



# AGENDA

## LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, November 3, 2011 • 9:00 a.m.  
Grace E. Simons Lodge  
1025 Elysian Park Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communications Systems Authority (the "Authority")

#### **AGENDA POSTED: October 31, 2011**

Complete agendas are made available for review at the designated meeting location during normal business hours and may also be accessible on the Authority's website at <http://www.la-rics.org>.

---

#### **Members:**

1. **William T Fujioka**, Chair, CEO, County of Los Angeles
2. **Mark R. Alexander**, City Manager, representing California Contract Cities Association
3. **Leroy D. Baca**, Sheriff, County of Los Angeles
4. **Charles L. Beck**, Vice Chair, Police Chief, City of Los Angeles
5. **Brian Cummings**, Fire Chief, City of Los Angeles
6. **Reginald Harrison**, Deputy City Manager, City of Long Beach
7. **LeRoy J. Jackson**, City Manager, City of Torrance, representing At Large Seat
8. **Dr. Mitchell H. Katz**, Director, DHS, County of Los Angeles
9. **Gerry Miller**, Chief Legislative Analyst, City of Los Angeles
10. **Daryl L. Osby**, Fire Chief, County of Los Angeles
11. **Donald Pedersen**, Police Chief, City of Culver City, representing At Large Seat
12. **Scott Pickwith**, Police Chief, representing the Los Angeles County Police Chiefs Association
13. **Kim Raney**, Police Chief, City of Covina, representing At Large Seat
14. **Miguel Santana**, CAO, City of Los Angeles
15. **Harold Scoggins**, Fire Chief, representing the Los Angeles Area Fire Chiefs Association
16. **Gregory L. Simay**, Assistant General Manager, City of Burbank Water & Power, representing At Large Seat
17. **Steven K. Zipperman**, Police Chief, Los Angeles School Police Department

---

#### **Officers:**

1. **Patrick Mallon**, Executive Director
2. **Wendy L. Watanabe**, County of Los Angeles Auditor-Controller
3. **Mark J. Saladino**, County of Los Angeles Treasurer and Tax Collector
4. **Patricia Saucedo**, Board Secretary



**NOTE: ACTION MAY BE TAKEN ON ANY ITEM IDENTIFIED ON THE AGENDA**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. ANNOUNCE QUORUM – Roll Call**

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. October 6, 2011 Minutes – Regular Meeting

**Attachment: Item 1**

**IV. CONSENT CALENDAR – (None)**

**V. REPORTS (2–3)**

2. Committee Reports

- A. Finance Committee – Greg Simay
- B. Legislative Committee – No Report
- C. Operations Committee – No Report
- D. Technical Committee – No Report

3. Director's Report – Pat Mallon

**VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

4. Release of Information During Solicitation Process – Pat Mallon

**Attachment: Item 4**

**VII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (5–8)**

5. Ad Hoc Advisory Membership Plan Committee– Pat Mallon

RECOMMENDATION: Establishment of an Ad Hoc Advisory Committee to review membership options and provide recommendations to the Board of Directors for their consideration.

**Attachment: Item 5**

6. JPA / Deltawrx Relationship– Pat Mallon

RECOMMENDATION: Affirmation of services contributed by the County of Los Angeles to the Authority.

**Attachment: Item 6**



7. Service Contract Solicitation Protest Policy – Pat Mallon

RECOMMENDATION: Confirm the County of Los Angeles ("County") Services Contract Solicitation Protest Policy, as previously adopted by your Board, will be administered by County contracting staff who were not involved in preparing the subject solicitation and will not use, support, or administer the system or services resulting from the subject solicitation.

**Attachment: Item 7**

8. Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee – Pat Mallon

RECOMMENDATION:

1) Approve the following recommended restrictions for the Evaluation Team:

a) Members of the new Evaluation Team may not have served as a member of the Evaluation Team who scored proposals in the prior procurement process.

b) Members of the new Evaluation Team may not have been a member of the Negotiations Team in the prior procurement process.

c) Members of the new Evaluation Team may not have been a subject matter expert in the prior procurement process.

2) Authorize the Executive Director to utilize the services of an outside firm/company that will be able to provide evaluators that are technically qualified to review proposals for a Land Mobile Radio ("LMR") system and the Long Term Evolution ("LTE") mobile broadband system, which personnel will comply with the restrictions listed above, and the cost of which will be paid by the County of Los Angeles.

3) Submit the names of nominees to serve as members of the Evaluation Team to the Executive Director.

4) Authorize the Executive Director to select the members of the Evaluation Team from the list of nominees submitted by the Board.

**Attachment: Item 8**

9. Closed Session - Conference with Legal Counsel - Anticipated Litigation

(Subdivision (b) of Government Code Section 54956.9)

Significant exposure to litigation (one case)



**VIII. MISCELLANEOUS – (None)**

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

10. Project Funding

11. Project Risk Controls

**X. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**XI. ADJOURNMENT and NEXT MEETING:**

Thursday, December 1, 2011 at 9:00 a.m., at the Grace E. Simons Lodge.



## BOARD MEETING INFORMATION

Members of the public are invited to address the LA-RICS Authority Board on any item on the agenda prior to action by the Board on that specific item. Members of the public may also address the Board on any matter within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board. The Board will entertain such comments during the Public Comment period. Public Comment will be limited to three (3) minutes per individual for each item addressed, unless there are more than ten (10) comment cards for each item, in which case the Public Comment will be limited to one (1) minute per individual. The aforementioned limitation may be waived by the Board's Chair.

*(NOTE: Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.3(b) the legislative body of a local agency may adopt reasonable regulations, including but not limited to, regulations limiting the total amount of time allocated for public testimony on particular issues and for each individual speaker.)*

Members of the public who wish to address the Board are urged to complete a Speaker Card and submit it to the Board Secretary prior to commencement of the public meeting. The cards are available in the meeting room. However, should a member of the public feel the need to address a matter while the meeting is in progress, a card may be submitted to the Board Secretary prior to final consideration of the matter.

It is requested that individuals who require the services of a translator contact the Board Secretary no later than the day preceding the meeting. Whenever possible, a translator will be provided. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, you are advised to make your request at least 72 hours prior to the meeting you wish to attend at (323) 881-8291 or (323) 881-8295.

SI REQUIERE SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCION, FAVOR DE NOTIFICAR LA OFICINA CON 72 HORAS POR ANTICIPADO.

The meeting is recorded and the recording is kept for 30 days.



