



Board of Directors MEETING MINUTES

**LOS ANGELES REGIONAL
INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY**

April 7, 2011

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
Mark R. Alexander, City Manager, City of La Cañada Flintridge, representing Contract Cities Association
Reginald “Reggie” Harrison, Deputy City Manager, City of Long Beach
LeRoy J. Jackson, City Manager, City of Torrance, representing At Large Seat
Daryl L. Osby, Fire Chief, County of Los Angeles
Kim Raney, Police Chief, City of Covina, At Large Seat
Gregory “Greg” L. Simay, Assistant General Manager, City of Burbank Water & Power, representing At Large Seat

Representatives For Board Members Present:

David Betkey, representing, Leroy “Lee” D. Baca, Sheriff, County of Los Angeles County
Cathy Chidester, representing Dr. Mitchell H. Katz, Director, DHS, County of Los Angeles
Andrew “Andy” P. Fox, representing Millage Peaks, Fire Chief, City of Los Angeles
June Gibson, representing Gerry Miller, Chief Legislative Analyst, City of Los Angeles
Patricia “Patty” J. Huber, representing Miguel Santana, CAO, City of Los Angeles
Sandy Jo MacArthur, representing Charles “Charlie” L. Beck, Vice Chair, Police Chief, City of Los Angeles
Nancy L. Ramirez, representing Steven K. “Steve” Zipperman, Police Chief, Los Angeles School Police Department

Officers Present:

Scott Poster, Task Force Leader
Connie Yee, representing Wendy L. Watanabe, Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller

Absent:

Donald “Don” Pedersen, Police Chief, City of Culver City, At Large Seat
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
Harold Scoggins, Fire Chief, City of Glendale, representing the Los Angeles Area Fire Chiefs Association
Vacant, Board Secretary



I. CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communications Systems Authority Board of Directors was called to order on April 7, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. by Chair Bill Fujioka.

II. ANNOUNCE QUORUM – Roll Call

Chair Bill Fujioka made an acknowledgement without a formal roll call that a quorum was present.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion was made for approval of the Minutes from the March 3, 2011, Board of Directors Regular Meeting. **MOTION APPROVED**

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

None.

V. REPORTS (1 – 5)

1. Committee Reports

- Finance Committee. Greg Simay, Chair of the Finance Committee, stated that having a joint meeting with the Technical and Operations Committee was significant. They discussed the merits of phasing the project and that there was a thought that while member agencies will likely be brought on-line to the systems in phases and that such phasing would be operational in nature and not necessarily relate to the funding plan. They were still debating to what extent the phased nature of the project could create any advantages or flexibility in the financing. He deferred the Communities Facilities District (CFD) to Jan [Takata].

Jan Takata, Senior Manager, County of Los Angeles Chief Executive Office, provided the Board with a copy of the brief overview summarizing the CFD overall approach. He said that the Consultants from Fieldman & Rolapp (who were mentioned at the last meeting) were available to answer any questions on the Community Facilities District concept.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson had a question regarding the timing. He stated that the handout showed the individual steps from the point of a go-to-the-point when the actual approval would be made and the bonds would be issued. He asked what sort of a timeframe we would be looking at. The Consultant responded that their understanding is that they were looking at an election. You would need to have an election to have this approved. And if they were looking toward the November 2012 Election, the financing would occur shortly after the 2012 Election—an estimated period of at 18/19 months.

Chair Bill Fujioka stated that we were within that window right now. The Consultant responded, “yes” and that there’s a lot of work to get to the election process.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson then said that we were in a “chicken-and-egg situation.” We don’t have an idea of what the RFP situation will be because we don’t know agencies involvement or non-involvement and that it’s going to be very challenging to make a November Election with that lack of information. He explained that if the cost was such that agencies would remove themselves from the process, the Reports and Analysis would have to be modified and changed before you went for the election and that still hasn’t been dealt with in the process itself. Therefore, shooting for November 2012 would be very difficult.



Board Member Mark Alexander stated that if one of the options that we are seriously considering is to going out to a vote of the residents in Los Angeles County, he thinks we've got one shot at that and that it's very important that before doing that we avail ourselves with the information that we need to try to ensure that it is successful. He went on to say that in many situations when you're going out to a vote of the people it would be helpful to have the survey information to find out what really resonates with residents before you put it out there. And that there a number of consulting firms that are available that can do those kinds of surveys and would certainly encourage that we go down that track to look at bringing on such a consultant.

Chair Bill Fujioka said that whether in his current or past job when they thought about putting something on the ballot they did go out just see what it was like through a preliminary survey instrument. They do have the means and if there are no objections, to bring in folks they've worked with in the past that are familiar with this sort of survey.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson suggested that this be put on as an Agenda item at our next meeting.

Chair Bill Fujioka expressed that it's just a general concept. And if they can embrace that concept it will be on the Agenda. He also stated that it could be through the process of formal approval or it could just be done.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked if the County—the storm-drain proposal being put on the ballot or expected on the ballot is aimed at November 2012 too. Chair Bill Fujioka responded, "yes it is", and that there will be a number of measures in 2012. So no matter how we look at it, this is a challenge. He went on to say that later in today's discussion/meeting we're going to talk about when staff and others went to Washington D.C. and of the reception we received not only from Congress but more importantly the word we're getting from the Obama Administration. There is very strong support for this. It's highly probable that there's an interest in using this effort as a nationwide model and that they want us to succeed. So one way we're going to take advantage of that desire is to try and get as much funding for this as possible. There are some parallel tracts we should be looking at. He stated that as we go back East, because all of us have our separate trips, we have different connections to knock on as many doors as possible and say "we will be the model for you but you're going to have to help us during these very difficult economic times." And it helps in the form of grant dollars.

He also said that we have that timeline and that it would be real helpful to everyone if the Finance Committee would layout a schedule—the steps that have to be taken over this 18-month period of time so we'll have an idea of when we need to engage; and at what steps and process different activities have to be accomplished.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson stated that in the process that is shown here, there are hearings held before the County Board (because this is apparently a County project or process). He asked if in the case of the JPA Board, if we were going out, would it be a County Bond issue.

