



Board of Directors MEETING MINUTES

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL
INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

January 3, 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
Brian Cummings, Fire Chief, City of Los Angeles Fire Department
Gerry F. Miller, Chief Legislative Analyst, City of Los Angeles
Steven K. "Steve" Zipperman, Police Chief, Los Angeles School Police Department
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
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
Mark J. Bennett, representing Daryl L. Osby, for the County of Los Angeles Fire Department
David Betkey, representing, Leroy "Lee" D. Baca, for the County of Los Angeles Sheriff Department
Cathy Chidester, representing Dr. Mitchell H. Katz, for the County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services

Officers Present:

Pat Mallon, LA-RICS Executive Director
Rachelle Anema, representing Wendy L. Watanabe, Auditor-Controller, County of Los Angeles

Absent:

Charles "Charlie" L. Beck, Vice Chair, Police Chief, City of Los Angeles
Reginald "Reggie" Harrison, Deputy City Manager, City of Long Beach
Donald "Don" Pedersen, Police Chief, City of Culver City, representing At Large Seat
Mark J. Saladino, Treasurer and Tax Collector, County of Los Angeles
Patricia Saucedo, Board Secretary



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. December 13, 2012 – Regular Meeting Minutes. Chairman Fujioka received a motion from Board Member LeRoy Jackson, and second motion from Jerry Miller. There were no objections.

MOTION APPROVED.

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR – (None)

V. REPORTS – (2-5)

2. Committee Reports

- a. Finance Committee – No Report
- b. Legislative Committee – No Report
- c. Operations Committee – No Report
- d. Technical Committee – No Report

3. Director's Report – Pat Mallon

Executive Director Pat Mallon stated we expect to have responses to RFP #LA-RICS 007 due back at 4:00 p.m. today. We are still looking towards a May 2013, perhaps June 2013, to bring a contract back to this Board, if everything goes well.

Our Evaluation Team has been assembled. They have received their training and they are ready to go (commence). We have representatives from the City of L.A., the County, and the Independent Cities; and, we have a team of SME's that have been identified and are going through training today (January 3, 2013). We will be ready to begin the evaluation process first thing on Monday morning (January 7, 2013) as scheduled.

We are continuing to work with NPSTC T-Band Working Group. We have been assembling replacement costs for the 11 major systems across the country. It is anticipated that probably in February 2013, perhaps March 2013, a report will be ready to be released from the NPSTC Group.

As far as the LTE System, we continue to remain on hold pending some form of a decision from FirstNet. We did have a Subcommittee Meeting with the FirstNet Board on December 19, 2012, and that will be reported here in agenda item 7.

The next FirstNet Board meeting is scheduled for February 2013, where we anticipate some direction regarding the BTOP grant.

As reported last month, we have been working with Karen Wong, from the California Chief Information Officer, regarding State participation as an Authority Member. The paperwork on that will begin shortly. It was delayed because of the holidays. The State is beginning to put together an application for a portion of \$135 million in grant funds, which was identified under H.R. 3630 for a State-wide implementation planning. They will begin the application process in the coming weeks. They have also scheduled the first California FirstNet Forum on January 30, 2013, in Sacramento and both Bay-RICS and LA-RICS will be participating in that meeting.



On the subject of Spectrum Use Agreements, we have received draft language from our FCC Council and it has been reviewed by the Authority's County Counsel. We will be distributing that very shortly to Authority members for review by their legal staff. And as part of the JPA agreement, Members agree to commit their spectrum to the LA-RICS Project. They will continue to hold the licenses, but will allow LA-RICS System to use those frequencies.

In reference to an Authority Indemnification Policy, we have initiated discussions with the L.A. County Risk Management Office. We will be following the lead that was established by the L.A. Regional Crime Lab's JPA in getting liability insurance to include Directors Coverage so that any decisions that this Board makes will be covered under that policy. We anticipate that this item will be placed on agenda in a future meeting.