# Board of Directors MEETING MINUTES

## LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, October 6, 2011 • 9:00 a.m.  
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  
**Leroy “Lee” D. Baca, Sheriff**, County of Los Angeles  
**Harold Scoggins**, Fire Chief, City of Glendale, representing the Los Angeles Area Fire Chiefs Association  
**Mark R. Alexander**, City Manager, City of La Cañada Flintridge, representing Contract Cities Association  
**LeRoy J. Jackson**, City Manager, City of Torrance, representing At Large Seat  
**Donald “Don” Pedersen**, Police Chief, City of Culver City, At Large Seat  
**Gregory “Greg” L. Simay**, Assistant General Manager, City of Burbank Water & Power, At Large Seat

---

#### Representatives For Board Members Present:

**Patricia “Patty” J. Huber**, representing Miguel Santana, CAO, City of Los Angeles  
**Andrew Fox**, representing Brian Cummings, Fire Chief, City of Los Angeles Fire Department  
**Sandy Jo MacArthur**, representing Charles “Charlie” L. Beck, Vice Chair, Police Chief, City of Los Angeles  
**June Gibson**, representing Gerry Miller, Chief Legislative Analyst, City of Los Angeles  
**Scott Poster**, representing Daryl L. Osby, Fire Chief, County of Los Angeles  
**Cathy Chidester**, representing Dr. Mitchell H. Katz, Director, DHS, County of Los Angeles  
**Nancy L. Ramirez**, representing Steven K. “Steve” Zipperman, Police Chief, Los Angeles School Police Department  
**Alan Patalano**, representing Reginald “Reggie” Harrison, Deputy City Manager, City of Long Beach  
**Derek Webster**, representing Kim Raney, Police Chief, City of Covina, At Large Seat

---

#### Officers Present:

**Pat Mallon**, LA-RICS Executive Director  
**Rachelle Anema**, representing Wendy L. Watanabe, Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller  
**Patricia Saucedo**, Board Secretary

---

#### Absent:

**Scott Pickwith**, Police Chief, City of La Verne, representing the Los Angeles County Police Chiefs Association  
**Mark J. Saladino**, Los Angeles County Treasurer and Tax Collector



- I. CALL TO ORDER – Chair Fujioka called the meeting to order.
- II. ANNOUNCE QUORUM – Roll Call. Chair Fujioka acknowledged that quorum was present.
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
  1. September 1, 2011 Minutes (Regular Meeting) – **MOTION APPROVED.**
  2. September 15, 2011 Minutes (Special Meeting) – **MOTION APPROVED.**
  3. September 22, 2011 Minutes (Special Meeting) – **MOTION APPROVED.**
- IV. CONSENT CALENDAR – None
- V. REPORTS
  4. Committee Reports
    - A. Finance Committee – No Report.
    - B. Legislative Committee – Chair Fujioka stated that the Governor signed AB 946.
    - C. Operations Committee – No Report.
    - D. Technical Committee – No Report.
  5. Director's Report – Executive Director Mallon informed the Board that the FCC advised that they will authorize the frequency extension today for County Channels 14 and 16. These frequencies were set to expire October 9, 2011.
- VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS
  6. Evaluation Team Membership – Executive Director Mallon requested that this item be pulled from discussion. He indicated that Counsel has been reviewing the legal requirements and are finalizing the legal opinion. He requested a Special Meeting to be held in two weeks to discuss Items 6 and 8. (Reference: see Item 8, last paragraph.)
  7. JPA/Deltawrx Relationship – Executive Director Mallon stated that this discussion item was at the request of Board Member Jackson. He explained that the Deltawrx contract is with the County of Los Angeles and their involvement has been indispensable. Executive Director Mallon further explained that Deltawrx was integral in the development of the first RFP, evaluation, and the development of the present RFP.

Board Member Jackson asked if the Board can see the responsibility/role and value structure to see what the Board is buying because in the long run they will be refunding the County in some way, shape, or form for the activities that are provided. He also stated that the Board has never assumed the loan of Deltawrx and should affirm the relationship between Deltawrx and the Board.

Executive Director Mallon stated that they can provide the contract value to the Board. He explained that at the present time Deltawrx was acting in the same capacity, as with any other County or City of Los Angeles employee, as an extension of the County to move the project forward.

Board Member Jackson reiterated that the Board should take up the action to give them authority to work for the Board, not just as an extension of the County, as they are not County employees.



Executive Director Mallon stated that he will bring this item back at the next regular meeting as an action item and work with Counsel to develop some kind of a formal document that the Authority can accept.

## VII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

8. Request for Proposal – LA-RICS System – Executive Director Mallon requested to pull this item and to schedule a special meeting in two weeks for its consideration. He explained that Counsel has been working diligently on the RFP and the Sample Agreement; however, they were not at a point where they felt comfortable to present the document to the Board with ample opportunity to review.

Board Member Baca stated that the Board, upon receiving the documents for review, will not be able to make the same substantive evaluation since it is extraordinarily complex. Board Member Baca stated that the issue is not whether the Board has the appropriate skills to qualify the RFP. Board Member Baca suggested that Executive Director Mallon be able to issue the RFP when it is ready.

Board Member Simay asked if the RFP provided vendors with the flexibility to consider a range of options on how to use existing assets for full integration to treatment of separate subsystem. Executive Director Mallon responded that the RFP did provide the flexibility. Per Board Member Baca's suggestion, Chair Fujioka added the caveat to the first recommended action that staff and counsel approve the RFP before it is released. Board Member Alexander stated that although he supports the recommendation, he would feel more comfortable to form a subcommittee of the Board, appointed by the Chair, so that staff could work with the subcommittee prior to the release of the RFP. Chair Fujioka agreed with Board Member Alexander's suggestion.

Chair Fujioka provided the revised motion on the floor:

- a. Authorize the Executive Director to release the Request for Proposal ("RFP") for the LA-RICS Land Mobile Radio ("LMR") system and the Long Term Evolution ("LTE") broadband system (the combined LMR system and LTE broadband system are collectively referred to as the "Telecommunications System") through the Los Angeles County ("County") Internal Services Department ("ISD"), subject to final review and approval of legal counsel and in cooperation and consultation with a subcommittee of the Board appointed by the Chair; and
- b. Find that County procurement and contracting policies, programs and procedures are adopted for purposes of the RFP, and any contract resulting from the RFP, to the extent, and in the manner, reflected in the RFP, and not otherwise; and
- c. Authorize the Executive Director to issue addenda to the RFP that the Executive Director determines, in his discretion, are consistent with the general scope of the RFP.