Chair Bill Fujioka said that we would have to look at that. If it's just a County Bond then we would hold and be responsible to debt-service solely of whether or not who holds it and that at this point-and-time he was not willing to say that the County would solely be responsible for the debt-service. But as to a public hearing process, it would be depending on how we set it up. He know that in order for the County to get involved with something of this type our regulations require us to have that public hearing of which may be the same with others around this table. So that's part of what you have to describe for us.



The Consultant stated it would not be a County obligation. The CFD is both the funding and a financing mechanism. Community Facility Districts have been formed and issued bonds based solely on the special tax and that's the intention here. It would be payable from the special tax. And given the breadth of Los Angeles County (if you include all 2.4M or so taxable parcels) the credit quality would actually be pretty good.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson said that his curiosity then was, this Board would be the one that will be holding the hearings required for the issues and making the decisions passing the resolution and asking the County to put it on the ballot as a joint ballot as a matter. The Consultant replied, "Yes."

Finance Committee Chair Greg Simay asked for the Consultant's opinion. He stated that the way the JPA is currently written, agencies have the option to drop-out within thirty-five (35) days of the adoption of a financing plan which may include CFD without incurring any obligations. There's another drop-out point, but that incurs some additional... His question was that if an agency has dropped-out within that thirty-five (35) day time limit, if the funding plan that was adopted by the majority of the Board talked about countywide financing whether CFD or that matter of property tax assessment, would it apply to that agency or how does that sit with what the language of the JPA is talking about.

Chair Bill Fujioka stated that it would be helpful for that. He asked that as we come back, we lay out the time-line and address these different options and that everyone consider - - but moving ahead, Greg was there in D.C. and we are getting absolute strong, not just comments but support from Washington D.C. on this. They are talking about it because of who we are the size of our County as a whole (with the eighty-eight cities). We're getting the kind of support that they are talking about and saying this will be a model. So before we even start talking about people opting out or not participating, we all have to embrace this tremendous opportunity right now. And if we stay together and if the consistent message of staying together, it increases our chances or probability of getting federal funds to support this. If they start hearing any rumblings that people are going to opt-out then it could hurt us overall.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson said that we had actually talked a little bit about this in the Ad Hoc Committee and one of the things the Board may want to look at is the Joint Powers Agreement itself and the timing and the decision points that are established in that document because it almost forces some decisions that may not be desirable for the overall group. Chair Bill Fujioka replied that we can blend those together.

- Operations Committee. Scott Edson, Chair of the Operations Committee provided a brief report. He said that the Ad Hoc Working Group did not have a chance to meet as often as possible due to Search and Rescue call-outs that some of the members were deployed on. They are still evaluating some operation issues and will be having a consecutive meeting with the Technical Committee this month. Also, there are operational issues that are being explored by the Technical Committee. So they expect to have full report to the Board by the next meeting later this month.

Chair Bill Fujioka asked if there were any questions. As there were none, the Technical Committee report was next.

- Technical Committee. John Black, Vice Chair of the Technical Committee provides a brief report. He gave an update on HR 607, the Broadband for First Responders Act.



- February 2011, House Homeland Security Committee Chairman Peter King and Ranking Member Bennie Thompson introduced the HR 607 bill. It allocates the D Block spectrum to public safety and provides funding to build-out a nationwide broadband network. Members of the Public Safety Alliance (PSA) have been united in their support.
- The Federal Financial Challenge is that Congress has previously accounted for revenue calculated to be received from auctioning the D Block at \$1.5 to \$3.2 billion. HR 607 proposes that the clearing and auctioning of public safety spectrum below 512 MHz provide for the legislative offset required for a new House bill.

The Concern for LA-RICS is mostly around Section 207 that requires the spectrum between 450 and 512 MHz to migrate their systems to 700 and 800 MHz. All the radio channels currently used by public safety and LA-RICS will be affected by this Section. But overall, there is support for HR 607; however, there is concern over 207. The Association of Public Safety Communications officials have expressed concerns and the National Public Safety Telecommunications Council (NPSTC) states that the bill needs to be amended.

Chair Bill Fujioka asked if there were any questions. As there were none, the Director's report was next.

2. Director's Report

Scott Poster, Task Force Leader provided a brief overview on the following:

- Site Usage
Currently for the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP), approximately 100 Los Angeles City sites; 120 County sites; and 40 Independent City sites are being evaluating.

A Team Leader has been developed for the project. Sara Henry will lead the team for both the County of Los Angeles and the Independent Cities. John Vidovich is the Team Leader for the City of Los Angeles. He is accruing all the City Staff and has a plan and place to collaborate with the City Officials to work through the issues within the City of Los Angeles

We currently have UltraSystems in place doing the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the BTOP sites. We plan on having the NEPA Evaluation done on April 30, 2011 and shortly after the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) will would be the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) which will entail public hearings. The public hearings are going to be an opportunity for us to meet and greet with the public.

Therefore, we need to advise our legislative officials. A meeting has been arranged with the Board of Supervisor Deputies to inform the County side. Eileen Decher, June Gibson, and John Vidovich are working together to inform the Los Angeles City Council. Sara Henry is developing a team to do presentations to the various Independent Cities Counties Councils and will be working on that role and structure within the next few weeks.

The site usage is a major project and it's going to take a lot of resources and a lot of time. Starting Monday [April 10, 2011] we will be working full-time on that endeavor.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked if the CEQA hearings will begin before this Board and if LA-RICS was the lead agency.



Scott Poster responded that he was not exactly sure how the CEQA process is going to be rolled out. We're going to try to have it regionally and have the least amount of many meetings as we can. We will come together with a plan and to develop a plan to bring back to the Board at the end of April to let you know more of what the plan is and how we're going to roll that out and "yes" that LA-RICS was the lead agency.

Board Member Greg Simay stated that he know that on the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) and some of the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) some of that communications tower are an eligible expense for some of the grant money; and that part of the planning will be to expedite the construction of any towers that are needed.

Scott Poster asked if he was referring to the radio system.

Board Member Greg Simay replied, yes. He said that he knows that there are two things going on: (1) the towers for the broadband system (because you have the BTOP Grant monies to manage); and (2) the voice interoperability portion (where there might be sites). He asked when Scott talked about identified sites, if that was for the BTOP portion alone or has there been a similar study for the voice interoperability.

