



County of Los Angeles
**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OPERATIONS CLUSTER**

SACHI A. HAMAI
Chief Executive Officer

DATE: May 12, 2016
TIME: 1:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Room 830

AGENDA

Members of the Public may address the Operations Cluster on any agenda item by submitting a written request prior to the meeting.
Three (3) minutes are allowed for each item.

1. Call to order – James Blunt / Gevork Simdjian

- (A) **Board Letter – APPROVAL OF CONTRACT WITH EN POINTE TECHNOLOGIES AND USE OF ITF FUNDING FOR A COUNTY ENTERPRISE MOBILITY SUITE (EMS) SOLUTION**
CIO – Peter Loo or designee

- (B) **Board Letter – REQUEST FOR APPROVAL AND AWARD OF AS-NEEDED SMALL OFFICE EQUIPMENT REPAIR MASTER AGREEMENT**
ISD – Dave Chittenden or designee

- (C) **Board Letter – AGREEMENT WITH QUEST INFORMATION SYSTEMS FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE AND PROPOSITION B ELECTRONIC FILING SOLUTION**
RR/CC – Dean Logan or designee

- (D) **Board Letter – RECORDS MANAGEMENT AND ARCHIVE, BOARD POLICY NO. 3.040 and 3.041**
RR/CC – Dean Logan or designee

- (E) **Quarterly Report - RESIDENTIAL PACE**
TTC and ISD – Dave Chittenden or designee

2. Public Comment

3. Adjournment

May 31, 2016

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California

Dear Supervisors:

**APPROVAL OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FUND
FOR COUNTY ENTERPRISE MOBILITY SUITE SOLUTION AND EXECUTION OF
CONTRACT WITH EN POINTE TECHNOLOGIES

(ALL SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICTS) (3 VOTES)**

SUBJECT

The Chief Executive Office is requesting Board approval of a Contract for Microsoft's Enterprise Mobility Suite solution with En Pointe Technologies, a Microsoft Corporation reseller, and authorization to utilize \$1,146,551.60 from the County's Information Technology Fund to implement this Countywide Enterprise Mobility Suite solution.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Approve and instruct the Chair of the Board to execute a Contract (Agreement) with En Pointe Technologies for Enterprise Mobility Suite (EMS) solution. This Agreement will be effective upon execution by your Board as an annual subscription.
2. Delegate authority to the Chief Information Officer (CIO), or his designee, to execute Amendments to add or change certain terms and conditions in the Agreement as required by your Board or the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), with all actions subject to review by County Counsel.
3. Approve \$1,146,551.60 from the County's Information Technology Fund (ITF) to implement the Countywide EMS.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The ITF was established to fund countywide or multi-departmental technology projects that improve the delivery of services to the public, generate operational improvements to one or more departments or programs, and improve inter-departmental or inter-agency

collaboration. The ITF funds will be used to assist with the implementation of the EMS solution for the first year.

The CIO, or his designee is implementing the EMS Solution in an effort to establish a Countywide Mobility Management environment to manage its mobile devices (e.g., smartphones and tablets), applications, content and data. EMS will build upon the County's existing Microsoft Office 365 (O365) platform for all County departments to prevent unauthorized access to enterprise applications and/or County data on mobile devices. The EMS capabilities include password protection, encryption and/or remote wipe technology, which allows an administrator to delete all data from a reported lost/stolen device. County Information Technology (IT) security policy will be centrally deployed, managed and enforced to increase security compliance and reduce County risk from lost/stolen devices on various types/brands of mobile devices.

The initial phase (i.e., production validation) includes participation by five (5) County Departments. Upon completion of the initial phase, County departments will implement this solution for management of their mobile devices. This effort will reduce risks from lost/stolen mobile devices and to ensure appropriate security policies (e.g., software versions, password) are enforced; especially for those mobile devices that store regulated data (e.g., Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), Personally Identifiable Information (PII), and confidential or sensitive data.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING GOALS

The recommendation is consistent with the principles of County Strategic Plan Goal 1: Operational Effectiveness: maximize the effectiveness of processes, structure, and operations to support timely delivery of customer-oriented and efficient public services. It is also consistent with the principles of the County's Strategic Plan, Goal 3: Integrated Services Delivery: maximize opportunities to measurably improve client and community outcomes and leverage resources through the continuous integration of health, community, and public safety services.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

ITF is being requested to support the Countywide Mobility Management environment and to facilitate the EMS implementation that will fund software licenses for all participating departments, including professional services for a total cost of \$1,146,551.60 (Attachment A).

Due to the successful implementation of the County's O365 e-mail migration efforts and obtaining negotiated prices from the California County Information Services Directors Association (CCISDA) Master Agreement we are receiving Microsoft's lowest pricing level for all City and County customers in California. The total expenditure under the Agreement will not exceed \$2 million.