Alternate Member Cathy Chidester expressed concern with the distribution of the RFP. Executive Director Mallon stated that the RFP will be distributed to a list consisting of 140 vendors from the Internal Services Department. The RFP will also be posted on the LA-RICS website and advertised in a publication in compliance with ISD requirements.

Alternate Member Poster asked for a clarification as to whether ISD will run the procurement. Executive Director Mallon stated yes.

Chair Fujioka received a first and second to the motion. **MOTION APPROVED.**





Chair Fujioka asked for Board Members interested in participating on the subcommittee to see him after the meeting.

Executive Director Mallon stated that earlier they had put Agenda Item 6 on hold for a special meeting in anticipation that the RFP would be considered at the special meeting. He explained that since Item 8 passed, Item 6 will be considered at the next regular meeting.

9. Request for Proposal – Project Management Support Services – Executive Director Mallon stated that the project management services RFP is very close to the environmental RFP approved at the last meeting. He explained that the intent is to come back to the Board with a recommendation after the solicitation.

Board Member Jackson asked if the RFP was available. Executive Director Mallon explained that legal counsel is still doing some final tweaking to the RFP, but it is available.

Board Member Jackson asked if there was a budget for the contract. Executive Director Mallon stated they do not know what the budget amount will be, however, the contract is a grant reimbursable expense.

Chair Fujioka received a first and second to the motion:

- a. Authorize the Executive Director to release the Request for Proposal ("RFP") for project management support services, through the Los Angeles County ("County") Department of Public Works ("DPW"); and
- b. Find that County procurement and contracting policies, programs and procedures are adopted for purposes of the RFP, and any contract resulting from the RFP, to the extent, and in the manner, reflected in the RFP, and not otherwise; and
- c. Authorize the Executive Director to issue addenda to the RFP that the Executive Director determines, in his discretion, are consistent with the general scope of the RFP.

**MOTION APPROVED.**

10. "D-Block" Outreach to Congress and Deficit Reduction Committee – Executive Director Mallon stated that this item is a request for authorization to communicate with the federal government; particularly, the Deficit Reduction Committee, to express the Authority's position to dedicate the D Block to public safety.

Chair Fujioka received a first and second to the motion. **MOTION APPROVED.**

11. Subcommittee on Membership Plan – Board Member Simay explained that as a funding plan is developed, the Board may want flexibility on membership. He stated that subcommittee would need to review provisions which the JPA adopted for approving the finance plan since the original deadlines have been far exceeded. Board Member Simay explained that the RFP allows for the possibility of accepting one bid but not another. And, if that possibility is exercised, it would be good to have the membership options in place. He stated that the motion is to study the merits, if there are any, and not to reach a conclusion about them since the merits would be presented to the Board for consideration.

Chair Fujioka stated that given the importance, he hopes that the Board stands together on everything as they move forward.

Board Member Huber asked how the subcommittee members would be selected. Board Member Simay stated he preferred that item to be placed as an agenda item for the Finance Committee as a whole to consider.



Chair Fujioka stated that this is a huge issue not just a Finance Committee issue. He asked that the item be placed on a regular agenda for the Board.

Alternate Member Fox agreed with the Chair's comments and added that the issue clearly had technical and operational implications. He explained that in the spirit of openness and transparency it is good to look at options. However, there are a variety of things that the Board will need to weigh in on, such as its members, the mission, and the scope of the recommendation.

Board Member Scoggins stated that the issue is a very important option to have on the table since member agencies with existing systems who do not need the support of the voice system will have an option to choose and still be a part of the team.

Chair Fujioka stated that what was implied is that should one entity have sufficient voice system, then that entity could cease being a member of this JPA.

Board Member Baca stated that flexibility is an important element since the fear is that we are building a train and everyone who needs to get on it cannot buy a ticket. He stated he did not believe it would interfere with the whole of the project because members can perform financially at a later stage. Board Member Baca stated that this approach is "to opt out to opt in" and members can jump on the train when they are ready to.

Alternate Member Chidester stated membership for other partners, such as hospitals and ambulance companies, also need to be defined.

Chair Fujioka asked staff to come back at the next regular meeting with a recommendation for a new committee and a process for identifying who would be on that committee, starting with volunteers. But, it should be representatives of the entities on the Board with each at a different phase of their communications system. Alternate Member Fox moved to support the Chair's suggestion. Chair Fujioka acknowledged a second on the motion.

Board Member Alexander said he understands the desire to do a study, however, he believes that it is premature. He explained that the funding plan is first and foremost, and this can be a part of looking at the funding plan as it may negatively impact or influence the funding plan.

Board Member Jackson stated that the timing is important because they need to know the costs and methodologies of funding before addressing some of these elements. On the other hand, the features of the membership are issues that are going to take a long period of time. Board Member Jackson clarified that in the long-term this issue should be brought to a committee of the Board or the full Board, but that they allow the Finance Committee to do preliminary work.

Board Member Simay stated that the broadband is well funded and the radio program is partially funding by grants. He stated that it is not too early to begin discussion on forms of membership or JPA that reflect the current realities.

Chair Fujioka reminded the Board that a motion was on the table for a separate committee of the Board with direction to staff to come back at the next regular meeting with a process of how to form the committee and a charge for the committee.

Board Member Alexander asked for roll call vote on the motion. **MOTION APPROVED.**

Absent (1):  
Scott Pickwith

Abstained (1):  
Lee Baca



**BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES**  
Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communications System Authority

In Favor (9):

Bill Fujioka  
Andrew Fox  
June Gibson

Alan Patalano  
Sandy Jo MacArthur  
Nancy Ramirez

Cathy Chidester  
Patty Huber  
Scott Poster

Opposed (6):

Donald Pedersen  
LeRoy Jackson

Derek Webster  
Greg Simay

Harold Scoggins  
Mark Alexander

**VIII. MISCELLANEOUS – None**

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

**12. Project Funding**

**13. Project Risk Controls**

Board Member Jackson asked staff to bring back the appeal process for the RFP since the Board left off the discussion due to the canceled RFP. Chair Fujioka directed staff to bring the item forward at the next meeting.

Board Member Jackson also asked that the next agenda include an item for consideration as to what information will be public and private in the RFP review process. He stated that in the last RFP, the Board did not know who the RFP went to or how many proposals were submitted. He explained that he would like to understand what information is tucked away and what will be public information, such as the number of proposals submitted.