Scott Poster responded that there has been an evaluation of both the BTOP and the radio systems and that we have to keep in mind that they are separate systems and have to be treated separately for grant funding reasons.

They will be looking and analyzing the sites, particularly within the Angeles National Forest (but figure those to be most problematic radio systems). While in D.C., they did meet with some people that can help expedite the process. So they are evaluating both the BTOP sites as well as the radio systems sites but when they go through this they will be bringing it back in two distinct pieces.

Board Member Greg Simay asked if he have City, County, and Independent for the two pieces - - and that he was thinking of to the extent of - - that we can get some communication towers built that takes a little deadline pressure off as far as spending things.

Scott Poster said that was correct, And that both the City and the County apart from LA-RICS is constructing some communications towers with Justice Association Grant (JAG) / American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) money. That process is in place and CEQA is already being completed for those projects. As for the radio system (as we are putting together), we are looking at it holistically and where we can take the opportunities to move forward on developing sites for the radio systems and places we will be doing that. We will be informing the Board.

- Washington, D.C. Briefing
Scott Poster reported that he, Mike Thayer, Sara Henry, and Susy Orellana-Curtis went and represented LA-RICS in D.C. and that it was a very busy but successful trip. He provided a brief report they met with:
 - The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) particularly Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to go over our grant situation which was positively received by DHS. We briefed them on a project. We met under time frames and will be working through any extensions that may be required.
 - The Public Safety System Trust, Chief Harlin McEwen on the regulation of the BTOP. The meeting was very successful and he is interested in the model here in California. Most importantly on that date they met with the White House Office of Science and Technology,



President Obama's, President and Chief Technology Officer, Aneesh Chopra. Apparently this model that we are building in Los Angeles region is going to be the model for the country. Primarily in the broadband, it really attracted the attention of the White House. They requested our Request for Proposal (RFP) in its entirety. We gave them what we could of the RFP.

At the end of May we will be conducting a summit. Mr. Chopra is planning to come to California and will be bringing some of the top minds from around the country from the top academic institutions in the United States to the Los Angeles region to work with us and identify any solution to help us with anything that we may need assistance with underscoring the point that he does not want to interfere with anything in our project. He just wants to extend a hand and help us with whatever possible.

The regional model that we are the model that he'd like to roll-out for the in the United States. Working together with jurisdictions in an enterprise system is very attractive and the interesting point is one of the most important thing that the federal government is looking at is our governing structure. The JPA is a way that we helped to utilize here with in the Los Angeles region is very attractive on a national basis. So it seems like the JPA is the way to go. They have been looking for us - - even Northern California has been looking for our JPA Agreement, our By-Laws and how we're doing it. Apparently, the functionality and governance of this structure is beneficial for a nationwide roll-out.

- Retired Admiral Jamie Barnett and David Furth, Deputy Chief for the FCC. One of the things the FCC has is a lot of regulatory provisions that are being pushed on this region and our project and other communication needs to be through the radio system as well. We did brief them completely, it was a very positive meeting and they understand some of request we have as to the Proposed Rulemaking. Primarily we met with selling frequencies auction and also secondary responder's. He was also able to provide some examples of how we use secondary responder's in our system and we are preparing an official response to the FCC to support secondary responder's being included in it. They were able to provide them with information that they have not heard before. That was a response that resulted in a very positive meeting in future communication and we will continue with Mr. Barnett.
- There was a House Sub-Committee Meeting on Homeland Security and Board Member Greg Simay was invited to attend as a witness and did represent LA-RICS at the Sub-Committee Meeting. At Chair King's meeting in Homeland Security and Board Member Simay did give LA-RICS a very positive name. He was able to give us a good report. He also provided the Board's desire on the D Block. There was a question on the D Block there were other public safety professionals as witnesses at that Sub-Committee Hearing. Board Member Simay was able to let the Federal Government Sub-Committee know the desire of the D Block and our opinion. It was a positive presentation. But it would be important to us - - as a JPA Board in particular that when we are notified of the ability to represent LA-RICS on a national level that the Board - - and we hopefully would get pre-notice and apparently it was a last minute thing. But if we have extra notice to let the Board know that we are being represented and that we represent each other in D.C. Coordination would be good.
- The Department of Commerce, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) and talked about our Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) Grant and the BTOP Grant. We were able to provide them with a briefing so that they can understand appropriately the program. We are going to rely on a response both from the PSIC program and the BTOP program. The City of Los Angeles was on a conference call as well.



- The Senate Homeland Security Governmental Affairs Committee, Troy Cribb, to give her a briefing. It was another positive support from that committee.
- Jessica Rosenworcel from the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee—[John D. (Jay)] Rockefeller's Group. She has also developed some legislation or assisted with developing legislation for the D Block. She was also updated and is supportive of our project.
- [Senator Dianne] Feinstein's Office, talking to Deven Rhinerson if we have issues with our funding sources that we will be able to deal with the [Senate] Appropriations Committee and look for some support in that regard. We will also probably end up meeting with [Representative] Adam Schiff's Office as well so that we may maintain that relationship on the Appropriations Committee.
- The Office of Emergency Communications, Jeanette Mann. In regards to the BTOP, the Office of Emergency Communications is extremely attracted to this project. We received a great deal of support from them and will be communicating with them frequently as well.

Board Member Greg Simay added that when he testified to Homeland Security about the D Block, they basically was affirming that "yes, we want it", but leave our UHF frequencies alone. The impression he got was that the Committee was sympathetic to that. He felt that HR 607 will be modified to exclude that. Although he didn't remark at the time, if there could be a little patience and wait for Voice Over Long Term Evolution (LTE) to evolve to the point where it could handle Voice of first responders (there will be a lot of bands freed up at that time) but it would be premature to do now.

Board Alternate Andy Fox asked Scott Poster to go over who represented LA-RICS in D.C., in the terms of agencies.

Scott Poster replied that it was the LA-RICS Team and then the Board through Greg Simay. Also, there was some through communication with the Grant Office from Los Angeles City.

