



# FINANCE COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL  
INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

August 27, 2015  
LA County Fire Department Headquarters  
1320 N. Eastern Ave., Training Room 15, Los Angeles, CA 90063

---

**Committee Members Present:**

**Ed Roes**, City of Los Angeles CAO  
**June Gibson**, City of Los Angeles Fire Dept.  
**Matias Farfan**, City of Los Angeles, Legislative Analyst Office  
**John Geiger**, County of Los Angeles CEO  
**Doug Cline**, County of Los Angeles Fire Dept.  
**Cynthia Evans**, County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Dept.  
**Kay Fruhwirth**, County of Los Angeles DHS/EMS  
**Daniel Calleros**, Los Angeles Police Chiefs Assoc.  
**Dan Jordan**, California Contract Cities

---

**Alternate Committee Members Present:**

**Bob Davis**, City of Los Angeles, LAPD

---

**Officers Present:**

**Patrick Mallon**, LA-RICS Executive Director  
**Susy Orellana-Curtiss**, LA-RICS Project Team  
**Beatriz Cojulun**, Committee Secretary

---

**Absent:**

**Patricia Whelan**, City of Los Angeles, LAPD  
**Jose Santome**, Los Angeles Unified School District  
**David Lantzer**, Los Angeles Area Fire Chiefs

---

**AGENDA ITEM A**



**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. ANNOUNCE QUORUM – Roll Call**

Chair John Geiger made an acknowledgement that a quorum was present and asked for roll call.

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (A-B)**

**A. July 23, 2015 – Regular Meeting Minutes**

Chair Geiger asked for a motion to approve, Committee Member June Gibson motioned first, seconded by Committee Member Matias Farfan. The Committee's consensus was unanimous. **MOTION APPROVED.**

**IV. CONSENT CALENDAR – (None)**

**V. REPORTS (B)**

**B. Director's Report – Pat Mallon**

- Funding Plan Status:
  - Three (3) cities have opted out recently: Lancaster, Bell Gardens and Monterey Park. We are awaiting a response from LA-RICS financial consultant for an analysis on the overall impact on the distribution of costs. The opt-out period remains at November 23, 2015. An Ad Hoc Committee review of a proposed risk based funding plan is open pending discussion between the County and the City of LA.
- LTE Project Status:
  - As of two days ago, there are 41 sites completed; 19 sites in construction; two (2) site pending permits; and one additional site, the LAPD Pacific Station, which is awaiting a green light from NTIA. NTIA requested minor modifications this afternoon. LA-RICS had hoped to recommence construction as the site was 40% complete at the time of the suspension. It is felt that it can be completed within the grant performance period.
- Grant Status:



- Grant performance period concludes on September 30, 2015. All sites are on schedule to be completed before that date. Intense discussions with Motorola regarding settlement of claims continue.
- The last item of significant concern is that NTIA has asked LA-RICS to submit a last drawdown on or before September 4, 2015, well in advance of the September 30, 2015, date. The Federal government will close down their computer system on September 15, 2015, allowing them enough time to process and send LA-RICS the funds. They are allowing LA-RICS to drawdown funds based on anticipated expenses, in advance of actually receiving invoices from the contractors.
- A Special Board meeting was held today, in which the Board approved the dropping of 77 sites as well as some changes that resulted in the reduction of the contract value of the \$22 million.
- LMR Project Status:
  - LA-RICS is moving forward as quickly as they can on the environmental process. FEMA has recently given direction as to how they want the program Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) to be completed. It will be a blanket PEA for all of the sites. FEMA has also provided direction on how to move forward with nine individual supplemental assessments for sites that are owned by the other Federal agencies. An item was also brought to the Board today regarding additional work on the environmental assessment and approved. Now a grant modification request will be submitted through the City's UASI Grant Administrator for consideration before giving the Environmental team the green light to move forward.
  - UASI – no action to UASI 2014-15

Committee Member Lt. Bob Davis asked about UASI 2011, 2012 and 2013 extensions have been put in for FEMA approvals; he wanted to know if anything was heard of that. Susy Orellana-Curtiss, LA-RICS Project Team, stated that LA-RICS has not heard anything regarding the extensions. A couple of weeks ago, at the Approval Authority Meeting, the Grant Administrator reported that they expected approval to come in the fall.

## VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Lt. Alex Radovic, LA County Sheriff's Department and LA-RICS Project, stated that he has a good understanding on how the LA-RICS project works, some of



the interoperability and technology issues, especially when it comes to it being a regional system. He is also on other LA-RICS advisory committees such as Legislative and Technical. The Operations and Technical Committees just had their meeting, and he has reviewed the ICIS/LA-RICS MOU next on the agenda. The Legislative Committee thought that, unless there was something legislative for them to deal with, they would refer to Tech/Ops Committee. The joint Tech/Ops Committee formed an Ad Hoc work group to consider how things are going to work and how the systems are interconnecting. Lt. Radovic stated that basically the matter comes down to funding. No one wanted to tackle the issue, but he hoped that Finance will talk about H.R. 3630 which requires Public Safety entities to vacate T-Band spectrum by 2021. LA-RICS has a migration plan to go to 700 MHz; ICIS at this point does not. The goal of this MOU is to integrate both of the systems together so we have one interoperable great system, probably by using an Inter Sub-System Interface (ISSI) to connect it. He does not feel there is a need for an MOU for the two systems to work together/interconnect. It was already established that both systems could be connected. He understands that ICIS is going to be building a P25 Phase Two compatible system, so that ICIS and LA-RICS can communicate with each other. But there is the issue of funding, and where should that funding be placed. He believes that from a reasonable and logical perspective, we see that one system that has a plan to meet the requirement to vacate the T-Band and one system hoping that H.R. 3630 somehow goes away. Basically you have LA-RICS on one side and ICIS on the other, with limited funding that is going to be dispersed from the UASI Approval Authority. Should money be put towards a system that in 2021, per law, is going to be obsolete? LA-RICS will have a 700 MHz system to which everybody can migrate. Lt. Radovic stated he has no problem providing funding for maintenance for the entities that operate on the T-Band now. But, do we really commit funds for a system to build infrastructure, towers, and other things which is not going to be usable after 2021. He believes it is the Committee's responsibility to set the path for interoperable communications for the future. No one really wants to deal with this issue, but the Committee needs to deal with this now. It is not a good investment to throw money at something that will not be there in the future and be obsolete. One system is banking on the repeal of H.R. 3630. HR 3630 is law. They are auctioning off spectrum; it is not going to be repealed. LA-RICS has a plan B. If you are going to put the money towards something, put it towards the future. He is not trying to sell LA-RICS; he is just stating what makes more sense. He would like to show the LA-RICS coverage compared to that of ICIS.

Lt. Alex Radovic asked Project Management representative Chris Odenthal if he could present a coverage map that showed the difference between the LA-RICS and ICIS systems. While Mr. Odenthal prepared to project the maps, Chair Geiger mentioned he had talked to members of the other Committees who suggested taking the analytical approach taken by the Technical/Operations to

go clause by clause in the MOU. Using this analytical approach by the Finance Committee is not quite as easy. UASI funding is what drives the MOU proposal. The matter is how to use it most effectively. The unarticulated premise is, “How does the UASI Approval Authority most effectively divvy up UASI funds to maximize interoperability in the region?” That is what the MOU is targeted to do. What is conspicuous in its absence is a budget for dollars associated with any proposed changes. In fact the clauses toward the end suggest that there will be a Technical Committee stood up in that it will be determined what actual implementation is necessary to effectuate this goal. It might make sense for this group to continue any report back or hold advisement to the Board of Directors until after we have reports back from Technical and Operations Committees so we have a greater visibility to what those changes might be and a better position to assess what costs might be associated with them.

Mr. Odenthal demonstrated the mapping; a Google Earth layout of LA County. What is seen on the screen is the location of ICIS sites throughout the County. ICIS maximizes coverage within their member agency’s footprint. Each city owns their own cell. The goal for each cell is to cover their location as good as possible. This is why we see clusters in particular areas; when one zooms in to Pasadena, Burbank, and Glendale. Approximately half of their sites are located right in those specific areas. What is seen when the map is spread out is a pretty significant lack of sites in South Bay and Area G (for the County). There is some talk of South Bay cities to join ICIS as it stands today. There are no sites currently in the South from an ICIS perspective. They have one site that is pointed into the northern desert which also does not provide the level of coverage that a public agency requires in that area. The only way to show the comparison is to overlay the system design of LA-RICS. What is not going to be seen is the architecture of the network, only site locations. He went on to demonstrate the LA-RICS design which showed broad coverage throughout the County region. The design does not include ten Forest Service sites under contemplation.

