



Board of Directors MEETING MINUTES

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL
INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

May 16, 2013

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
Gerry F. Miller, Chief Legislative Analyst, City of Los Angeles
Reginald “Reggie” Harrison, Deputy City Manager, City of Long Beach
LeRoy J. Jackson, City Manager, City of Torrance, representing At Large Seat
Gregory “Greg” L. Simay, Assistant General Manager, City of Burbank Water & Power, representing At Large Seat
Kim Raney, Police Chief, City of Covina, representing At Large Seat

Representatives For Board Members Present:

Patricia “Patty” J. Huber, representing Miguel Santana, for the City of Los Angeles Chief Administrative Office
John Vidovich, representing Brian Cummings, for the City of Los Angeles Fire 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 Wendy L. Watanabe, Auditor-Controller, County of Los Angeles
Patricia Saucedo, Board Secretary

Absent:

Brian Cummings, Fire Chief, City of Los Angeles Fire Department
Charles “Charlie” L. Beck, Vice Chair, Police Chief, City of Los Angeles
Daryl L. Osby, Fire Chief, County of Los Angeles
Leroy “Lee” D. Baca, Sheriff, County of Los Angeles
Dr. Mitchell H. Katz, Director, DHS, County of Los Angeles
Timothy Scranton, Fire Chief, City of Beverly Hills, representing the Los Angeles Area Fire Chiefs Association
Scott Pickwith, Police Chief, City of La Verne, representing the Los Angeles County Police Chiefs Association
Mark R. Alexander, City Manager, City of La Cañada Flintridge, representing the Contract Cities Association
Donald “Don” Pedersen, Police Chief, City of Culver City, representing At Large Seat
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. April 4, 2013 – Regular Meeting Minutes. **MOTION APPROVED.**

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR – (None)

V. REPORTS – (2–5)

2. Committee Reports

a. Finance Committee – Stephen Sotomayor

Finance Chair Stephen Sotomayor, reported that over the past months, the subcommittee of the Finance Committee has been meeting to look at the proposed numbers that were presented by the highest scoring vendor to start building a funding plan for the LA-RICS Project. The Committee has a baseline plan, but unfortunately we are unable to disclose the numbers because there is an open procurement. On May 30th, we will hold a special meeting of the Finance Committee and we hope to be able to share the actual proposed numbers with the entire committee at that point depending on the status of negotiations and return to the Board with a full funding plan the following month.

Chairman Bill Fujioka asked the Board if there were any questions. Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked the ad hoc committee that was talking about splitting or doing other things? Is that still meeting too? Stephen Sotomayor replied, the ad hoc committee met through the month of April and has not met this month. But the full Finance Committee will be meeting in a special meeting on May 30th. Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked and your (May) 30th meeting is focused on the radio part of this, not the LTE. Stephen Sotomayor replied, correct it is going to be focused on the radio part.

b. Legislative Committee – Olyvia Rodriguez

Olyvia Rodriguez, Vice-Chair of the Legislative Committee, reported that the Legislative Committee met on April 17th, and approved a recommendation to your Board to submit comments to the FCC with respect to the implementation of the T-Band provisions under Federal Law H.R. 3630. The recommendation made a number of suggestions consistent by the NPSTC's report issued on March 15th. The NPSTC report contended that there is insufficient funding for the proposed move among a number of other concerns. The comments, with one minor amendment, were approved.

c. Operations Committee – No Report

d. Technical Committee – No Report



3. Director's Report – Pat Mallon

Land Mobile Radio Procurement:

- We are and have been in negotiations with the highest scoring vendor for the last ---- five/six weeks now. We are close to concluding that. We hope that is wrapped up within the next few days. And then we do expect to receive a letter of intent from them within the next few weeks following the conclusion of negotiations.
- We remain within the documented process in the RFP to conduct debriefings of both proposers following the receipt and acceptance of the letter of intent.