Board Member Simay requested an estimated time commitment for the new Evaluation Team as early as possible. Executive Director Mallon explained that information will be provided at the next meeting and suggested that the Board may want to consider a closed session to discuss Counsel's legal opinion.

Chair Fujioka requested that Board Members who would like to participate in the subcommittee discussed earlier should submit their request to Executive Director Mallon.

**X. PUBLIC COMMENT – None**

**XI. ADJOURNMENT and NEXT MEETING:**

Chair Fujioka adjourned the meeting at 9:48 a.m. The next meeting will be held on Thursday, November 3, 2011 at 9:00 a.m., at the Grace E. Simons Lodge.



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER**

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION  
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 525  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-3873  
PHONE: (213) 974-8301 FAX: (213) 626-5427

WENDY L. WATANABE  
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:  
ACCOUNTING DIVISION  
500 W. TEMPLE ST., ROOM 603  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-2713

October 19, 2011

The Board of Directors  
Los Angeles County Regional Interoperable  
Communications System (LA-RICS)  
c/o Patrick J. Mallon, Executive Director  
2525 Corporate Place, Suite 200  
Monterey Park, CA 91754

Members of the Board:

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM  
(LA-RICS) STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS  
FOR THE QUARTER ENDED JUNE 30, 2011**

Enclosed is the Statement of Receipts and Disbursements for the Los Angeles County Regional Interoperable Communications System (LA-RICS) for the quarter ended June 30, 2011.

If you have any questions, please contact Rachelle Anema at (213) 974-0335 or Rachel Rosario at (213) 974-8345.

Very truly yours,

Wendy L. Watanabe  
Auditor-Controller

Connie Yee, Division Chief  
Accounting Division

WLW:JN:CY:RA:rr

H:\Special Funds\Special Funds Unit\JOINT POWERS AUTHORITIES\LARICS-REGIONAL INTEROPERABILITY COMMUNICATION SYSTEM\LARICS - REPORTS\FY 10-11 LARICS COVER LETTER\Cover Letter-LARICS 4th Qtr FY10-11.doc

Enclosure

c: Greg Simay, Chairman, Finance Committee  
Susy Orellana-Curtiss, LA-RICS Project Team  
Michael Iwanaga, County of Los Angeles, Chief Executive Office

OCT 24 2011

*Help Conserve Paper – Print Double-Sided  
"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"*

**AGENDA ITEM 2A**

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABILITY COMMUNICATION SYSTEM  
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS  
FOR THE QUARTER ENDED JUNE 30, 2011

	LARICS - Reg Comm Fund V58	LARICS - BTOP Fund V57
<b>Beginning Cash Balance as of April 1, 2011</b>	\$ 718,760.12	\$ -
<b>Receipts:</b>		
Interest	1,470.66	98.18
LA-RICS-BTOP-LA Safety Net Grant (Federal)		830,987.00
<b>Total Beginning Cash Balance and Receipts</b>	<u>720,230.78</u>	<u>831,085.18</u>
<b>Disbursements:</b>		
Grant Management Services - Neeku Group	36,171.54	
Legal Services - Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth	7,247.50	
Environmental Consulting Services - UltraSystems Inc	512,845.47	
Travel Expenses	11,214.91	
L. A. County, Department of Human Resources Services	1,216.95	
Professional Consulting Services - Televate, LLC.	60,181.78	
Miscellaneous Expenses	8,303.58	
<b>Total Disbursements</b>	<u>637,181.73</u>	<u>-</u>
<b>Ending Cash Balance as of June 30, 2011</b>	<u>\$ 83,049.05</u>	<u>\$ 831,085.18</u>

Prepared by  
Los Angeles County  
Department of Auditor-Controller  
Accounting Division  
MS 10/14/11



WENDY L. WATANABE  
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER**

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION  
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 525  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-3873  
PHONE: (213) 974-8301 FAX: (213) 626-5427

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:  
ACCOUNTING DIVISION  
500 W. TEMPLE ST., ROOM 603  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-2713

October 19, 2011

The Board of Directors  
Los Angeles County Regional Interoperable  
Communications System (LA-RICS)  
c/o Patrick J. Mallon, Executive Director  
2525 Corporate Place, Suite 200  
Monterey Park, CA 91754

Members of the Board:

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM  
(LA-RICS) STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS  
FOR THE QUARTER ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 2011**

Enclosed is the Statement of Receipts and Disbursements for the Los Angeles County Regional Interoperable Communications System (LA-RICS) for the quarter ended September 30, 2011.

If you have any questions, please contact Rachelle Anema at (213) 974-0335 or Rachel Rosario at (213) 974-8345. <sup>8327</sup>

Very truly yours,

Wendy L. Watanabe  
Auditor-Controller

  
Connie Yee, Division Chief  
Accounting Division

WLW:JN:CY:RA:rr

H:\Special Funds\Special Funds Unit\JOINT POWERS AUTHORITIES\LARICS-REGIONAL INTEROPERABILITY COMMUNICATION SYSTEM\LARICS - REPORTS\FY 11-12 LARICS COVER LETTER\Cover Letter-LARICS 1st Qtr FY11-12.doc

Enclosure

c: Greg Simay, Chairman, Finance Committee  
Susy Orellana-Curtiss, LA-RICS Project Team  
Michael Iwanaga, County of Los Angeles, Chief Executive Office

*Help Conserve Paper – Print Double-Sided  
"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"*

OCT 24 2011

  
**AGENDA ITEM 2A**

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABILITY COMMUNICATION SYSTEM  
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS  
FOR THE QUARTER ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 2011

	LARICS - Reg Comm Fund V58	LARICS - BTOP Fund V57
<b>Beginning Cash Balance as of July 1, 2011</b>	\$ 83,049.05	\$ 831,085.18
<b>Receipts:</b>		
Interest	830.74	2,462.44
LA-RICS-BTOP-LA Safety Net Grant (Federal)		264,038.65
Transfer from V57 to V58 - Federal Grant	830,987.00	
Transfer from V57 to V58 - Interest	98.18	
<b>Total Beginning Cash Balance and Receipts</b>	<u>914,964.97</u>	<u>1,097,586.27</u>
<b>Disbursements:</b>		
Grant Management Services - Neeku Group	36,209.40	
Legal Services - Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth	2,470.00	
Professional Consulting Services - Omeallain Limited	63,100.00	
Professional Consulting Services - Televate, LLC.	138,334.19	
Environmental Consulting Services - UltraSystems Inc	164,772.13	
Travel Expenses	10,991.32	
Miscellaneous Expenses	850.00	
Transfer from V57 to V58 - Federal Grant		830,987.00
Transfer from V57 to V58 - Interest		98.18
<b>Total Disbursements</b>	<u>416,727.04</u>	<u>831,085.18</u>
<b>Ending Cash Balance as of September 30, 2011</b>	<u>\$ 498,237.93</u>	<u>\$ 266,501.09</u>