## **VII. ACTION ITEMS (C)**

### **C. DRAFT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) BETWEEN ICIS AND LA-RICS**

Chair Geiger stated that clause “C” in the proposed MOU suggests that any system, not only ICIS but any public agency system in the region could plug and play into this configuration. He does not want to encourage anything that would result in members opting out. In terms of centralization and control during surges that go on in times of first response, there is a need to establish priorities and is best done as a collective system rather than as many separate systems. It does



give him pause as to what the unintended consequences of that could be for the region and which will have a cost implication, as well.

Alternate Committee Member Lt. Davis directed everyone to the MOU and the comments from various agencies. For those who may not know, the UASI Board initiated this process. Ultimately they selected Judge Bonner to come in and figure out what was the best path moving forward fundamentally, not so much financially, and to put forward a system-of-systems approach, which historically has been proposed for many years. There are a lot of advantages and disadvantages. The point is to make an MOU that is essentially a starting point. The UASI Board wants to look at it from a funding point of view, asking where to put funds, not how much. It is just saying if we are going to put funding towards ICIS, then we want some agreement between ICIS and LA-RICS that they will be able to coexist. The goal is regional interoperability. That is a UASI Board's decision. He stated that the UASI Board is holding up funding waiting for the MOU to have some decision made. He recommended approving it so that the JPA Board could work on it to see if they want it or if they want to kick it back to one of the committees. Until they get that, they cannot really start that process.

Committee Member Gibson stated that she was under the impression that when the JPA was formed there were a lot of ICIS members in LA-RICS. But now that has changed. Chair Geiger stated that he also noted that and went on to recap that the ICIS stood up in 2002. ICIS, contract cities, other agencies, and County joined and stood up LA-RICS in 2009; 2011 LA-RICS went to contract. In 2014 some cities began dropping out of the JPA, including ICIS members.

Committee Member Gibson asked if only ICIS members or certain cities opted out. Executive Director Mallon stated that the ICIS cities that opted out are: Glendale Burbank, Pomona, Montebello, and Beverly Hills. Still in are the City of Pasadena and Culver City. Pasadena is operating their ICIS cell on 15 channels that are licensed to the County but loaned to them. Those channels are part of the LA-RICS system design. Committee Member Gibson followed up again on what she had previously asked. Conceptually she was opposed approving the MOU because the end goal would be to discourage members of ICIS from opting out. What does that mean as to whether the Committee approves or not approves the MOU? It seems to be a concept of let us work together so that those agencies that have opted out, and ultimately everybody, can enter into this process: so there can be interoperability amongst the region.

Chair Geiger stated that is why he had wanted to hold off on a recommendation to the Board until hearing back from the Operations and Technical Committees; whether or not interoperability can be done as a system-of-systems. That is why a JPA was formed. That's why he wants to hear from the subject matter experts.



Alternate Committee Member Davis stated that the Operations and Technical Committee had a meeting and had a few concerns, but basically they are forwarding this to the JPA Board.

Lt. Radovic stated that it was not accurate. Most of the items were tabled, with a fair amount of revisions. There is a Technical/Operations Ad Hoc Committee that was formed to go through all of the tabled items and decide how to modify/address those. For example, Item 10 was brought up, and from a technical standpoint it cannot be done. If a deputy is driving down the street in his Sheriff's car operating in an LA-RICS area he cannot change to an ICIS tower? According to Article 10, he cannot. Technically, it can be done but we cannot be on their system?

Chris Odenthal stated that it is not an easy question, but he is referring to the dual infrastructure that is in the MOU. Right now, ICIS' proposed edit is that you could not roam onto ICIS if you are on the LA-RICS. That is what their proposed edit refers to and is based on capacity. Each agency whether it is LAPD, the Sheriff's Department, LA County Fire Department, would stay on LA-RICS as long as there was coverage in that area for that network. ICIS is not proposing a limitation on constructing of any additional towers because they do not have the system capacity to handle LA-RICS users roaming onto their network. That is the limitation, and that is why you see they inserted language. They want to be able to control the capacity in their network because they need that capacity for their users. Therefore, you run into LA-RICS needing the same coverage displayed on the map because there is no capacity to roam into an ICIS network.

Committee Member Gibson asked if the national standard is to have everybody be P25 compliant? If everybody is required to be under the same standard, whatever is constructed is going to have to be able to communicate with each other and interconnect.