FCC Notice of Inquiry:

- As mentioned earlier by Ms. Rodriguez we ran into a time crunch in bringing a formal FCC Notice of Inquiry Response to your Board due to the postponement of the May 4th meeting to today. We did meet with the Legislative Committee on April 7th, and they made some slight modifications to the draft that was prepared by staff. We circulated that amended version to Board Members and their Alternates a week before the May 13th due date and received no additional input. On May 13th, we did submit that Legislative Committee approved response.

Washington DC trip:

- Last week, I had the opportunity to make a number of visits to our representatives in Washington DC. I would like to report on two of those meetings. The first one was with FEMA. I would like to thank Alisa Finsten from the City of Los Angeles who made the trip to Washington for that one meeting. And I have to report that we received a very, very positive response from FEMA. They were excited to hear about the progress that we've made in the project. They certainly do understand the hurdles that we've encountered.

FEMA representatives stated that they are looking to LA-RICS to be the demonstration project for the rest of the nation as far as interoperability. And most importantly to us, they articulated a willingness to work with LA-RICS and the City of Los Angeles to make the most of UASI and SHSGP funds. And of equal importance, to help us move through the NEPA process which is a requirement to expend federal grant dollars from the environmental perspective.

LTE System:

- The project still remains on hold pending execution on the Spectrum Management Lease Agreement with FirstNet and lifting of the grant suspension by NTIA. We have been in weekly conference calls with FirstNet representatives. We have a couple of remaining issues that we are concerned about. First is the duration of the spectrum lease. Our concern on this issue is that we need to have a licensing period that is sufficiently long enough to be of value. As an example, the initial proposal was that the spectrum lease would last through the end of the grant period. Essentially, this means we would get the system built out and our access to the spectrum would soon expire. We have been very articulate in the need to have a longer duration and to ensure that any member that subscribes to the system have some kind of a system to migrate to if there is a termination of our spectrum lease, such as some other system that FirstNet or the State of California will want to use. The other item that we have a concern with is what we are referring to as the Indemnification (the claw back) Clause. They have asked that vendors that bid on the system be willing to accept the financial responsibility to make that system



compatible with the federal government's architecture. And we don't know what that architecture is. We see it as a very difficult hurdle to overcome when we are asking a vendor to buy into an indemnification clause of a system that to date has no definition. One of the requirements from the FirstNet Board is that we identify a demonstration area that LA-RICS can show, and that the rest of the nation can learn from. The first area that they asked us to look at was "in-building" coverage. This would be a very great benefit to us. However, our concern is that in order to focus the resources to build out in an area such as a high-rise area, we would have to do so at the expense of some other area. So that was not really reasonable to us. Another factor is environmental concerns. We have been focusing on police stations, fire stations, sheriff stations or existing transmitter sites in order to expedite the CEQA process. To intensify the coverage in a high-rise area, we would probably have to go outside the list of public safety sites, thus creating an environmental concern.

The other area that we talked about that did get immediate traction with FirstNet was the inclusion of secondary responders and perhaps even a third level of responders in the base of broadband system users. As was adopted by this Board, we recognize that secondary responders are an intricate part of a response to any kind of event. And, to have them on the same system with the first responders, even if we set up some kind of tiered access to the system, would give us a better ability to respond. Additionally, and as consideration of a third tier, we would investigate the inclusion of public utilities. Public Utilities, such as Southern California Edison, LA City's Department of Water and Power, and municipal services such as Burbank are equally as important in responding to a big disaster. We think that would enhance a subscriber base making a system more viable from a business perspective. Additionally, most of the public utilities have some fiber network that we might be able to access under some kind of a usage agreement which would enhance our backhaul systems.

We have received a go ahead from FirstNet to begin a consultation process with their representative and staff had their first meeting with that individual on Monday and Tuesday this week, at the Broadband Summit in Washington DC.