Board Alternate Andy Fox stated that with the Board's concurrence, particularly in the grant area where we have UASI, SHSGP, and a number of grants that we do our best to make sure that when we go back to D.C. that there is a diverse group of representatives of agencies. So, as we move forward, he thinks it's important that we communicate to Scott and the staff that if we are going to go back and do issues with grants we try to make sure that we are represented by as many people as reasonable, certainly with respect to the SHSGP and the UASI.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked if this will be a discussion of the Legislative Committee if the Board kind of work up who might make that.

Chair Bill Fujioka said that we can have that a discussion. But as to the grants, the time of this visit was not dictated on who would go and who was available of going. Going back with 15 people representing every agency to talk about grants is always a challenge. So having a representative team leaving was absolutely critical. The other thing he would like to do is maybe ask our Project Team to put together a set white paper/talking points or something that can be given to our respective agencies and leaders because we all go back for different reasons and at different times. We should be speaking with the same voice of the same issues with the same everything. So we have that scripting because we want to show solidarity.



He further said that we have an opportunity. The people in D.C., starting with the Obama Administration down to Congress, the Senate, and the staff in different agencies love this program. They want to and if they can make it helps us make it successful we let them - - we'll give them the opportunity. Because if we are successful, they'll take credit for it. They'll take our plan and drop it at every major city and county in the United States. It's a hell of an opportunity. And he know oftentimes we get a little frustrated about some aspects of it but I'll ask everyone - - I'll employ everyone to just focus on the overall of both. If we get that goal done and have that focus some of these other little things will just work its way out.

Board Member Greg Simay asked Scott Poster followed-up in regards to Chief Fox's mentioned that in the written testimony is closing the gap between current grant funding and the nominal cost of the project is very problematic. He thinks that communizes with the desire to grant fund more of this and that grants makes a huge difference.

Board Alternate Andy Fox said that he thinks Scott did the best in terms of pre-planning but when we know we're going to take the time to go to D.C., to being thoughtful about sending the representatives. He suggested that we send a mix of uniform members, with technical staff, with grant specialists just be thoughtful about that; and certainly representing that - - the County, the City, and the Independent Cities groups is going to get us to where we need to go.

Scott Poster added that Alisa [Finsten] did represent the City of Los Angeles; and that they were also in contact with Dario Gomez who works for the City of Los Angeles in D.C. Both were at that meeting for the Department of Homeland Security. When the Board of Supervisors goes back, Board Chair Fujioka will be going. They are going to be soliciting asking for assurances for UASI funding as well. Also a new brochure was developed and delivered throughout Washington that will be made available to you as well.

Board Member Kim Raney as if there were any conversation back there for the narrowband requirement for January 2013 because a lot of cities have to make some decisions next year. And that we are trying to get an extension for the LA-RICS JPA cities.

Scott Poster responded yes. They did discuss the narrowbanding requirement with Jaime Barnett and David Furth of the FCC; and are proposing our attorney representing the JPA is developing a document to give to them and it has been fairly well received and has been completely understand the issues we have at hand and without giving us an official sanction it was very positive of the approach on giving us that extension. He thinks that they can officially give us that written document or assurance at this point, but it was very positive.

Board Member Kim Raney said that what they are hearing that they can't give the extension, so a lot of cities have to make capital decisions next year to meet their requirement. Scott Poster replied that it is not what they heard in Washington.

- **Ad Hoc Committee Results**
There were two meetings held, March 23, 2011 and April 5, 2011 (for those who couldn't make it to the previous one). The Ad Hoc Committee was made up of JPA Board Members [Mark] Alexander, [Greg] Simay, [LeRoy] Jackson, [Patty] Huber, [Daryl] Osby, [Reggie] Harrison, [Nancy] Ramirez and [David] Betkey. All the members that met were given a full presentation under a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) of the process and procedures that are in place in determining the decision for a vendor selection. There were two questions presented as directed by the Chair of the Board. Question #1, "was a procurement process followed." The unanimous choice of all members of the Ad Hoc Committee was "yes." Question #2, "is there



support for the Interim Director's decision to negotiate with the proposed vendor." That was also a unanimous "yes."

Board Member Greg Simay suggested that we should proceed with the negotiations with the proposed vendor without excluding the possibility of negotiations with the other. But he thinks the Ad Hoc Committee needs to meet one more time to speak to the evaluators and if possible the Negotiating Team is present as well. And that's simply to help answer the question, the due diligence of, "are we confident that either of the vendors if selected can in-fact fulfill the contract for the given price and with the minimum of a possibility of change orders difficulties, and so forth". He also thinks that he owe the Independent Cites the due diligence to say that he spoke with members of the Evaluation Team that encompassed not only those from an Independent City prospective but those from the County and City prospective. And that even with all the spectrum of opinion there's always risks no matter who you pick but he thinks that would then give the Ad Hoc members a very complete picture and we would then be able to say that we have done our due diligence.

Jose Silva, Office of the County Counsel, pointed out that there's no Agenda Item relating to that and that it's an action. So if we have it as an agendized item so maybe for next meeting we can take that up.

Board Member Greg Simay said that's the procedurally correct way to do it, then make that an item for discussion - - and at our next meeting. Chair Bill Fujioka said that the one thing that is very clear is that the team continues to negotiate. Board Member Greg Simay said yes and that this was not meant to delay the negotiations. This is to be done in parallel is the intent.

Jose Silva said that if they can get that proposed item a little bit more firm to make sure that we capture everything that you want to do. Chair Bill Fujioka said that they'll ask Scott or others to work with Greg to get the language for the action item for our next Committee Meeting and continue with negotiations uninterrupted.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson made a clarification that some members of the Ad Hoc Committee had to leave so when it was spoken of the unanimous it was of the remaining individuals that were there. Scott Poster responded, "no." Each individual was asked and each individual responded yes.

Board Alternate Nancy Ramirez said that she don't recall taking that vote because she did leave early, and asked if it was taken toward the end of the meeting Scott Poster responded, "no" but that he thinks he asked "if you supported the decision before you left."

Board Member LeRoy Jackson said that he thinks that all the members that were there, appreciated the briefing they received and that the information that was shared with them was very helpful.