Funding for ongoing maintenance and support costs of EMS is already allocated within the participating department's existing perpetual mobility software purchases. There is no anticipated cost increase for this centralized EMS solution for departments where support is provided by the Internal Services Department. However, due to EMS being an annual subscription model, participating departments costs are based on their submitted number of required software licenses in this shared infrastructure.

FACTS AND PROVISIONAL/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

EMS will provide information security and privacy safeguards on mobile devices to facilitate compliance with County IT security policies, procedures and guidelines for maintaining the privacy and security of County information.

CONTRACTING PROCESS

On February 12, 2016, CIO released a Request for Bid (RFB) for EMS where seven Microsoft resellers responded accordingly. Consequently, on February 25, 2016, the County conducted a comprehensive, fair, and impartial evaluation of the bids received. As a result, the highest ranked and qualified reseller was selected.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

EMS is a countywide solution that will prevent unauthorized access to enterprise applications and/or County data on mobile devices, while establishing and maintaining a minimum information security and privacy baseline consistently across all County departments.

CONCLUSION

Upon your Board's approval, the Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors, is requested to return three (3) original signed copies of the agreement and one (1) adopted stamped Board Letter to the Chief Executive Office, Service Integration Branch, Office of the CIO.

Respectfully submitted,

Sachi A. Hamai
Chief Executive Officer

c: County Counsel
Executive Office, Board of Supervisors



JIM JONES
Director

County of Los Angeles INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

1100 North Eastern Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90063

Telephone: (323) 267-2103
FAX: (323) 264-7135

"To enrich lives through effective and caring service"

May 31, 2016

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

DRAFT

Dear Supervisors:

**REQUEST FOR APPROVAL AND AWARD OF
AS-NEEDED SMALL OFFICE EQUIPMENT REPAIR MASTER AGREEMENT
(ALL DISTRICTS - 3 VOTES)**

SUBJECT

Requesting Approval to award and execute seven As-Needed Small Office Equipment Repair Master Agreements (As-Need SOE Repair MA) and to execute additional master agreements with new contractors as they become qualified during the term of the Master Agreement, to provide small office equipment maintenance services for County departments.

RECOMMENDATION THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Authorize the Director, Internal Services Department (ISD), or his designee, to award and execute Master Agreements substantially similar to the attached standardized agreement (Attachment I) to the seven contractors listed on Attachment II to provide small office equipment repair service to departments countywide. The agreements will be effective July 1, 2016, for an initial term of three years, with two one-year extension options, and six month-to-month extensions.
2. Authorize the Director, ISD or his designee to: 1) execute agreements with new contractors as they become qualified pursuant to the open solicitation; 2) execute options to extend the Master Agreements; 3) execute applicable amendments should the original contracting entity merge, be acquired, or otherwise have a change of entity; 4) execute applicable amendments to add/delete small office equipment maintenance-related service categories, brands and items to the agreements as they become necessary to meet the County's needs; 5) execute individual services requests from end users; and 6) suspend or terminate agreements for the administrative convenience of the County.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

ISD maintains a pool of qualified contractors to provide small office equipment maintenance and repair services for all County departments. The recommended As-Need SOE Repair MAs will provide County departments with a centralized source and streamlined process to obtain a variety of as-needed repair services for desktop computers, fax machines, mailing equipment, printers, scanners, identification card printers, and other small office equipment. Approval of the recommended agreements will ensure County departments continued access to a pool of qualified contractors past the June 30, 2016 expiration date of the current agreements.

Recommendation number 2 requests that authority be delegated to the Director, ISD or his designee to execute agreements with newly qualified contractors; exercise renewal options; execute applicable amendments should the original contracting entity merge, be acquired, or otherwise have a change in entity; add or delete service categories, brands and items; execute service orders and; suspend or terminate agreements for administrative convenience.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

The recommended Master Agreement supports County Strategic Plan Goal Number 1, Operational Effectiveness, by effectively managing County resources to provide efficient and responsive small office equipment maintenance throughout the County.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

The Master Agreement does not guarantee any minimum amount of business and the County only incurs an obligation when work is performed. Expenditures resulting from these agreements vary each year based on departmental usage. For Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17, the services provided under the recommended contracts are estimated at approximately \$1.7 million in the aggregate (based on historical usage). Appropriation and funding for these services are included in each department's FY 2016-17 fiscal year budget based on each department's historical cost experience. It is each department's responsibility to utilize the agreements within their approved budget authority in the FY 2016-17 and subsequent fiscal years.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The Master Agreements were approved as to form by County Counsel. The agreements contain the Board's required contract provisions including those pertaining to consideration of qualified County employees targeted for layoffs, as well as qualified GAIN/GROW participants for employment openings, compliance with the Jury Service Ordinance, Safely Surrendered Baby Law and the Child Support program. ISD has determined that the

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
May 31, 2016
Page 3

proposed agreements are not subject to County Code 2.121 "Contracting with Private Business" and are therefore not subject to the County's Living Wage Program. Two of the seven recommended vendors are certified as Local Small Business Enterprises. A summary of the Community Business Enterprise Program information for all vendors is provided in Attachment III.