On May 6th, I did have the opportunity to meet with NTIA. I reported at our last meeting the concerns we had was moving forward with the NEPA approval process. Each federal department has to adopt their own NEPA process and the one that has been adopted by the Department of Commerce, which effects NTIA, is that any local environmental process has to be fully complete before the Department of Commerce can entertain the initiation of the NEPA process. That means that if any one of the 255 sites that we have outlined for our broadband system requires any kind of a CEQA process, whether it be an environmental impact report, a mitigated declaration, or negative declaration, it will delay the initiation of the NEPA process. Similarly, if we go on to any federal properties such as the Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management, each of those agencies individually will have an opportunity to comment on both the CEQA and the NEPA applications. This will really exacerbate our scheduling dilemma. The final result of that meeting was that we need to look entirely to sites that would fall within our AB 1486 CEQA exemption. Any site that is privately held will not meet the CEQA exemption. In those instances, we need to find a replacement site. We are in the process of doing that today. We can present to this Board for consideration sites which meet the limited criteria and once that is done we can initiate the NEPA process. NTIA anticipated that a typical CEQA process would take us nine, to twelve, to eighteen months and only then could they begin the NEPA process. They advised that the NEPA process could take as long as six months. By that point we would run out of the grant period before we could stick a shovel in the ground. If we are to get a system functioning in as much of the County areas as possible, it is my recommendation that we proceed and move along that line. Board Member Greg Simay asked, about the utility responders referencing a



speech to utility executives by President Obama. In referencing Sandy Hook, the President mentioned alignment with electric line workers as first responders, at least under that circumstance. I think that concept will dove-tail very neatly with the lessons of Sandy Hook. Executive Director Pat Mallon added that in our consultation with FirstNet, they would like us to demonstrate, along with opening the system up to other responders, how to establish and operate a tiered system such that in the event of a disaster the initial emphasis would be in first responders and then as we set up a command post and we need to bring in additional resources, then you open it up to the second and third tiers or additional tiers, as maybe be required. And in working with our consultants, they say that it can be accomplished.

NTIA has provided a grant extension through September 2013, due to the extended negotiations that FirstNet has required for the spectrum lease agreement. We fully expect that once the spectrum use agreement has been executed and we have the lifting of the suspension, then we can ask for a two-year extension which will carry us until September 2015.

4. Project Manager's Report – Pat Mallon

Executive Director Pat Mallon stated, the project manager's report is included in your packet.

5. Grant Status Report – Pat Mallon

As mentioned earlier, we did meet with FEMA on May 7th. During that discussion FEMA advised us that a request for the extension of the UASI '09 had received favorable consideration. We are waiting for formal notice through the various chairs. Our grant extension request for UASI '10 is pending and they would certainly like to see us have an executed contract before they act on that request. As reported last month, the UASI Approval Authority met on May 22nd, to approve funding allocations for UASI 2013. The funding level for IJ 1 projects was reduced by 10% to 38%. The UASI IJ 1 Working Group met on April 5th to allocate 38% to specific tasks. LA-RICS received an earmark of \$13.7 million.

The LTE funding remains suspended pending execution of the site use agreement. A short-term extension is pending as of today with a longer term extension to follow.

VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS – (None)

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (6–8)

6. Site Access Agreement – Pat Mallon

- a. It is recommended that your Board authorize the Executive Director or his designee, with assistance from County of Los Angeles CEO – Real Estate Division, to begin discussions and/or negotiations with various City Managers for Site Access Agreements for specific sites by the LA-RICS Authority for use as possible Land Mobile Radio (LMR) and/or Long Term Evolution (LTE) broadband communication sites.

Executive Director Pat Mallon introduced for the Site Access Agreement, LA County Counsel, Truc Moore and Amy Caves, Counsel on Real Estate. Ms. Moore advised the Board Members that a few meetings ago they were presented an outline of what terms would be included in a site access agreement. Subsequently, comments were received from Board Members and at this point we are asking for your concurrence to move forward to begin the consultation process with individual cities. Our expectation is that we will send out a letter to those cities along with a draft