- **Director's Update**
Following today's Board meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee which is composed of [Kim] Raney, [Andy] Fox, [Scott] Edson and [John] Geiger will meet and score the four proposals/submittals in response to the RFP on the new Director. The resumes that they feel are appropriate will be sent to you before the next meeting.

After the Regular Session they would have a Closed Session and the candidates will be interviewed by the Board on April 28, 2011.

- **DELTAWRX Contract**
In response to Board person Jackson's question, there was going to be no reimbursement requested for the Director or for DELTAWRX from the JPA. The contract for DELTAWRX



supporting the LA-RICS is sitting with the CEO's Office and would remain under there administration.

And as far as the Director's position, once a Director is on-board we will determine the funding for how it's rolled out. But most likely it would be grant money funding.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson said that he's still concerned that there's no relationship between us and DELTAWRX other than they've appeared and they are participating. And that it would seem that the Board should have a relationship in some sort of way either a concurrence contractual relationship or an acknowledgement. But that it seems an unusual procedure they are just here because of the graciousness of the County.

Chair Bill Fujioka said that he's more than happy to have this Board pay for the contract.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson said that he was not speaking about pay and was happy with the pay situation.

Chair Bill Fujioka stated that normally there's a relationship with "he who pays has that kind of relationship to be able to direct the activities of a group." It's kind of having the best of worlds, "don't pay but control the contract".

Board Member LeRoy Jackson said that he don't want to control the contract by the Board, but thinks there ought to be an arrangement or an acknowledgement by the Board that "yes, we want to have DELTAWRX participating and involved by us as authorized by the County on a free-basis." He went on to say that even free work ought to be acknowledged and guidelines established.

Chair Bill Fujioka said that we'll look at something. They'll work with County Counsel and find a mechanism to make that happen. But in very direct terms, we need (from the County side) - - I need someone with that special knowledge and ability to help as a consultant as we walk through this very complex process and we've chose DELTAWRX to do that. He thinks they've done an exceptional job and as we move forward he will still keep that.

- Negotiations are on-track and on- schedule.
- D Block has already been dialoged here today by the Technical Committee and Chairperson Simay. It does look there's a tremendous push for public safety to get the D Block 10 MHz of that D Block spectrum but we'll see how it's going to be legislatively done through Washington and rolls-out.
- Board Secretary
Effective April 28, 2011, a new Secretary, Patricia Saucedo, has been hired for the Director and that that by your previous approval will become the Board Secretary.

3. Grant Status

Susy Orellana-Curtiss, LA-RICS Project Team Member reported the following:

- Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI)
During our trip to Washington, D.C., they were informed by the Department of Homeland Security that they are hopeful that the UASI '11 announcement for funding should come as soon as mid-April. As soon as they are informed, they will be sure to advise the Board of the allocation amounts.



- **Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP)**
The U.S. Department of Commerce, NTIA will be coming to Los Angeles for a site visit June 1 through June 3, 2011. The purpose of the visit is to allow the Federal Program Officer to go over programmatic, financial, and administrative activities of our funded project (the LA SafetyNet). The Federal Program Officer will be attending the June 2, 2011 LA-RICS Board of Directors meeting which we thought was a perfect opportunity for the granting agency to witness the governing body at work.
- **Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) Grant**
The PSIC extension was submitted on March 29, 2011 requesting an extension of our granting funds the \$22.2M through June of 2012. The Board will be informed as soon as they learn that the extension has been granted.

We were also made aware by the Department of Homeland Security that there is a grant opportunity for our JPA member agencies. It's the Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG). Basically, it is intended to provide financial assistance directly to fire departments and non-affiliated Emergency Medical Services (EMS) organizations to enhance their capabilities with respect to fire and fire-related hazards.

Per our conversation with the FEMA contact in D.C., they informed us that funds would be made available. Their #1 Funding Priority, which is Fire Department Priorities, that would allow us to purchase firefighting equipment. These grants are intended to make AFG funds available for equipment that will enhance the safety or effectiveness of firefighting, rescue, and fire based EMS functions. We are working with the Regional Fire Program Specialist, Doug Woods who is going to help us put together a grant-writing seminar that will prepare us and your member agencies for the 2011 grant process, which they expect to open this summer.

Regarding future LA-RICS procurements that are either grant-funded or non-, at your March 3, 2011 Board of Directors' meeting, there was a request from the Board Members that staff provide a brief report summarizing the procurement and contract evaluation process in order to make a more informed decision regarding the approval of entering into contracts. Based upon the request of the Board, the current process was re-evaluated, and we now recommend the following:

Board letters requesting approval of contracts between LA-RICS and an independent contractor will come before your board AFTER negotiations have been completed and we are ready to sign a contract. At that time, we will be able to provide your Board with the details supporting the selection of the contractor and the evaluation process, without compromising the integrity of the procurement process.

- **State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP)**
No reportable action.
- **Justice Association Grant (JAG) / (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA))**
No reportable action.

**4. DISCUSSION ITEM: Self Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) Procurement**

John Geiger, General Manager of Standards & Practices, County of Los Angeles Internal Services Department (ISD) gave a brief overview of certain excerpts from the Superior Court file in that matter on a petition for a mandate to overturn a Decision to award a bid contract to a particular vendor. The Court did overturn that bid and sent it back to the participating entities for future analysis, and ultimately the results were the same, but the infirmities and problems with that procurement, were remedied. That procurement involved certain fire equipment that was to be purchased by consorting of certain participating local entities and ISD handled the bid procedures for those entities. The similarities between that procurement in what you have pending for the turnkey system for LA-RICS, frankly ends there. In short, the evaluators the SBCA procurement failed to follow the evaluation scoring rules. That evaluation was based 50% on price and 50% on unarticulated subjective factors that were developed as the process moved forward. Here in our procurement we have very definite factors that were brought to this Board and were contained in the RFP (5% of the scoring went to references and financial responsibility of the proposers; 30% to the business and technical approach for the turnkey system; 40% to the articulated abilities to meet the system specifications; and finally 25% for price). There is no methodology for point reduction, only points added for compliance with those particular sections. In the SCBA procurement though, unknown and unarticulated in the procurement documents the Evaluation Committee in-fact did do a reduction of points which the Superior Court was uniquely unimpressed with.