We have been working and meeting with the City of Los Angeles as the UASI Grant Administrator, they are very concerned about the UASI '09 Funds, which is now about \$21-\$22 million (Please see amount correction noted in item 5 below). The expiration for that Grant was May 31, 2012, so it is technically expired. Cal-EMA as the State's Grant Administrator understands the issues that have been dealt towards the LA-RICS Project under H.R. 3630 and they have been holding off on any kind of decision until we can give them a schedule of activities going forward. Part of that information needed to determine that schedule is how many proposals we will be getting this afternoon. We are continuing to look at our options in getting an extension or perhaps looking at segments of the LA-RICS System that we can get done a little bit earlier.

4. Project Manager's Report – Pat Mallon

Pat Mallon stated there is no additional information to add based on the handout given for agenda item 4.

5. Grant Status Report – Pat Mallon

Pat Mallon stated there has been no change from last month. We do have one item on today's agenda, item 8a with a correction to accept \$250,000, not \$25,000 shown.

Please note: The amount of \$21 million in grant funding previously reported is incorrect; the correct amount is \$16,929,838.

VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS (6–7)

6. 2013 Schedule of LA-RICS Board Meetings – Pat Mallon

Pat Mallon addressed the schedule for 2013 meetings stating notice that meetings are scheduled on the first Thursday of every month with the exception of July which is delayed one week due to the July 4th holiday which falls on a Thursday.



7. FirstNet Site Visit – Pat Mallon

Pat Mallon reported that on December 19, 2012, the LA-RICS staff with Mr. Fujioka met with representatives of the FirstNet Authority to provide them a briefing on the LA-RICS' LA-SafetyNet Project. The first FirstNet Board meeting was held on September 25, 2012, at which time one a high level national concept for the National Public Safety Broadband System was presented which relied very heavily on the commercial sector. The description on the hardening of the system to meet public safety requirements was by using redundant systems. In other words, FirstNet would contract with multiple carriers and through the multiple carriers, and perhaps even satellite carriers, they would equal the hardening that typically is required for public safety installations. They found in Hurricane Sandy, that concept had a flaw. Most of the commercial operations share poles; they share the transmitter sites. When you lose the transmitter sites, you don't lose one system, you lose four or five. There was a significant system outage in the Hurricane's impacted areas. We definitely recognize that as a shortcoming of the design.

FirstNet released a Notice of Inquiry, with responses due back on November 11, 2012. LA-RICS did submit a response to the Notice of Inquiry, identifying four overarching considerations:

(1) The National Public Safety Broadband Network needs to meet mission-critical operational requirements, and that one size does not fit all. What might be good for rural Kansas is not necessarily good for urban Los Angeles County. FirstNet Board must meet and work closely with local State Municipal and Tribal Agencies to make sure that the system meets the local requirements.

(2) The National Public Safety Broadband Network **must include** mission-critical voice, "push to talk". This is one of the considerations that were dropped in the Statement of Requirements that is now being considered by that Board. They said "push to talk" is not ready on the Public Safety Broadband and they should put it off until some future point. Our concern is that, as we move forward with our LMR System, if we are to be in a position where we can vacate the T-Band in nine years, we have to replace it with some form of a push to talk capability over the broadband system.

(3) FirstNet must take into account the harmonization of diverge in interest of the commercial and Public Safety sector missions. The commercial operations are there to make profits, public safety operations are there to save lives; regardless of what the cost is, within some reasonable consideration. So our concern is that the local influence has some kind of an impact over the design, deployment, and access to the system.

(4) FirstNet should consider deploying an initial network of proof of concept site, such as LA-RICS. We think we are in an ideal position because of our size and the complexity of the L.A. County area to provide them with a good test bed where they can learn from our experiences.

Chairman Fujioka stated this would be a good time to pause. One thing that I wanted to emphasize, two things actually; One is this commercial option. Regardless of what direction we go with, vendors and so on, in the way our contract is going, to have a commercial option pushed down our throats is outrageous and totally unacceptable. I want us to talk about this collectively. Using whatever legislative powers we have within our representatives. But also for fire and police agencies to talk to their associations, not only here in the State of California, but across the nation, to say we have to aggressively fight this. If we are required to go on principally, with commercial option, can you imagine? We talked about what happened during the Hurricane Sandy, when they had multiple commercial vendors on the same tower. And when that tower went down, their system went down. And we know, through the earthquakes we've had, and we