of the site access agreement and then begin meeting face to face. The one item that was surfaced, in a past meeting, and in comments received from Board Members, was the issue of the "County mode" that the Authority could take. We removed that term from the draft agreement and inserted rather a place holder to allow the affected individual cities, host cities, and LA-RICS to collaboratively negotiate language in order to move the process through. Of critical importance to us is that if the city approval process becomes long and involved and staff-intensive, we do not have the staff to be able to go out and hold 255 public hearings. We will be relying very heavily on the cities to carry through, in essence, with an installation by an Authority of which they are a member. We are going to be under a severe time constraint to get the project done. If the process lingers, we cannot let it delay the completion of the project. So if we get to a point where it becomes impossible to get it done, we will have to drop the site, which will be indeed unfortunate.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked, did you give us a new draft of the site agreement? Counsel of the Authority, Ms. Moore replied, no, we have never circulated the actual draft agreement. What we did do was put an outline together with the draft terms. Based on that outline there might have been some misunderstanding on what the actual language says. We did receive your memo and are prepared to discuss those items with you and your staff. You will see that the language is clear and it provides for fairness for both the City as well as for LA-RICS. Our goal today is to be able to move forward to start those discussions with you, and to answer and address your individual concerns.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked, so then each agreement with each agency will be a little different? Ms. Moore replied that it is possible they may vary from City to City, depending on the needs of the affected City and what they would require for their various sites. The agreement would be adjusted accordingly. Pat Mallon further added that it is our intent to push out the site access agreements for those broadband sites first due to the time restriction. Then as we are able to execute a contract with a vendor and we know specifically which sites are going to be involved in the LMR system, then move forward with those.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked, so you'll be sending a formal proposal to the agencies involved which will have the specific sites and the contemplated design? Executive Director Pat Mallon replied, yes. The cover letter will contain the specific locations along with the draft of the access agreement so that their counsel can begin to review it. Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked about the nature of the monopoles and the nature of the facility and the nature of any public utility requirements for them. Executive Director Pat Mallon advised that that information will be conveyed to the extent that we can make a determination now before we have a contractor on board. We are trying to obtain from our consulting staff the various options of disguised poles such as flag poles, fire department hose drying racks, palm trees, and pine trees, and water towers. We understand the sensitivity, particularly as we get into some of the residential areas with fire stations. We want to make it as inconspicuous as possible.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked, as mentioned in previous discussions, there would be no offset of funding other than for the service costs that are related to the facility or by LA-RICS? And this would not in any way relate to future definition of participation? Pat Mallon stated, correct, I think I understand your question. The one thing that we have learned from FirstNet, and from NTIA, is that the infrastructure, specifically, the poles can be used for supplemental purposes as well. As an example, if we were to put a pole up in the City of Torrance that commercial users would find advantageous, we can work an agreement with them for access to the pole. That would generate some revenue that could then be shared with the City and LA-RICS. Since LA-RICS would be maintaining the pole, we would certainly like to be able to put some money into reserves to continue the maintenance. But, there would be a revenue sharing opportunity for the host City. Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked or the host City could say no. Executive Director Pat Mallon replied absolutely.



Board Member Reginald Harrison stated that following a few conversations with the Director about the approval of the design review process in the site access agreement, we've gotten some flexibility now in this document. He thinks most of the cities recognize the importance of LA-RICS and the importance to public safety and that we can work with cities through their processes to help expedite the deployment of the project. It is really helpful that we start off with the right footing and would be helpful to maintain a collaborative approach in a go forward basis. He also joined Mr. Jackson in that commercial users of these facilities would have to go through a different process and a city may not want to approve them at all. Executive Director Pat Mallon stated, that is entirely at the discretion of the city. We could receive some benefit from it, but certainly that is not our goal. One of the cities has indicated that if LA-RICS was to put up a monopole at their city hall site, they would want it to replace an existing installation. They would be interested in having those existing antennas moved to the LA-RICS tower and it will maintain a revenue source for them. Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked a legal question regarding while the project itself has received some latitude under State law, will the access agreement as its brought forward to the City as a separate issue be exempt, or would it be covered by local law on CEQA?