Prepared by  
Los Angeles County  
Department of Auditor-Controller  
Accounting Division  
MS 10/14/11



**LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE  
COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY**

2525 Corporate Place, Suite 200  
Monterey Park, California 91754  
(323) 881-8291

PATRICK J. MALLON  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

November 3, 2011

TO: LA-RICS BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
FROM: PATRICK J. MALLON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**RELEASE OF INFORMATION DURING SOLICITATION PROCESS**

**I. Background**

At your Board meeting of October 6, 2011, Board Member Jackson requested clarification of what information can be shared throughout the contract solicitation process.

**II. Shareable Information**

Attached please find a solicitation process summary, identifying shareable information at each phase of the solicitation process.

**AGENDA ITEM 4**



## **RELEASE OF INFORMATION DURING SOLICITATION PROCESS**

- Release of RFP
  - Once the RFP has been reviewed and approved, it is released to the public.
  - Vendors' questions regarding the RFP are submitted in accordance with the instructions in the RFP. A deadline is established for submission of written questions.
  - A Proposers Conference is held with the prospective Vendors.
  - If written Addenda are needed at any time during the RFP process, addenda are sent to (a) prior to the submission deadline for proposals, to all Vendors that requested the original RFP, (b) on and after the submission deadline for proposals, to all Vendors that submitted proposals. Some reasons an Addendum would be issued include providing answers to Vendors' questions, or to provide changes/clarification to the RFP.

### **Prior to the submission deadline for proposals, we can share with the Board:**

- **Copy of the RFP – on the date the RFP is released**
- **Vendor Q&A – on the day written responses are released to the vendors**
- **Proposers Conference sign in sheet**
- **Copy of each addendum to the RFP – on the date such addendum is released**

### **Submission of Proposals**

- Vendors must submit their proposals by the submission deadline stated in the RFP, with the required data in the prescribed format.

### **Once proposals have been received, we can share with the Board:**

- **Number of proposals received**
- **Name of Proposers**

### **Evaluation Process**

- During the Evaluation Process, to avoid potentially compromising the Evaluation Process, all proposals and the evaluation and scoring documents must be safeguarded (e.g., maintained in locked drawer or cabinet) and made available to personnel involved with the Evaluation Process only.
- Once the Evaluation Process is complete and a recommended Proposer is identified, the recommended Proposer and non-recommended Proposers are notified accordingly, and the non-recommended Proposers are offered Debriefings.

### **During the Evaluation Process, we can share with the Board:**

- **Number of proposals passing/failing – once notices have been sent to failing proposers**

### **Once the Evaluation Process is complete and Proposers are notified accordingly:**

- **Makeup of evaluation team, excluding names**

### **Negotiations**

## **AGENDA ITEM 4 – ATTACHMENT A**

- During negotiations, all information contained in proposals, evaluation materials, and negotiation strategy documents are to be safeguarded and to be made available only to personnel having a need to know, throughout the negotiation process.
- Once negotiations are complete, a firm offer letter is obtained from the recommended Proposer stating, in summary, that the negotiated contract is a firm offer of the Proposer, pending the Authority's completing of the protest processes and approval by the Authority's Board.
- After the firm offer letter is obtained, non-selected Proposers will be offered a Proposed Contractor Selection Review under the first level of review of the Proposed Contractor Selection Review stage of the services contract solicitation protest process.

**At this time, we can share with the Board:**

- **Name of the recommended Proposer**
  - **A copy of the recommended Proposer's proposal and corresponding evaluation documents, absent extraordinary circumstances, with redactions permitted under the California Public Records Act**
  - **Names of any non-selected Proposers requesting Proposed Contractor Selection Review**
- **Review Panels**
    - All non-selected Proposers that had a Proposed Contractor Selection Review will be offered a Review Panel, which is the second step of the Proposed Contractor Selection Review stage of the services contract solicitation protest process.
    - A Review Panel will be convened for each non-selected Proposer that requests a Review Panel

**Once the agenda is posted for a Review Panel, we can share with the Board:**

- **The materials that have been submitted to the Review Panel**
- **Contract Execution**
    - A Board package is filed to be placed on the Board agenda.
    - On the date the item is scheduled for Board approval, the Board may take one of the following actions:
      - Approve the item without discussion;
      - Hold the item for discussion and then approve or disapprove;
      - Continue the item to a future Board agenda;
      - Disapprove the item; or
      - Approve the item with modifications.
    - Pursuant to the California Public Records Act, certain additional records relating to the RFP process are available for public inspection and photocopying after the contract is placed on the Board's agenda and the agenda is posted.
    - Once the Board has approved award of the contract, the document is executed and distributed to all parties.



# LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

2525 Corporate Place, Suite 200  
Monterey Park, California 91754  
(323) 881-8291

PATRICK J. MALLON  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

November 3, 2011

Board of Directors  
Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communications System ("LA-RICS") Joint Powers Authority  
(the "Authority")

Dear Directors:

## **AD HOC ADVISORY MEMBERSHIP PLAN COMMITTEE**

### **SUBJECT**

Establishment of an Ad Hoc Advisory Committee to review membership options and provide recommendations to the Board of Directors for their consideration.

### **BACKGROUND**

On October 6, 2011, the Board of Directors discussed the establishment a committee to review and examine membership options for Authority. The Board approved a motion directing staff to return at the next regular meeting with a defined purpose for the committee and process for selecting committee members.

### **PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

It is recommended that your Board establish an Ad Hoc Advisory Membership Plan Committee. An ad hoc committee is appropriate in this instance since it is a temporary committee charged with the specific purpose of reviewing various membership options. It is recommended that the ad hoc committee consist of eight Board members.