Chris Odenthal stated that the interconnection part allows both groups, ICIS and LA-RICS interoperability. An ICIS member can stay on their network, but can talk directly to someone on the LA-RICS network. Because they are set-up and tied together; each can stand alone, and each can function together, but only as long as the P25 standard is met.

Committee Member Gibson asked if they are able to communicate, what is the problem?

Lt. Radovic said that if he was in a situation in which he needed to connect to their system, but he is told that there are too many cars and cannot use their tower, he cannot connect. If he has to talk to their people and there is a major



event happening in that area, and trying to connect to their tower, Article 10 says he cannot.

Alternate Committee Member Lt. Davis questioned as to what is currently being done. Lt. Radovic stated that the Sheriff's Department can basically hand another department a radio and use his radio at their command post, and communicate anything he wants communicated on their system. That is how it is done now.

Lt. Davis stated that the Agreement addresses that. It essentially says that this is the beginning and there will be a Joint Technical Committee to work out all of those things and go to the UASI Board and spend the money no matter what you do. So at least there is influence, and hopefully through these different things, like the Finance Committee, the Joint Ops Committee, from both the JPA and ICIS. They have similar needs and concerns. What gets funneled into this committee and go to the Boards will say this is what we want to do. The committee is going to represent the interest of both LA-RICS and ICIS, according to the MOU.

Lt. Radovic asked Lt. Davis who oversees the UASI funding for FEMA right now.

Lt. Davis said that was the UASI Board. Committee Member Gibson said that the City of Los Angeles does not oversee it, they administer the funds. This was completely different than overseeing. But the UASI Approval Authority Board does oversee the funding and that is representative of different agencies.

Committee Member Cynthia Evans wanted clarification as to UASI withholding funding since they are the ones that created the MOU and that both parties get together and lay all this out. Are they going to hold this out until. Lt. Davis interjected and stated that he was sure that at some point funds would get released, but does not speak for them. He knows that they started this process and is sure they are waiting for an answer. His opinion is that if he were on any side, for or against, he would say that he would rather have some influence than wait so long that the time period passes and they are going to make some decisions anyway.

Chair Geiger stated that he hoped that the UASI application process and the Federal Grant Administrative Guidelines allowed LA-RICS, as a public agency to have a voice.

Susy Orellana-Curtiss stated that she attended both Legislative and the Joint Operations and Technical committee meetings prior to today's meeting. The edits that were made by Ops/Tech joint committees, were tabled for further discussion by formation of an ad-hoc committee. The overarching comment by





the Joint Ops/Tech Committee is that this agreement should not identify or stipulate items that are technical or operational in nature. That needs to be handled by the formation of Ops/Tech Committee between ICIS and LA-RICS.

The position voiced by both Ops/Tech and Legislative, is that this MOU should not dictate funding. This MOU should just establish that there will be an interconnection plan. The Ops/Tech committee of ICIS and LA-RICS will identify and work through the technical and operational issues. The item that required discussion at the Legislative Committee was H.R. 3630. The consensus from the Legislative Committee was this MOU should not dictate how funding is distributed. This is simply an MOU that is to establish being able to connect to two Systems. Mentioning HR3630 impacts funding of legacy vs. hybrid system, and since the MOU shouldn't dictate or impact funds being awarded, there is no reason to mention it.

There were a lot of the tabled items resulting from the Joint Ops/Tech Committee meeting. Once the report comes back from Ops/Tech Committee, we will see that this MOU will ensure interoperability in the region. LA-RICS and ICIS will form a Ops/Tech Committee that will address these points. That is really what is left in the MOU. A lot of these technical issues such as who makes the determination and who reports back to the Approval Authority were tabled for legal counsel to look at.

Chair Geiger stated that the Board of Directors will want to see the red line version of what comes back from the Ops/Tech Committee. He is curious to see it because, as it is written right now, there are cost implications, so much so that Article 10.f requires the ICIS and the LA-RICS Contractor to be in the room to issue change notices to comport with interoperable decisions that is handed down by Judge Bonner. He does not know what those cost implications are, but it gives him pause that by agreeing to the MOU, LA-RICS could be deferring that decision to the UASI Approval Authority Board. Certainly the UASI Approval Authority Board would finance those changes dollar on the dollar, but if there is an overage that the LA-RICS members are not able to pick-up, he believes that this is where this Committee's discussion appropriately tackles the heart of the funding plan.