Ms. Moore replied, stating that we will be able to work with you on the CEQA language needed to move the site access agreements forward. Board Member Greg Simay asked, do you expect the majority of these to be mounting antennas on existing towers? Executive Director Pat Mallon stated, to the extent that we can and if there is space on the towers, we would prefer to do that. Where we come into a quandary is if, say an existing tower is a non-exempt site such as its privately held, then we face holding up the rest of the process for CEQA. Our position would probably be to not do that installation initially. But that certainly does not preclude some future expansion of the site. Board Member Greg Simay stated, most of the sites would not have that problem. By their nature, they already have an existing tower that is taking advantage. Executive Director Pat Mallon stated out of the 255, there were 25 sites that were co-located with an LMR site.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson moved to concur but wants to specify that there would be a formal proposal to each of the agencies. Chairman Bill Fujioka stated, yes, that was stated by staff. Board Member Reginald Harrison moved for the second motion. No objections were voiced.

MOTION APPROVED.

7. Approve Amendment to UltraSystems Environmental, Inc. (UltraSystems) Contract – Pat Mallon
 - a. It is recommended that your Board authorize the Executive Director to execute a contract amendment with UltraSystems, to increase the contract sum by \$1,031,396 for the option to provide specialized field surveys for both the Land Mobile Radio (LMR) Project and the Long Term Evolution (LTE) Project, as well as the option to complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the LMR Project, if needed.

Executive Director Pat Mallon stated this action item is to request approval of an amendment to the UltraSystems' contract. This Board approved a contract with UltraSystems to provide environmental consultation for both the Land Mobile Radio and the LTE system. Under the Land Mobile Radio system we initially looked at that being an environmental assessment and as we have gone further into the project, we have come to the realization that an option to allow work on an Environmental Impact Report may be needed. The EIR was not included in their scope of work originally, nor was it included in their price. We have had our consultants do some initial screening of the sites. Some of them will require a biological, historical, or land use study. We also have 24 proposed sites that we think would require such study. We are requesting an allocation which would support their activities on the Land Mobile Radio system and for the broadband system. With regard to the broadband system, we are going to have to eliminate



some sites. We will then need to go through the CEQA review on the proposed replacement sites. The amendment will establish an amount of money to do that. The request is to augment their contract by approximately \$1,031,000.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked how much has actually been spent today on the contract? And, what are the deliverables that we've received for that funding? Executive Director Pat Mallon asked Susy Orellana-Curtiss to respond on this matter. Susy stated, to date, we've spent approximately \$1.2 million dollars. We have received an analysis on the 255 prescribed sites for the LTE system and we have received almost complete analysis on a combined list of sites for the LMR system. Board Member Jackson asked, "and of the remaining, what are they going to spend that for?" Susy stated, there is a balance remaining within their original contract which they are going to use to complete some of their analysis on the LMR system sites. Once we receive the letter of intent from the LMR contractor and finalize a contract, we will be able to finalize those sites. The additional funds will allow us for the replacement sites for the LTE broadband system due to the CEQA exempt requirement from NTIA. Board Member Jackson asked, we haven't selected those sites yet? Susy replied, we selected 255 sites originally which we prescribed and were released in the solicitation round two. But because of the latest development from NTIA, we need to complete the CEQA process prior to initiating the NEPA process and look at only the CEQA exempt sites for the LTE system. Board Member Jackson asked, so they did not look at all the sites originally? Susy replied, they looked at all 255 prescribed sites, but not all 255 are CEQA exempt. So we are looking at replacing the non-CEQA exempt sites with new sites. And that requires a new set of analysis on the added sites. Board Member Jackson asked, in addition to the 255 sites? Susy replied, yes, that's correct. Board Member Jackson asked, so you are going to have another list of sites going out in a future day? Susy replied, we are currently vetting a list of additional sites. If your Board approves this amendment, the Environmental Consultant will be vetting the sites for compliance with the CEQA exemption criteria. Board Member Jackson asked, again, how many sites are those? Susy replied, we are actually looking at the sites that are not CEQA exempt from the original 255 and there are some studies that need to be done regarding coverage, so it isn't a site per site replacement. I cannot give you an exact number of how many replacement sites there will be. Board Member Jackson stated that is a peculiarity that this will cost us as much as the original full assessment of sites only for a limited number of sites. Executive Director Pat Mallon explained this is a not to exceed budget. We have received a cost of \$6,500 per site. So that is up to 55 sites as a replacement and we will not be using all 255, we don't know the exact number yet because we are still performing our review. As an example, an area such as Pepperdine University is private property. We have looked, and unfortunately, there is no suitable public safety site that will provide coverage for that area. In the Palos Verdes Peninsula, we had two sites identified but both of them are in large brush areas. The environmentalists are indicating those sites are highly likely to not meet the CEQA exemption because of migratory/protected birds and their nesting areas. We are looking for alternative sites. If we can identify an alternative site, we will need to do an environmental analysis on that specific site. That is on the LTE side. On the Land Mobile Radio system, we did not contract initially for a full environmental impact report. This funding will allow us to be able to do that, if one is needed. Alternate Member Patty Huber moved, second by another Board Member. Hearing no objection, the motion was approved.