The procedure used in the overall evaluation in 2008 for SCBA was a Consensus Scoring. The County no longer used Consensus Scoring starting in early 2009. Informed Averaging was advanced by ISD and approved in June 2009 by the Board of Supervisors for use in all procurements. Informed Averaging is in-fact the procurement methodology that the JPA is using for its turnkey system right now. Inheriting the Informed Averaging are certain checks-and-balances which prevent evaluators from entering into falling off-track. Those checks-and-balances include the presence of a facilitator in the room. ISD has had a facilitator in the room throughout the process and continues to monitor as we move forward into Negotiations. But most significantly, is our assistance from a consultant—DELTAWRX. We have been able to leverage our presence in the room by being able to work closely with DELTAWRX—their personnel and their expertise has been significant.

Under Item 2c, the Ad Hoc Procurement Review Committee unanimously has informed you that the evaluators have followed County process and that is a revised approved County process. That's not the process that was followed to various degrees unsuccessfully in the SCBA procurement. And secondly, the current project status is supported by following that process which also have a unanimous approvable of that coming back from the Ad Hoc Committee.

Board Member Greg Simay stated that the basic fall-out of this is the procedure that we're using for LA-RICS and that has the benefit of past experiences would be extremely defensible as a procedure in any court of law and given that we have been faithfully following that procedure, if we have insulated ourselves against challenges that are at least procedural in nature?

John Geiger responded, "yes it would." He have every confidence of that, not only having done the forensic analysis as has the Ad Hoc Committee, but also having been through the vendor debriefing.

5. DISCUSSION ITEM: Board Elections

Jose Silva briefly discussed the Board Elections. He reported that under Section 3.01 of the Bylaws, "At least six (6) months prior to expiration of the terms, the Board of Directors shall



announce and set the date for the Board of Directors meeting for which a mail-in ballot election of the At Large Director and Alternate Director Seats shall be conducted as follows..."; and that under Section 2.02 of the JPA Agreement, the term of the Director shall be two (2) years. He said that he was informed that this six (6) months prior to the expiration of the term, he believe we're at that point, or in fact, may have gone beyond that point. But, unfortunately under Section 2.02(h) of the Agreement, "The term of each Director and Alternate Director shall be two years or until a successor has been appointed." Since we missed the appointment of the successor we haven't done that yet. Everyone is still in place who was previously put into place; however, at this point we should probably consider putting on the Agenda for a future meeting maybe the next meeting but it's the Board's discretion the election as required under the section of the Bylaws.

Sara Henry also stated that the election refers to the At Large Members. The Standing Members, it's still a two (2) year term. We asked that you go on record at a future meeting when it's agendized and just put on the record that you will be severing an additional term. Members of the Board can serve unlimited terms under the JPA Agreement.

Jose Silva then said that Mark Alexander was very much involved in putting together this section of the Bylaws and asked that if he had anything to add to do so now.

Board Member Mark Alexander said that in essence we've already surpassed the timeline for meeting the procedure that was called out in the Bylaws. The call for the election should have really occurred six months ago. The existing terms of the Members expires in May 2011. So, he would propose that you come back within a future meeting (if not the next one) the Board consider a suspension of that provision of the Bylaws. It talks about the process conducting the election for the At Large Members. And as part of that discussion, he thinks need to then determine, for how long of a period we're going to suspend that provision of the Bylaws. Terms of office are for two (2) years, the At Large Members as well as the Standing Members are two year terms. He personally would be amenable because he thinks stability on this Board is very important particularly at this point of where we're at. So he personally would be supportive of suspending that process for another year and taking a look at it next year. But that's something he thinks the Board has to discuss as an action item.

Chair Bill Fujioka stated that was a good suggestion and so that will be put on our next Agenda as an action item.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (6)

6. Contract Adjustments

a. ACTION ITEM

Scott Poster addressed the Board. The Authority since the date of inception has approved various LA-RICS contracts in order to allow for minor amounts, for minor changes and extensions, and accommodate unforeseen additional work, without disrupting project timeline. We request, we request delegated authority to the LA-RICS Director to execute amendments to existing contracts that (a) resulting in an increase to the maximum contracts, some by no more than 20%; (b) to accommodate increase or decrease in the units of service provided by and/or a period of performance, not to exceed one year; and (c) to obtain prior authority of Council approval.

The purpose of this recommended act is to provide continue uninterrupted service by independent contractors, retained by LA-RICS in the event of unforeseen changes, arising, or



required during the extension of the contract term or our increase in work. This action is similar to the actions taken by the County Board of Supervisors. Recently, March 2011, the very similar action was given to the department Director of Public Works to increase the contract amount, also to adjust the annual contract of unforeseen work if required. We're looking for your approval of that flexibility for the Director for the 20%.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson said that he was comfortable with giving some authority. He thinks the 20% is a little high from his standpoint but would suggest 10% to start with. And if there's concerns or problems down the road we revisit at that point and time.

Board Member Mark Alexander said that he concur , and is would also support the concept of allowing some discretion, but thinks that in addition to a percentage value there needs to be a maximum dollar value because 20% or 10% of a million dollar contract is a lot of money.

Board Member Greg Simay said that he know that in some cities it's a percentage or a dollar amount, whichever is less and that he would support something in that form.

Susy Orellana-Curtiss said that the action before your Board previously approved contracts: the Neeku Group contract with a \$116K annual contract sum; the UltraSystems contract with a \$1M of maximum term sum; your professional legal services contract which doesn't have a limit but an hourly rate; and the Televate contract which hasn't been signed but was presented to you at the last Board meeting, which has \$1.5M annual contract sum. From this point forward it is our intention to include language in each of our Board letters that would ask for delegated authority. If we feel the need or anticipate unforeseen work might be included and your Board would be able to vote independently.

Chair Bill Fujioka asked if the today's action only speaks to the four... Susy Orellana-Curtiss responded yes, and that we've analyzed the amount of the annual contract sum and requested 20% because we feel that, that is a reasonable amount in regards to the four mentioned.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson stated that he'll move 10% and \$200K max.