Committee Member Gibson asked what the status of this MOU is in respect to the other committees. Are you are basically indicating that neither committee has adopted or denied or disapproved the MOU?

Susy Orellana-Curtiss stated said that Legislative Committee received and filed the MOU with no action taken, pending input from Ops/Tech Committees. Ops/Tech met this past Tuesday. They went section by section. Some sections were deferred to legal counsel, and some other sections were deferred to an ad-



hoc committee for further consideration. They do not have the redlined version that could be provided to the Board, yet. Committee Member Kay Fruhwirth asked whose redlined version is in the agenda. Ms. Orellana-Curtiss stated that at the Ops/Tech meeting they initially understood that it was representing ICIS edits. However, the Ops/Tech Committee we learned that not all were from ICIS but a combination of Judge Bonner and ICIS edits.

Committee Member Farfan asked if Judge Bonner drafted the first version of this MOU, the answer was yes.

Committee Member Doug Cline asked what is the benefit of doing the MOU when the outgrowth is years down the road and their system is compliant, what is the need for this now.

Executive Director Mallon stated that the cause of this is a request from the UASI Approval Authority, due to ICIS, and LA-RICS for applying for funding out of the investment justification dedicated to interoperable communications. ICIS is perusing funds to further expand on their system which then limits the ability of the LA-RICS to build a truly countywide system. Therefore, the request was made by then Chief McDonnell (now Sheriff), who was the Chief of Police in Long Beach. The concern from a funding perspective is that we are building out two systems, one over the top of the other. Committee Member Cline stated that it does not seem economical to do that. Executive Director Mallon agreed no. As to the concern that the ICIS system is built out on spectrum that Congressional mandates be auction off in 2021, ICIS is proceeding with the expectation that the Congress is going to recognize the error in their ways and is going to change that decision.

He went on to state that in the past four years he has met with Congressional offices and he senses that there is no appetite to change the law. At a recent spectrum auction completed this January 2015; \$44.9 billion was received by the Federal government for auctioning three small portions of spectrum. The T-Band is 42 MHz of spectrum, which is a big chunk of spectrum. The concern is that from a Federal standpoint there is significant financial value in forcing public safety off of those channels. That was the reason that the LA-RICS hybrid solution was developed. The hybrid system takes into consideration not having to replace all of existing radios before the end of their useful life.

Committee Member Cline asked what if cities opt out and join ICIS does that not complicate our cost-share even more? If the MOU is in place would they feel like they will still need to interact with LA-RICS?

Executive Director Mallon stated that the intent behind the LA-RICS has been to interface between the two systems. There will be interoperability as long as they



have spectrum. The issue that prompted us to look for a solution moving forward was that that spectrum is going to go away. So the question is, from a financial standpoint, do we invest in a system that will be obsolete.

Committee Member Cline stated that if the MOU goes through, in 2020 when they are a year out from it, then LA-RICS will have to pay for the upgrade of the ICIS system to get them P25 compliant. Would that be possible as well? Executive Director Mallon stated that they would have to change the frequency spectrum that they operate on.

Committee Member Dan Jordan understands why ICIS would want to enter into this MOU, but why would LA-RICS?

Susy Orellana-Curtiss stated statements have been made in the past that LA-RICS is building out a system not having a plan in place to make use of existing infrastructure, for example ICIS sites. This is not correct. Our technical team contacted ICIS to identify the infrastructure that could be used by the LA-RICS build-out. Requests were made for the use of that infrastructure to ICIS but the requests were denied. They contend that their infrastructure is not usable because their towers are fully loaded. There have also been misrepresentations that LA-RICS did not include the ISSI in the contract. LA-RICS does have a plan, and we did meet with Motorola and ICIS to develop an approach, and the ISSI is included in the executed agreement to build the Land Mobile Radio System. The MOU could serve to confirm all of this information, to avoid misrepresentations made at Approval Authority meetings, for example. Committee Member Jordan asked who was making this misrepresentation. Ms. Orellana-Curtiss stated that ICIS was. Committee Member Jordan stated that it was interesting that it was the same people that want to enter into this.