MOTION APPROVED.

8. Approve Amendment to Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, PLC (FH&H) Contract for Professional Legal Services – Pat Mallon
 - a. Authorize the Executive Director to execute a contract amendment with FH&H, to increase the Attorney's hourly rate to \$385, to align the rates with JPA Counsel hourly rate as reflected in Exhibit C.



Executive Director Pat Mallon stated that the Authority enjoys the services of an FCC Counsel located in Washington DC. That individual, Mr. Robert Gurs, also provides legal counsel for FCC matters to the County of Los Angeles. His rates have been adjusted by County Counsel for services to the County. This Amendment would be to bring the JPA rates at \$385 into line with what the County is presently paying him. All of these services are being paid for with grant funds. Chair Bill Fujioka asked for a motion to approve. He heard a first, and then a second by Alternate Patty Huber with no objections.

MOTION APPROVED.

VIII. CLOSED SESSION REPORT – (None)

IX. MISCELLANEOUS – (None)

X. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chair Bill Fujioka invited Lisa Specht to address the Board for her public comment.

Good afternoon, Lisa Specht, Manatt, Phelps, & Phillips, LLP. As you know we have previously raised concerns about the Authority's decision to delay Raytheon's debriefing. And most recently, on April 23rd, I sent to this Board a letter asking you to address this decision to delay. Mr. Mallon's response to that letter, which all of you received a copy to, seemed in my view to be non-responsive. He said that if we had concerns about the timing of the debriefing, we should have challenged to the RFP. I don't think so. I want to be clear, our client has acknowledged and continues to acknowledge that under the RFP the Authority does have the discretion to delay the Raytheon debriefing until after the contract is negotiated. However, and this is our point, the Authority also has the discretion to schedule the debriefing any time before the contract is negotiated. It could be scheduled as early as tomorrow. So we are simply raising the issue of how the Authority is exercising its discretion. At the last Board meeting, my colleague, Victor De la Cruz, asked the Board to exercise its oversight and have the Authority schedule the briefing without further delay. In response, Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked the matter be put on to the next agenda for consideration. I should say the agenda at the next meeting. So last week we wrote to Mr. Mallon, just to confirm that in fact it would be on the agenda and when we didn't get a response, we called him. He said he didn't think it would be on the agenda, unfortunately he was correct. It is not on today's agenda. Obviously, we are really disappointed by this outcome. Our client has invested significant time, significant money in this process and I just don't think I should have to be here today begging for a debriefing when it seems so clear to me that this is the right thing to do. All my client wants is a debriefing that is consistent with the County's best practices, and every Los Angeles County procurement that I have been involved in in the last 20 years. For such a complex procurement, with technology that has been the subject of multiple change orders, cost overruns, and technical complications, in many other areas of the Country, transparency seems particularly important here to ensure a fair and open competition. So again we ask you to have the Authority schedule a debriefing without further delay. I thank you for your time.

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

9. FirstNet Path Forward
10. Insurance for JPA
11. Project Funding
12. Project Risk Controls



XII. ADJOURNMENT

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked question on the Insurance, will that be continued to our next meeting? Executive Director Pat Mallon stated we are waiting on a formal quote from one of the vendors; we did not receive it in a timely enough fashion to include it on this agenda. It will be on the June's agenda.

Chair Bill Fujioka then adjourned the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.