Board Member Reggie Harrison asked if we have exceeded the 10% threshold and if you anticipate that you would?

Susy Orellana-Curtiss responded that we have not. And the strongest example or the reason why we bring this before your Board is that our UltraSystems contract the contractors are working on the Environmental Assessment Report. However, this goes back to the Department of Commerce and they are going before the issue - - they might have questions or require a follow up explanation by the contractor. The term of that contractor ends September 15, 2011. We anticipate full completion of the grant funds by the term and would require at the very least \$200K, which is 20% of the contract in order to cover one month's expenditures. 10% would only be allowed.

Chair Bill Fujioka asked could be reasonable to say \$200K or 10%, but no greater than, so they could have a threshold of \$200K for these smaller contracts. Because she's saying right now, if we miss out on a month then we won't have enough to carry us over to the next month.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson said that you've come to the Board and we could address that right now. But for a general rule-of-thumb, he thinks the 10% or \$200K whichever is less is really were he was going. If differentiated for that one contract.

Chair Bill Fujioka* asked if she felt this will hamper your ability to move forward with some of these contracts?



Susy Orellana-Curtiss responded that we've looked at the four contracts put before you. The only one that wouldn't be impacted would be the professional legal services contract that does not have a maximum annual contract sum, but, for Televate, UltraSystems and Neeku Group which have come before your Board, 20% would be a reasonable amount that we would request. But for future contracts we would include the language for each independent one for your Board to decide.

Board Alternate Andy Fox stated it seemed to him that Mr. Jackson's upper threshold regards a maximum of \$200K would be acceptable...10% or \$200K, whichever is less. Board Member Mark Alexander replied, "no"... on a \$1M contract, 10% is \$100K which would be the cut-off, so it wouldn't get to the \$200K.

Board Alternate Andy Fox* then stated that the distinctions is there are at least on contract that's not going to make it.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson stated that he didn't mind accepting that one contract and concurring with the allowance for that one. He understand that's a very fast track one. But for a general rule, he thinks the 10% or \$200K whichever is less is the target. And he would motion.

Board Alternate Patty Huber said that she would agree with Director Jackson that for the one contract where we know we could make that one for \$200K and say the standard policy is the 10% or \$200K whichever is lesser the general policy for any contract and they could always bring exception back to us.

Board Member Mark Alexander said that he thinks it's important that whatever we decide it ought to be applied consistently because it gets confusing if you're going to start having different criteria for different contracts and we as a Board ought to give some direction to the Staff on what we deem is acceptable. So he would prefer that we adopt something that can be applied uniformly.

Board Alternate Andy Fox replied that why he was asking the question. The Board meets once a month and their doing business every day so we need to get very clear from Staff would 10% or \$200K whichever is less will that meet your day-to-day needs?

Susy Orellana-Curtiss responded that it would not for these four contracts but for 10% and \$200K whichever is greater, but thinks what Mr. Jackson said whichever is less.

Board Alternate Andy Fox replied, "not to exceed", he thinks is the point.

Chair Bill Fujioka then said not to exceed, so he thinks would have - - you could go to \$200K if you have a \$3M contract you would stop at \$200K.

Board Alternate Andy Fox answered, "no" you would have to bring that back. Anything over \$200K you would have to bring that back.

Susy Orellana-Curtiss responded exactly, which is our intention from this point forward

Chair Bill Fujioka asked if you could go to \$200K. That's what they are saying...

Board Alternate Andy Fox said that he had a friendly amendment to the motion to just amend it to 10% not to exceed \$200K. And he was doing that on the basis of Staff is indicating that with the present four contracts that's what they need to do business.

Board Member Greg Simay stated that for small contracts for \$50K you could have a tremendous overage. He thinks as a general rule as far as giving Staff discretion, it's 10% or \$200K whichever



is less. If it looks like it's going to exceed that then all Staff needs to do is just go to the Board. So he would propose that we adopt as a general rule 10% because he thinks we need that discipline particularly since we're going to be going close to one billion dollars over the course of this project. But at the same time there will be reasons to stray beyond that and as long as Staff is going back to Board he thinks you could anticipate a 20% before you get there then the Board can debate it and bless it and you've in-fact have done that. We can make those four contracts an exception but as a general rule if it's going to exceed 10% it goes back to the Board for further discussion. If it stays under \$10% it's Staff discretion and then we can review that over time and see if that's working out.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked if the motion is the 10% or \$200K whichever is lesser with these four accepted as coming back to the Board and approved for a higher amount as indicated by you at the time.

Scott Poster asked if it was for future contracts. Board Member LeRoy Jackson replied "no" that it was for these four. Board Alternate Andy Fox also said that it was for these four. He thinks that what you're saying is for these four 10% up to \$200K is okay.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson again responded "no." We're saying that 10% or \$200K the lesser of either is the standard for the Board. Now for the future and in future contracts with an exception clause that says if it seems like it's going to need more you come to us for an approval or modification up to 20%. But at that that be accepted for these four contracts that we've already done because you've already come to us and these particular cases you need to extend.

Board Alternate Andy Fox asked if that get what is needed? Susy Orellana-Curtiss stated she anticipate we may be coming back before your Board because the 10% may not satisfy the need for our environmental assessment.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson replied that these are done.

Chair Bill Fujioka said that we have a motion for that. The one thing that should it happen where we are close to or you could easily project we are going to exceed that amount then he urge that you exercise the emergency clause and we can send out a special agenda within a 72 hours of a meeting that will allow us to take it up at the very next meeting in accordance with our Brown Act requirements. We have a motion from LeRoy; Board Member Greg Simay **Seconded**.

Board Member Reggie Harrison wanted to be clear, future contracts you will bring them forward with a clause in there requesting?

Board Member Greg Simay* said that the reason is every budget including ours has a contingency factor so the Staff discretion has to harmonize with that or you wind up being in danger of eating up your contingency and the Board is surprised if you don't have.

Board Member Mark Alexander said that the was still a little confused by the motion. Right now, its 10% or \$200K whichever is less except...

Board Member LeRoy Jackson****These four contracts we've already approved. The Administrator is saying that they require the 20% because of the timelines that they are facing right now.