haven't had the "big one" yet, you couldn't get a signal on your cell phone. Can you imagine what would happen within public safety agencies? When we mention that, there is one person on the Board who is a Fire Chief, he said, "Well it works in my area. The commercial option will work. We are absolutely positive it will work." He is from a rural area of Portland, where you probably can't have a tower system that we need in L.A. County. And so I would ask that our Fire and Police folks get to their associations now and start raising this issue; start talking about it. And then, have your counterparts throughout the nation go into their legislators and say, "This is crazy, this can't work." If we don't push back now, someone is going to dump this on us.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked if they were talking about not having a stand-alone system, but one would be run by a commercial vendor?

Chairman Fujioka replied that FirstNet is proposing to build one system across the nation that will be driven by the commercial sector. FirstNet would contract with multiple commercial carriers to develop and deploy the National Public Safety Broadband System that would operate primarily on the commercial network.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked, "Not a stand-alone system?" Pat Mallon replied *correct*. Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked so they would not build the infrastructure that was originally anticipated? Pat Mallon replied *that is correct*.

Pat Mallon continued, that there would be some form of infrastructure with Nation-wide core (or multiple-cores) throughout the country that would support public safety applications. So there would be some infrastructure costs there, but the system would rely largely on commercial towers and backhaul.

Chairman Fujioka replied I think we need to control our own system and not be solely dependent on the commercial systems. Because once you give that up, you will be at their mercy not only on a system-basis but also in cost, and that really alarms me.

The other issue we raised is that we are asked to migrate off our T-Band. They will be auctioning off the T-Band and there will be funding for the migration. So what we are pushing now is, if we could be a pilot with them providing funding now. We will be their poster child, we will be the one that will stand up and to get the system going. But rather than giving it to us 12 years from now, find a way to get the funding up front. So we are going to be pushing real hard this year for that.

Pat Mallon continued, some other elements that we included in our Notice of Inquiry Response was the need to encourage integration of existing public assets, such as towers that are owned by public safety or by municipal organizations.,

We also highlighted the need to include secondary responders. The initial vision of the National Public Safety Broadband System was that it would be for first responders only. And we feel that, just to use Mr. Fujioka's reference to the wind storms recently, we relied upon Parks Department and Roads Department and Public Works, and other agencies to help clear that debris. During the mudflows following the Station Fire, we used Public Works to clear the mud. Those types of organizations need to be on the system as well. We underscored the need that it be an affordable system and that it not be profit-oriented; that it be public safety oriented. And we also stressed the need for the development of subscriber equipment, today not four or five years from now. As we replace our equipment today (typically our equipment lasts eight to ten years), we don't need to buy a piece of equipment today that is going to be obsolete in two years because they came up with something that will work on the public safety broadband system. They need to do that today, so that we can buy one device that will meet all needs.



During the December 19, 2012 meeting, we provided them (FirstNet Subcommittee) with a Briefing Book and I will make that available. We can email that out to you, if you would like a copy we will certainly share a copy with you. In the Briefing book, we provided a project overview with a little history of the LA-RICS Project and some of the procurement hurdles that we have overcome. And our successes with the environmental compliance issue. We provided them with coverage maps and some technical aspects of the project. We shared some discussions about our projects' lessons learned in both contracting and technical, as well as stake holder lessons. We discussed some contractual language that they had proposed, which basically says that if we are allowed to build-out a LTE system, and if FirstNet determines not to use that site, that the cost of the LTE system would be returned back to the federal government. That creates some significant issues for us in contracting with anybody because if there is a risk that they will lose those funds, they are going to raise the price in some other area. We talked about our project schedule and the need for them to make a timely decision, as well as for them to give us a grant extension. Currently currently our BTOP grant is set to expire in August 2013. We will need at least a two-year extension.

Among other topics is national control versus local management. There has been a big push by them to say, if it is a national public safety broadband system, the feds are going to control it. We are concerned that someone sitting in Washington DC can effectively manage a local system. Who is allowed to go on? What kind of applications are going to be local? What access rights are you going to give to individual subscribers? That needs to be managed here locally. We emphasized the need for push to talk. And we gave them a list of FirstNet decision points that they need to make, such as the grant extension, the clarification on Scope of what LA-RICS will be allowed to build once they have established the architecture, the level of national versus local console, and then, clearly allowing us to move forward with our NEPA process. We felt it was a very productive meeting.