Per the Board's direction, staff submits the following recommendations:

- A. Establish an Ad Hoc Advisory Membership Plan Committee to review various membership options based on the following criteria:
  - 1. Feasibility of different membership plans for JPA members;
  - 2. Funding plan options pertaining to different forms of membership;
  - 3. Opt-in/Opt-out options for different forms of membership; and
  - 4. Board of Director voting structure for different forms of membership.
- B. Members of this committee should be representative of the agencies serving on the Board. Staff recommends that the Chair appoint a total of eight Board members, with a Board member selected from each of the following agencies:
  - 1. Los Angeles County Sheriff or Fire
  - 2. Los Angeles County CEO
  - 3. City of Los Angeles Fire or Police
  - 4. City of Los Angeles CLA or CAO

5. City of Long Beach
  6. LA Area Fire Chief's Association
  7. LA County Police Chief's Association
  8. LA-RICS Board of Director – Member at Large
- C. The Ad Hoc Advisory Membership Plan Committee establish a meeting schedule at their first meeting and provide reports to the Board of Directors at regular Board meetings.
- D. The Ad Hoc Advisory Membership Plan Committee report their findings to the Board at the regularly scheduled February 2, 2012 Board of Directors meeting.

**FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING**

There is no fiscal impact.

**FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENT**

The Authority's counsel has reviewed the recommended action.

**AGREEMENTS/CONTRACTING**

No Agreements necessary.

Respectfully submitted,



PATRICK J. MALLON  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PJM:sh

c: Counsel to the Authority



# LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

2525 Corporate Place, Suite 200  
Monterey Park, California 91754  
(323) 881-8291

PATRICK J. MALLON  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

November 3, 2011

Board of Directors  
Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communications System ("LA-RICS") Joint Powers Authority  
(the "Authority")

Dear Directors:

## **AFFIRMATION OF SERVICE CONTRIBUTED BY COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

### **SUBJECT**

Affirm services contributed by the County of Los Angeles to the Authority.

### **BACKGROUND**

On October 6, 2011, staff provided the Board with information regarding services provided by DELTAWRX, on behalf of the County of Los Angeles, to the LA-RICS project. Board Member Jackson requested that the item be brought back to the Board as an action item to affirm the relationship between the Authority and DELTAWRX. Board Member Jackson also requested additional information as to their contract.

### **PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

It is recommended that your Board affirm the services contributed by the County of Los Angeles through services rendered by DELTAWRX. DELTAWRX has provided the necessary technical and administrative support to accomplish the many tasks needed to move this project forward.

The services provided by DELTAWRX are a contribution from the County of Los Angeles to the LA-RICS project. DELTAWRX was retained in 2006 to assist with the development of the technical scope of work for the original Request for Proposal and to ensure timely progress is made toward a consolidated radio system. The original contract term was from May 2006 to May 2011 with a maximum contract sum of \$4,075,929. The County of Los Angeles executed a second contract with DELTAWRX for the most recent term of two years, from 6/13/2011 to 5/31/2013, with a maximum contract sum of \$1,699,815. All sums paid to DELTAWRX are paid for by the County of Los Angeles. The contribution from the County of Los Angeles for the DELTAWRX contract fulfills, in part, the required in-kind match contribution for the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program ("BTOP") grant.

### **FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING**

There is no fiscal impact.

### **FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENT**

The Authority's counsel has reviewed the recommended action.

**AGREEMENTS/CONTRACTING**

No Agreements necessary.

Respectfully submitted,



PATRICK J. MALLON  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PJM:sh

c: Counsel to the Authority



## LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

2525 Corporate Place, Suite 200  
Monterey Park, California 91754  
(323) 881-8291

PATRICK J. MALLON  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

November 3, 2011

Board of Directors  
Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communications System ("LA-RICS") Authority (the  
"Authority")

Dear Directors:

### **SERVICES CONTRACT SOLICITATION PROTEST POLICY**

#### **RECOMMENDED ACTIONS**

It is recommended that your Board confirm the County of Los Angeles ("County") Services Contract Solicitation Protest Policy, as previously adopted by your Board, will be administered by County contracting staff who were not involved in preparing the subject solicitation and will not use, support, or administer the system or services resulting from the subject solicitation.

#### **BACKGROUND**

On October 6, 2011, your Board, among other things, adopted County procurement and contracting policies, programs and procedures for purposes of (a) the RFP for the Land Mobile Radio ("LMR") system and the Long Term Evolution ("LTE") broadband system (the combined LMR system and LTE broadband system are collectively referred to as the "Telecommunications System"), (b) the RFP for project management support services, and (c) any contract resulting from each RFP, to the extent, and in the manner, reflected in each RFP, and not otherwise. Board Member Jackson requested staff provide information regarding the protest process. The services contract solicitation protest process as described in the RFP for the Telecommunications System, Section 5.8, is attached for your reference.

The services contract solicitation protest process consists of four stages of review, all as further described in the attached Section 5.8: (1) Solicitation Requirements Review, which allows prospective proposers to, among other things, request a review of the RFP's requirements or processes; (2) Disqualification Review, which allows proposers, among other things, to challenge disqualification of its proposal as non-responsive; (3) Finalist Selection Review, which provides for review of the Authority's selection of finalists, if finalists are designated; and (4) Proposed Contractor Selection Review, which allows proposers to challenge the selection of a proposed contractor on the grounds, among other things, that the Authority materially failed to follow procedures set forth in the RFP or made identifiable mathematical or other errors. The Proposed Contractor Selection Review stage further consists of two levels of review: (a) the Proposed Contractor Selection Review, which is conducted by staff and (b) the Review Panel, which is conducted by a three member Panel.

## **AGENDA ITEM 7**

Under the County's Services Contract Solicitation Protest Policy, the Solicitation Requirements Review, Disqualification Review, and Proposed Contractor Selection Reviews are required to be conducted by staff with County services contracting knowledge and experience who were not involved in the subject solicitation. The Finalist Selection Review is not specifically provided for under the County's Services Contract Solicitation Protest Policy; however, it would be advisable for such review to similarly be conducted by staff with County services contracting knowledge and experience who were not involved in the subject solicitation.

Also under the County's Services Contract Solicitation Protest Policy, the Review Panel is selected from a pool of potential Panel members consisting of County contract managers and contract analysts, all of whom are to have County services contracting knowledge and experience. No Panel member is to have involvement with the subject solicitation.

Your Board must determine whether the Authority's services contract solicitation protest process will be administered by County contracting staff.

**PURPOSE/ JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Approval of the recommended action will allow County contracting staff, who were not involved in preparing the subject solicitation and who will not use, support, or administer the system or services resulting from the subject solicitation, to conduct the Authority's services contract solicitation protest process. The benefits of adopting this recommended action are that the County contracting staff (1) will have the requisite knowledge of County services contracting, and (2) will have been trained with respect to, and will be familiar with the process under, the County's Services Contract Solicitation Protest Policy, on which the Authority's services contract solicitation protest process is based.