Board Member Mark Alexander then said that that applies immediately, but in the future on those same four contracts they are going to be subject to this 10% or \$200K rule.



Board Member Greg Simay responded, "yes" except they come to the Board, just as these came to the Board.

Board Member Reggie Harrison said that he was still confused why we need a blanket when in the future you'll bring contracts to us that have a clause in there where you are requesting contingency funds. So, why don't we just deal with that because their request item was actually as it pertains to the existing contracts that's all they needed guidance from us. And Staff has reported that on a go forward basis they'll have an item as a part of the contract.

Chair Bill Fujioka stated that he thinks it's just a general discussion of how we would approach because Mark mentioned the consistency for all future contracts.

Board Member Reggie Harrison then said that he thinks what you put in for the future then it would be dictated by the type of contract that you have. It may be appropriate for 10%, 20% or depending on the type of contract is going to dictate he hope.

Susy Orellana-Curtiss said that she understand the Board's motion to just provide us with the guidance that anything with the 20% we should prepare to explain and justify as to why; however the 20% would be the standard that the Board would be amending.

Chair Bill Fujioka reiterated 10%. There was a first, a second, no objections? Hearing none, that will be the order. **MOTION APPROVED**

Board Member LeRoy Jackson stated that we were going to get a full evaluation of the previous contracts approved, the rating standards, the methodology, and process and he didn't see that in the packet.

Susy Orellana-Curtiss said that she mentioned the broadband engineering contracts during her grants report. But from this point forward we're going to be bringing board letters before you Board once negotiations have been completed so that we may be able to fully disclose the details of the evaluation process and the selected contractor. For the TeleVate the broadband engineering contract we haven't completed our negotiations and so we're unable to provide your Board at this time with that detail. But as soon as the negotiations are completed we will provide your Board with a summary. And from this point forward on all future contract solicitations we will bring the detail before your Board in the board letter.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked if we could see the ratings that you did to arrive at that contract?

Susy Orellana-Curtiss said that we will be able to show you the ratings as soon as negotiations are completed.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson said that he was rather uncomfortable that we acted on a contract without knowing all that information that was what we were asking for. It wasn't in the Agenda Item, it wasn't in the Analysis, it was in the discussion of how you arrived at it. We asked you to give the analysis and the background. He don't think that asking for confidential information but thinks Staff owes a responsibility or explaining how they arrived at that decision and he was expected it on this Agenda or hope that it be on a future one and does not wait until we have signed-off on the contract.

Susy Orellana-Curtiss said that the it is our intention is from this point moving forward that we would be bringing items before you at the time that we are fully able to disclose the details so that you are able to make an informed decision.



Sara Henry responded that since we're still in negotiations if we release the scores it cuts into our advantage with negotiating with Televate because if anything happens with Televate we want to make sure we could go to the next highest proposer and that was the delays that we were not done negotiating. But we can similar to the process adopted for the larger contract; we can put together an Ad Hoc Committee and release the details of the scores to the Board members.

Board Member LeRoy Jackson said that he was not looking at the scores and that it just seems to him that the Staff ought to be able to say why they recommended this agency at this stage. And this is very different than our RFP. You have not come forward to us to recommend that we enter in a contract with somebody. You held us off from doing that, and in this case we have approved entering into a contract and we don't know the details of why you arrived at that conclusion and he thinks you have an obligation to tell us why you arrived to that conclusion.

Sara Henry said that the request from Board Member Simay was for the evaluation scores and that's why we held-off. The reasons for arriving at the conclusion that the evaluators did and it was part of the conversation and asked that they receive the highest score based on the criteria that was part of the RFP that was part of the board letter at the time. .

Board Member LeRoy Jackson then said that he would ask it in a different way. Why did we approve the contract in that case and we have not done it for the general RFP?

John Geiger responded that you have already given delegated authority for the Director to enter into the contract with the contract still in negotiations. To give you greater confidence in the process and the outcome yet to adhere to the very stringent timetables that the Authority is under, we do this. Once the contract negotiations are complete and the contract is finalized with a vendor signature, that will be distributed to you as well as the underlined data and documentations with a cover memo from the Director of an intent to sign-off on the contract in perhaps five (5) business days unless this Board sets a special meeting for further discussion and consideration. That way there is a self-executing methodology but you have the final trigger on whether or not that goes forward.

Chair Bill Fujioka said that was a good suggestion and that it not an action item. That it's just a practice that we'll be following.

VII. MISCELLANEOUS – (None)

VIII. ITEMS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION BY THE BOARD

Board Member LeRoy Jackson asked if there would be a discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee going back and...

Chair Bill Fujioka responded, "yes," the issue of the Ad Hoc Committee having a further review and with that discussion.

Board Member Reggie Harrison said that he had a chance to confer with Greg on his item and know that Jose is going to be working with Greg on that as well but that he didn't know if that was a formal motion on that or not but it sounds like Greg is amenable to some of the suggestions that he's have as well for this item.

Chair Bill Fujioka said that we suggested that putting it on the Agenda as an action item and at that point we could have the full discussion of how we can structure it.



These issues are **to be discussed at a future meeting:**

1. a. Project Funding and Guidance Feedback
 - To what extent a subscriber unit would speak to part of the financing packet
 - To what extent will that be viewed as the responsibility of the agency
- b. Project Risk Controls
2. The Lifespan of Equipment and Associated Costs
 - Depreciation and Replacement of Equipment
 - Annual License Costs related to any proposals (e.g., software or other elements)
 - Annual Anticipated Maintenance Costs
 - Annual Management Operational Costs

IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No additional comments from the public on items of interest were received.

X. ADJOURNMENT and NEXT MEETING

Jose Silva mentioned that the since the next meeting is not going to occur on the regularly scheduled time, he wanted to point that out to everyone and believe that under the Brown Act that makes it a Special Meeting rather than a regularly scheduled board meeting.

Board Member Greg Simay made a request to request to keep those to a minimum, because a lot of us are planning days away on the assumption that it's on the first ~~Tuesday~~ [Thursday] of the month.

Chair Bill Fujioka adjourned the meeting at 10:24 a.m.

The next regular meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for Thursday, April 28, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. at the Grace E. Simons Lodge