Committee Member Gibson stated that no one from ICIS was here, and was not sure if "misrepresentation" was the proper word to use. From her standpoint and also being on the Technical Committee, but even internally within City of the Los Angeles and their staff's technological expertise, there is an internal agreement within City of Los Angeles on moving forward with LA-RICS. She wants to be fair to ICIS since they are not here to defend themselves. She does not believe that any agency is intending to misrepresent anybody; all agencies are in this process because they want what is best for their agency. She cannot see anyone not being interested in the best for public safety. She believes that there may be a difference of opinion technologically and the direction that they should go in respect to ensuring interoperability. Committee Member Jordan stated that that was how he took Ms. Orellana-Curtiss' comment, not in any way suspicious or sneaky.



Committee Member Gibson asked for clarification on the Ops/Tech Committee, if they had also placed the item on hold and tabled it. Ms. Orellana-Curtiss said they had the item referred it to an Ad Hoc Committee to further address the tabled sections.

Chair Geiger asked if this should be tabled until they get a report back by the Ops/Tech committee at the Board of Directors meeting on September 10, 2015, then act subject to the direction of the Board of Directors.

Chair Geiger asked for a motion to approve, Committee Member Doug Cline motioned first, seconded by Committee Member Kay Fruhwirth. The Committee's consensus was unanimous. **MOTION APPROVED.**

Ayes 10: Roes, Gibson, Davis, Farfan, Geiger, Cline, Evan, Fruhwirth, Calleros, and Jordan.

## VII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (D)

### D. REVIEW AND RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET

Susy Orellana-Curtiss stated that the budget is before them one more time, reflecting an amendment to the Budget that was adopted by the Board at the August 6, 2015, Board Meeting. Having received actual expenditures in the LA-RICS 13<sup>th</sup> accounting period, one category changed relative to Grant Funded Expenditures, Contractors and Consultant Services. The amount for BTOP funding captured in FY 2014-15 has now increased, changing the amount remaining to be spent in this Fiscal Year from \$81.6 million to \$68.3 million. This is just to reflect a correction to the accounting of expenditures of FY2015-16 under the BTOP Grant (Summary Page is on page 8, Agenda Item D).

Committee Member Farfan stated that it was his understanding that UASI monies were set aside, but it still shows in the part of the Adopted Budget. Ms. Orellana-Curtiss stated that the Board actually adopted the Budget with the Project Team funded by UASI/SHSGP grants totaling \$2.485 million, with a requirement of a report back due in 90 days, conveying a response from FEMA regarding the question of supplanting. The budget also includes one other edit requested by the Board to identify which positions are specifically funded by UASI and SHSGP and how much. That is reflected on page 2 of 7.

Chair Geiger stated that he had two comments that he would like placed on record:



- One is a letter of support in answer to certain questions from CalOES that was submitted by Deputy Mayor Jeff Gorell, dated August 26, 2015.
- Secondly, there are staff items that are UASI funded in full or part. He has worked with LA-RICS staff and has pulled all of the MOU's for staff positions with LA County to ensure that they reflect no gaps and that, in fact, they were third-party contracts. They are not supplanted staff.

Committee member Fruhwirth asked if the supplanting issue was resolved. Chair Geiger stated that it has not been resolved yet. There have been continued discussions with the Grant Administrator. At this juncture, all of the questions that needed to be answered have been answered. LA-RICS will continue to work with the Mayor's office.

Ms. Orellana-Curtiss stated that the Board approval for the budget was for 90 days, specifically for the \$2.4 million identified as UASI/SHSGP funds for Project Team. Executive Director Mallon stated that there is a need to find a resolution during the month of September, because by the next JPA meeting on October 1, 2015, LA-RICS need to get approval for the remaining 9 months of the Fiscal Year for that specific line item.

Committee member Farfan asked if the action to be taken today is to adjust the BTOP line item. The answer was yes.

Alternate Committee Member Davis asked several questions that required Ms. Orellana-Curtiss to go over sections of the Adopted Funding Plan and clarify the numbers included in the Adopted Budget are in line with the Adopted Funding Plan line items of Member Funded JPA Operations and LTE Administrative Costs.

Chair Geiger asked for a motion to recommend approval. Committee Member Jordan motioned first, seconded by Committee Member Fruhwirth. The Committee's consensus was unanimous. **MOTION APPROVED.**

**VII. MISCELLANEOUS – (None)**

**V. PUBLIC COMMENTS – (None)**

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



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

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT and NEXT MEETING:**

Chair Geiger announced adjournment of this meeting at 2:19 p.m. The Committee's consensus was unanimous.

The next Committee meeting will take place on Thursday, September 24, 2015, at 1:00 a.m., at the same place, LA County Fire Department Headquarters.

**APPROVED**