An alternative to the recommended action is for your Board to select representatives from the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles or Independent Cities, who were not involved in preparing the subject solicitation and who will not use, support, or administer the system or services resulting from the subject solicitation. Although this approach would allow for other Member agencies to participate in the services contract solicitation protest process, Authority staff believes the recommended action is preferable. To the extent that the appointed Member agency representatives are not County contracting staff, such representatives would need to undergo training in order to adequately conduct the Authority's services contract solicitation protest process.

**FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING**

There is no fiscal impact at this time.

Respectfully submitted,



PATRICK J. MALLON  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PJM:so

Attachment

cc: Counsel to the Authority



## **5.8 Protest Process**

Any prospective Proposer may request a review of the requirements of this RFP, as described in Section 5.8.1 below. Additionally, any actual Proposer may request a review of a disqualification, finalist selection, or of a proposed contractor selection under this RFP, as described respectively in Sections 5.8.2, 5.8.3, and 5.8.4 below. Under any such review, it is the responsibility of the Proposer challenging the decision of the Authority to demonstrate that the Authority committed a sufficiently material error in the solicitation process to justify invalidation of a solicitation requirement, disqualification, finalist selection or a proposed contractor selection, as the case may be.

Throughout the review process, the Authority has no obligation to delay or otherwise postpone an award of an Agreement based on a Proposer protest. In all cases, the Authority reserves the right to make an award when it is determined to be in the best interests of the Authority to do so.

The grounds for Authority review of the Contractor selection are limited to the following:

- a. Solicitation Requirements Review
- b. Disqualified Proposal Review
- c. Finalist Selection Review
- d. Proposed Contractor Selection Review

To the extent procedures for conducting the review process are not set forth in this RFP, the Authority will use the substance of the procedures set forth in Los Angeles County Board Policy 5.055 (Services Contract Solicitation Protest) and the implementation guidelines and procedures from time to time issued thereunder. The Authority, however, reserves the right to implement such implementation guidelines and procedures in a manner the Authority determines appropriate, in its sole discretion, for this RFP and the Authority in general.

### **5.8.1 Solicitation Requirements Review**

A Proposer may seek a Solicitation Requirements Review by the Authority. A request for a Solicitation Requirements Review may be denied, in the Authority's sole discretion, if the request does not satisfy all of the following criteria:

- a. The request for a Solicitation Requirements Review is made by the date set forth in Section 1.8 (Schedule of Events) of the issuance of the RFP;
- b. The request for a Solicitation Requirements Review includes documentation that demonstrates the underlying ability of the person or entity to submit a Proposal.
- c. The request for a Solicitation Requirements Review itemizes in detail, each matter contested and factual reasons for the requested review; and
- d. The request for a Solicitation Requirements Review asserts either that:
  - 1. application of the minimum requirements, evaluation criteria, solicitation process and/or business requirements unfairly disadvantages the Proposer; or,
  - 2. due to unclear instructions, the process may result in the Authority not receiving the best possible responses from prospective Proposers.

## **AGENDA ITEM 7 – ATTACHMENT A**

The Solicitation Requirements Review shall be completed and the Authority's determination shall be provided in writing to the requesting Proposer within a reasonable time prior to the Proposal due date.

#### 5.8.2 Disqualified Proposal Review

A Proposal may be disqualified from consideration because the Authority determined it was a non-responsive Proposal at any time during the evaluation process. If the Authority determines that a Proposal is disqualified due to non-responsiveness, the Authority shall notify the Proposer in writing. Upon receipt of the written notification of non-responsiveness, the Proposer may submit a written request for a Disqualified Proposal Review.

A Disqualified Proposal Review shall only be granted under the following circumstances:

- a. The person or entity requesting a Disqualified Proposal Review is a Proposer;
- b. The request for a Disqualified Proposal Review is submitted within five (5) business days of the date of the written determination; and
- c. The request for a Disqualified Proposal Review asserts that the Authority's disqualification of the Proposal was erroneous (e.g., factual errors, etc.) and provides factual support on each ground asserted as well as copies of documents and other material that support the assertions.

The Disqualified Proposal Review shall be completed and the Authority's determination shall be provided to the Proposer prior to the conclusion of the evaluation process.

#### 5.8.3 Finalist Selection Review

The Authority will provide written notification to each Proposer who has not been selected as a finalist during Evaluation Phase Two – Evaluation and Scoring Phase.

Any Proposer that has not been selected as a finalist during Evaluation Phase Two – Evaluation and Scoring Phase may submit a request for a Finalist Selection Review, in the manner and within the timeframe as shall be specified by the Authority in the written notification.

A request for a Finalist Selection Review may, in the Authority's sole discretion, be denied if the request does not satisfy all of the following criteria:

- a. The person or entity requesting a Finalist Selection Review is a Proposer;
- b. The request for a Finalist Selection Review is submitted by the date and time specified by the Authority in the written notification;
- c. The person or entity requesting a Finalist Selection Review asserts in detail with factual reasons one or more of the following grounds for review:
  1. The Authority materially failed to follow procedures specified in its solicitation document. This includes:
    - (a) Failure to correctly apply the standards for reviewing the Proposal format requirements

- (b) Failure to correctly apply the standards, and/or follow the prescribed methods, for evaluating the Proposals as specified in the solicitation document
  - (c) Use of evaluation criteria that were different from the evaluation criteria disclosed in the solicitation document
- 2. The Authority made identifiable mathematical or other errors in evaluating Proposals, resulting in the Proposer receiving an incorrect score and not being selected as a finalist Proposer
- 3. A member of the Evaluation Committee demonstrated bias in the conduct of the evaluation
- 4. Another basis for review as provided by state or federal law; and
- d. The request for a Proposed Contractor Selection Review sets forth sufficient detail to demonstrate that, but for the Authority's alleged failure, the Proposer would have been selected as a finalist Proposer.

The Finalist Selection Review shall be completed and the Authority's written determination shall be provided to the Proposer prior to the conclusion of the evaluation process.

#### 5.8.4 Proposed Contractor Selection Review

##### 5.8.4.1 Debriefing Process

Upon completion of the evaluation, the Authority shall notify in writing the finalist Proposers not selected for negotiations that the Authority is entering negotiations with another Proposer. Upon receipt of the notice, any non-selected finalist Proposer may submit a written request for a debriefing within the timeframe specified in the notice. A request for a debriefing may, in the Authority's sole discretion, be denied if the request is not received within the timeframe specified in the notice.