Board Member Greg Simay commented, I think when we talked about the D-Block earlier, many of us pointed out that you did not want to be bumped off by a commercial customer or have a commercial user complain when they were bumped off the first time for mission critical use. I think public and private utilities may be a very good ally in this and may have a mission that is more compatible than a commercial carrier. And, if we can find spectrum adjacent to our D-Block, I understand from some of my technical people, that mission critical voice would be very possible with contiguous spectrum. It is just mainly going through the same process that P25 did, a lot of wrangling and jockeying, but it becomes more of a political will problem than an engineering problem, if we just secure the spectrum.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked, what is the long-term evolution system?

Pat Mallon explained, LTE (long-term evolution) system is considered to be fourth generation to the broadband system; so 4G Broadband and LTE are synonymous. Mr. Jackson replied, okay, thank you.

Board Member Mark Alexander asked is the commercial option a viable alternative for a redundant system?

Pat Mallon explained, what we proposed to them in our presentation is to allow LA-RICS to move forward with a public safety grade, LTE or broadband skeleton. Our system is designed for 95% at the door coverage throughout the urban area of Los Angeles County. Obviously, if you are a public safety representative, you would like it to communication at 99.999% coverage inside so that when something goes wrong, you have the immediate ability to communicate. It would be cost prohibited for us to build out a cellular network that would cover all of Los Angeles County to provide that kind of coverage. So our system is designed, using the grant funds available, to



provide 95% coverage “at the door” in the urban area. We do not cover the National Forest; we do not cover the Santa Monica Mountains because it is virtually impossible to cover. What we have proposed to them is that we, through some kind agreement with the commercial enterprises, that we get that 99% in door coverage, through some form of roaming agreement. If there is a big event and the commercial systems were to go down, the public safety grade hardening system would continue to operate at the 95% level and we could still coordinate the response to the door. So we would have some kind of partnership under this concept with commercial enterprise to provide that, in essence, 5% gap from at the door to inside. Mr. Fujioka added, versus having the commercial having the entire system.

Board Member Mark Alexander stated I understand, but the way you have just explained it almost sounds like our system would withstand any kind of catastrophe before their system would more likely go down.

Pat Mallon explained the commercial sector typically does not build to the same standards that public safety does, for seismic, for winds, for ice or load bearings. We have it, at minimum in our specifications, TIA 222 REV G, which is a standard of seismic requirements, the size of a pole, the strength of a pole, the ability for it to sway in an earthquake yet come back to the same position. The commercial industry does not build to those standards because it is costly. So we do anticipate that the public safety broadband system that we will build under LA-SafetyNet would be hardened to greater standards compared to the commercial system and would also have a redundant of backhaul. Instead of having one link (via microwave, via fiber optic) there would be a minimum of two. Mr. Fujioka asked, any other questions?--more to follow.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (8)

8. Accept 2012 State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) Funds – Pat Mallon

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that your Board:

- a. Accept \$250,00 in grant funds from the Fiscal Year 2012 State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) as distributed through the California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA); and,
- b. Authorize the Executive Director to execute the attached 2012 Homeland Security Grant Program Sub-recipient Agreement between the County of Los Angeles and the Authority.

Pat Mallon stated agenda item 8 is a request for your approval of a sub-recipient agreement with the SHSGP funds in the amount of \$250,000.

Chairman Fujioka received a motion from Board Member LeRoy Jackson, and second motion from Sandy Jo MacArthur. There were no objections. The motion passed.



VIII. MISCELLANEOUS – (None)

IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS – (None)

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

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

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Bill Fujioka announced the items for future discussion. He requested that our Legislative Committee begin further discussions and seek strategies on the commercial options. Additionally, as individual entities, he asked that each Board Member go back and talk to those legislative staff, and reach out to all your peers on this (commercial options) matter.

He further announced the next meeting to be held on Thursday, February 7, 2013, at 9:00 a.m., at the Grace E. Simons Lodge and adjourned this meeting.