the same time continuing with the entire system. So at least we could present that this part of it is complete, it's done. There's different ways to look at this. We have to show progress, that's the key.

Pat Mallon concluded stating, we advised NTIA that we are in the process of developing an implementation plan in concert with Motorola.

Chairman Bill Fujioka acknowledged receipt and file of the Auditor's report on behalf of the LA-RICS Board.

## VI. DISCUSSION ITEM (7)

### 7. Funding Plan Comments

Pat Mallon stated, Agenda Item 7 is a report on comments received from a draft funding plan. We've received one from the City of Signal Hill. That was primarily to ask questions about the number of talk groups that would be allotted to their city and we've answered that, and a copy of the response letter is attached. Also, we have two meetings, one on Wednesday, April 9, 2014, and one on Thursday, April 10, 2014, on additional outreach meetings to solicit, to give cities an opportunity to give us feedback on the funding plan."

Mark Alexander stated, can you give a status on the work with the Auditor-Controller on developing the cost estimates for the contract cities. Pat Mallon stated, "I would have to defer to the Sheriff's Department and Auditor-Controller; we have received no information from them." Bill Fujioka stated, "We'll get that information to you, I think their pretty close (in completing that)."



**VII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (8-12)**

8. Approve Amendment Two for Agreement No. LA-RICS 008 for Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communications System Authority ("LA-RICS") - Public Safety Broadband Network

It is recommended that your Board:

Delegate authority to the Executive Director to (a) Execute an Amendment, substantially similar in form to Attachment A, to Agreement No: LA-RICS 008 - Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communications System – Public Safety Broadband Network System, exercising the Unilateral Option for all Work pertaining to System Design in Phase 1 for Additive Alternate No. 1, a Home Subscriber Server ("HSS"), and all Work for System Design in Phase 1 for Additive Alternate No. 2, a Redundant Evolved Packet Core ("EPC"), for a total Contract Sum of \$395,044; and (b) to issue one or more Notices to Proceed to Motorola for this Work.

Pat Mallon read the details of agenda item #8. He concluded stating, our request is that you approve Amendment #2 which will allow Motorola to move forward with the detailed design process for additive alternates 1 and 2. The total value is \$395,044.

Board Member Greg Simay, seconded by Alternate Board Member Patty Huber motioned to approve; Board Member LeRoy Jackson abstained on this motion.

**Ayes:** 14 – Raney, Pickwith, Pedersen, Alexander, Harrison, Simay, Walker, Fujioka, Osby, Miller, Scott, Huber, Mac Arthur, Ramirez

**Abstain:** 1 – Jackson

**MOTION APPROVED.**

9. Approve Amendment Three for Professional Broadband Engineering Consulting Services

It is recommended that your Board:

1. Approve an increase to the Maximum Contract Sum in the amount of \$912,000, increasing the Maximum Contract Sum amount from \$3,300,000 to \$4,212,000;
2. Delegate authority to the Executive Director as follows:
  - a. Approve changes in Televate, LLC's ("Televate") scope of work to allow Televate to perform site acquisition services that will assist the Authority in successfully securing site access agreements to implement the Public Safety Broadband Network ("PSBN") system to meet the grant performance period deadline of September 2015; and,
  - b. Execute Amendment Three with Televate, substantially similar in form to Attachment A.

Pat Mallon read the details to agenda item # 9. He concluded stating this approval would give us some additional resources.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson, seconded by Board Member Scott Pickwith on the motion to approve this item.

**Ayes:** 15 – Raney, Pickwith, Pedersen, Alexander, Harrison, Simay, Walker, Fujioka, Osby, Miller, Jackson, Scott, Huber, Mac Arthur, Ramirez

**MOTION APPROVED.**



10. Antennae License Agreement for the City of Los Angeles

Based on a revised recommendation read in by the Executive Director, it is recommended that your Board:

1. Delegate authority to the Executive Director to complete negotiations with and execute, in substantially similar form, the attached Antennae License Agreement (Attachment A) with the City of Los Angeles, to allow for the deployment and use of this equipment purchased in Phase 1 to occur at a City site; and, allow the Executive Director to execute a substantially similar agreement to cover the LTE core installation with the City of Los Angeles.
2. Delegate authority to the Executive Director to execute on behalf of the Authority, all permits to enter, right of entries, and licenses, necessary to allow for work to occur for Phase 1 design activities in both the LMR and Public Safety Broadband Network ("PSBN") projects, as may be required in the future by any member agency of the Authority.

Pat Mallon read the details to agenda item # 10.

Board Member Gerry Miller, seconded by Alternate Member Patty Huber motioned to approve.