The purpose of the debriefing is to compare the requesting Proposer's response to the solicitation document with the evaluation document. The requesting Proposer shall be debriefed only on its response. Responses from other Proposers shall not be discussed, although the Authority may inform the requesting Proposer of its relative ranking.

During or following the debriefing, the Authority will instruct the requesting Proposer of the manner and timeframe in which the requesting Proposer must notify the Authority of its intent to request a Proposed Contractor Selection Review (see Section 5.8.4.2 (Proposed Contractor Selection Review)), if the requesting Proposer desires to request such review.

##### 5.8.4.2 Proposed Contractor Selection Review

Any Proposer that has timely submitted a notice of its intent to request a Proposed Contractor Selection Review as described in this Section may submit a written request for a Proposed Contractor Selection Review, in the manner and within the timeframe as shall be specified by the Authority.

A request for a Proposed Contractor Selection Review may, in the Authority's sole discretion, be denied if the request does not satisfy all of the following criteria:

- a. The person or entity requesting a Proposed Contractor Selection Review is a Proposer;
- b. The request for a Proposed Contractor Selection Review is submitted by the date and time specified by the Authority;
- c. The person or entity requesting a Proposed Contractor Selection Review asserts in detail with factual reasons one or more of the following grounds for review:
  1. The Authority materially failed to follow procedures specified in its solicitation document. This includes:
    - (a) Failure to correctly apply the standards for reviewing the Proposal format requirements.
    - (b) Failure to correctly apply the standards, and/or follow the prescribed methods, for evaluating the Proposals as specified in the solicitation document.
    - (c) Use of evaluation criteria that were different from the evaluation criteria disclosed in the solicitation document.
  2. The Authority made identifiable mathematical or other errors in evaluating Proposals, resulting in the Proposer receiving an incorrect score and not being selected as the recommended Contractor.
  3. A member of the Evaluation Committee demonstrated bias in the conduct of the evaluation.
  4. Another basis for review as provided by state or federal law; and
- d. The request for a Proposed Contractor Selection Review sets forth sufficient detail to demonstrate that, but for the Authority's alleged failure, the Proposer would have been the highest-scored Proposal.

Upon completing the Proposed Contractor Selection Review, the Authority representative shall issue a written decision to the Proposer within a reasonable time following receipt of the request for a Proposed Contractor Selection Review, and always before the date the contract award recommendation is to be heard by the Board. The written decision shall additionally instruct the Proposer of the manner and timeframe for requesting a review by a Review Panel (see Section 5.8.5 (Review Panel Process) below).

#### 5.8.5 Review Panel Process

Any Proposer that is not satisfied with the results of the Proposed Contractor Selection Review may submit a written request for review by a Review Panel in the manner and within the timeframe specified by the Authority in the Authority's written decision regarding the Proposed Contractor Selection Review.

A request for review by a Review Panel may, in the Authority's sole discretion, be denied if the request does not satisfy all of the following criteria:

- a. The person or entity requesting review by a Review Panel is a Proposer;
- b. The request for a review by a Review Panel is submitted by the date and time specified by the Authority; and

- c. The person or entity requesting review by a Review Panel has limited the request to items raised in the Proposed Contractor Selection Review and new items that (1) arise from the Authority's written decision and (2) are one of the appropriate grounds for requesting a Proposed Contractor Selection Review as listed in Section 5.8.5.2 (Proposed Contractor Selection Review) above.

Upon completion of the Review Panel's review, the Panel will forward its report to the Authority, which will provide a copy to the Proposer.

#### 5.8.6 Contact/Address for Protest Requests.

All protests and notices provided for by this Section 5.8 shall be submitted in writing to the Authority RFP Contact.



# LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

2525 Corporate Place, Suite 200  
Monterey Park, California 91754  
(323) 881-8291

PATRICK J. MALLON  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

November 3, 2011

Board of Directors  
Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communications System ("LA-RICS") Joint Powers Authority  
(the "Authority")

Dear Directors:

## EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERSHIP

### **BACKGROUND**

On October 6, 2011, staff provided the Board with a written report on the selection criteria for the composition of the Evaluation Team for the Telecommunications RFP.

### **PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

It is imperative to form the Evaluation Team for the Telecommunications RFP as soon as possible. After consultation with legal counsel regarding the composition of the Evaluation Team, the following restrictions are recommended:

1. Members of the new Evaluation Team may not have served as a member of the Evaluation Team who scored proposals in the prior procurement process.
2. Members of the new Evaluation Team may not have been a member of the Negotiations Team in the prior procurement process.
3. Members of the new Evaluation Team may not have been a subject matter expert in the prior procurement process.

Based on the criteria listed above, the Board may want to consider assistance from an outside firm/company, in addition to staff from JPA member agencies, in evaluating vendor proposals. An outside firm/company will be able to provide evaluators and subject matter experts that are technically qualified to review proposals for a Land Mobile Radio ("LMR") system and the Long Term Evolution ("LTE") mobile broadband system and that will meet the criteria listed above. The County of Los Angeles is willing to pay for the costs of hiring a firm/company for their assistance in the evaluation process, should the Board choose this option.

### **FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING**

There is no fiscal impact.

### **FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENT**

The Authority's counsel has reviewed the recommended action.

### **AGREEMENTS/CONTRACTING**

No Agreements necessary.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION**

It is recommended that your Board:

- 1) Approve the following recommended restrictions for the Evaluation Team:
  - a) Members of the new Evaluation Team may not have served as a member of the Evaluation Team who scored proposals in the prior procurement process.
  - b) Members of the new Evaluation Team may not have been a member of the Negotiations Team in the prior procurement process.
  - c) Members of the new Evaluation Team may not have been a subject matter expert in the prior procurement process.
- 2) Authorize the Executive Director to utilize the services of an outside firm/company that will be able to provide evaluators that are technically qualified to review proposals for a Land Mobile Radio ("LMR") system and the Long Term Evolution ("LTE") mobile broadband system, which personnel will comply with the restrictions listed above, and the cost of which will be paid by the County of Los Angeles.
- 3) Submit the names of nominees to serve as members of the Evaluation Team to the Executive Director.
- 4) Authorize the Executive Director to select the members of the Evaluation Team from the list of nominees submitted by the Board.

Respectfully submitted,



PATRICK J. MALLON  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PJM:sh

c: Counsel to the Authority