**Ayes:** 15 – Raney, Pickwith, Pedersen, Alexander, Harrison, Simay, Walker, Fujioka, Osby, Miller, Jackson, Scott, Huber, Mac Arthur, Ramirez

**MOTION APPROVED.**

11. Approve the LA-RICS Legislative Committee recommendations regarding 2014 Legislative Priorities

It is recommended that your Board:

2. Continue to support increased funding for critical Federal grants for the LA-RICS Project through the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) and the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP), and the consideration of multi-year performance periods for these grants;
2. Pursue additional funding opportunities at the Federal and State level for the LA-RICS Project, including a one-time significant allocation for this large scale project to be built under one grant;
3. Seek additional flexibility with milestones and timelines under various grants, including the critical grant under the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP);
4. Continue to maintain the position communicated by LA-RICS in its comments submitted to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) last May 2013 relating to the challenges with implementing the T-Band provisions required under H.R. 3630 which was enacted in 2012;
5. Specifically, LA-RICS position communicated to the FCC indicated that LA-RICS strongly supports efforts to allocate new spectrum resources for public safety to address the loss of the T-Band. And, that if adequate spectrum resources should not be made available, LA-RICS respectfully requests that the Commission support Congress revisiting the forced migration of public safety from the T-Band; and,



6. Continue to seek additional 700 Mhz channels through the FCC for the LA-RICS Project. Without these additional channels, it will be very difficult for LA-RICS to meet public safety needs even with the addition of the Public Safety Broadband System.

Pat Mallon briefly described the details to Agenda Item 11. Olyvia Rodriguez addressed the Board advising that on March 12, 2014, the Legislative Committee unanimously approved this recommendation for the Board's consideration. The key concern is that there is consensus on key issues and to be conveyed to federal agencies and for the delegation in California, our U.S. Senators and our House of Representatives. There are increases that have been enacted for important grants to the project like SHSGP and UASI FY 2014 and LA-RICS should be considered. There is a need for increased funding for 2015 for these grants as well and we're not just limited to the federal government.

In addition to funding, we have concerns with the limited radio spectrum available in the LA region. A meeting with the FCC is going to be important to convey the importance about a response back to comments submitted by Board in May 2013. There is a need for additional spectrum to meet the needs of local jurisdictions

The Committee also provided an attachment that provides a list of some of those key agencies and congressional members. Board Member Daryl Osby requested a cheat sheet with acronyms that we use. Also, whatever our position is as related to our JPA, develop speaking points so we were all saying the same thing. The fact of the matter is that we all talk to the same constituents, the same entities, as a Board we're saying the same thing; speaking points relating to the priorities today.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson, seconded by Board Member Gerry Miller and Alternate Member Nancy Ramirez motioned to approve.

**Ayes:** 15 – Raney, Pickwith, Pedersen, Alexander, Harrison, Simay, Walker, Fujioka, Osby, Miller, Jackson, Scott, Huber, Mac Arthur, Ramirez

**MOTION APPROVED.**

12. Comments Received – Draft Proposed Funding Plan

It is recommended that your Board:

1. Review the attached Revised Cash Flow Appendix (Appendix I), to the Draft Proposed Funding Plan which incorporates recommended edits received by LA-RICS Member agencies during the comment period; and,
3. If the Board finds it sufficient for comment, approve release of the Revised Appendix I for review by LA-RICS Members as a supplement to the Proposed Draft Funding Plan released on March 7, 2014.

Pat Mallon briefly described the details to Agenda Item 12.

Board Member Mark Alexander, seconded by Alternate Member Sandy Jo Mac Arthur motioned to approve.

**Ayes:** 15 – Raney, Pickwith, Pedersen, Alexander, Harrison, Simay, Walker, Fujioka, Osby, Miller, Jackson, Scott, Huber, Mac Arthur, Ramirez

**MOTION APPROVED.**



**VIII. CLOSED SESSION REPORT – (None)**

**IX. MISCELLANEOUS – (None)**

**X. PUBLIC COMMENTS – (None)**

**XI. ITEMS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION BY THE BOARD**

13. Project Funding

14. Project Risk Controls

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Fujioka announced the next Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 7, 2014 and requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. Alternate Member Patty Huber and seconded by Alternate Member Nancy Ramirez motioned to approve adjournment.

**Ayes:** 15 – Raney, Pickwith, Pedersen, Alexander, Harrison, Simay, Walker, Fujioka, Osby, Miller, Jackson, Scott, Huber, Mac Arthur, Ramirez

**MOTION APPROVED.**