CONTRACTING PROCESS

On December 8, 2015, ISD released a Request for Statement of Qualifications (RFSQ) for As-Need SOE Repair MA and posted the solicitation and contracting opportunity announcements on the County's "Doing Business with Us" website (Attachment IV). Seven Statements of Qualifications (SOQ's) were received and reviewed for compliance with the RFSQ. The seven vendors listed in Attachment II were determined to be qualified and are being recommended for the Master Agreement. Additionally, 14 incumbent vendors have notified the County of their intent to submit an SOQ.

New vendors may qualify for a Master Agreement at any time during the term of the contract by submitting an SOQ. These contractors will be subsequently added to the Master Agreement provided they meet the minimum requirements identified in the RFSQ. Thereafter, departments may use a contractor of choice based on pricing, proximity, responsiveness and/or quality of service.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

Approval of the recommendations will ensure that ISD and County departments continue to receive small office equipment repair without a lapse in service.

CONCLUSION

The Executive Office, Board of Supervisors, is requested to return one stamped copy of the approved Board letter to the Director, ISD.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Jones
DIRECTOR, ISD

JJ:DC:JS:YY
Attachments (4)

c: Chief Executive Officer
Chief Operating Officer

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
May 31, 2016
Page 4

County Counsel



Dean C. Logan
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

DRAFT

March 29, 2016

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE CONTRACT WITH
QUEST INFORMATION SYSTEMS
FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE AND PROPOSITION B ELECTRONIC FILING SOLUTION
(ALL DISTRICTS) (3 VOTES)**

**CIO RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE () APPROVE WITH MODIFICATIONS ()
DISAPPROVE ()**

SUBJECT:

The Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (RR/CC) requests approval of a new contract with Quest Information Systems (Quest) for a Countywide web-based Campaign Finance and Proposition B Electronic Filing Solution (RR/CC Contract Number 15-006). This solution will be used for candidates, potential candidates, candidate controlled committees, treasurers, primarily formed committees, major donors, and independent expenditure committees to file their campaign finance disclosure statements, County forms, and California Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) forms as prescribed by the California Secretary of State (SOS) using an online website which is compatible with current web browsers including, but not limited to, Internet Explorer, Firefox, Chrome, and Safari.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Authorize the RR/CC or designee to execute a contract (Attachment I) with Quest to provide the RR/CC with a Campaign Finance and Proposition B Electronic Filing Solution. The contract term will commence upon Board approval and run for three initial consecutive years unless extended or sooner terminated as provided in the

contract. The contract contains two one-year and six one-month extension options, extensions shall be at the sole discretion of the County.

2. Delegate authority to the RR/CC or designee to prepare and execute amendments to extend the contract for up to two additional one-year periods and six one-month options for a maximum term of five years and six months.
3. Delegate authority to the RR/CC or designee to prepare and execute amendments to include new or revised contract provisions as required by your Board or Chief Executive Officer.
4. Delegate authority to the RR/CC or designee to amend the contract as necessary for optimal performance of the Campaign Finance and Proposition B Electronic Filing Solution with County Counsel review. Any cost increases will not exceed 10% of the contract sum over the term of the contract for a total maximum contract sum of \$1,041,425.00.
5. Delegate authority to the RR/CC or designee to terminate the contract for convenience.

PURPOSE / JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

The Department's Campaign Finance Section (CFS) enforces regulations and ensures compliance with applicable provisions of the Political Reform Act and the California Code of Regulations. The CFS also works closely with other agencies including the Los Angeles County District Attorney, Fair Political Practices Commission, Attorney General, Secretary of State, and the Franchise Tax Board.

The Proposition B Unit within the CFS ensures compliance with Los Angeles County Ordinance Chapter 2.190 related to Political Campaigns for County Office which is applicable to candidates for County offices of Assessor, District Attorney, Sheriff and the five (5) members of the Board of Supervisors.

A major provision of Prop B regarding Los Angeles County Ordinance Chapter 2.195 involves campaign disclosure filings which require candidates for County office, committees supporting or opposing those candidates, and committees supporting or opposing County ballot measures to file certain campaign statements electronically.

The Campaign Finance and Proposition B Electronic Filing Solution will serve as a replacement to the current Track Registrar-Recorder's Automated Campaign Contributions Electronic Reports (TRACCER) System. This new solution will increase efficiencies and enhance the overall filing experience for candidates and elected officials to file their campaign disclosure statements online and allow the public to view and search these statements on the Departmental website.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals:

This request supports the County Strategic Plan as follows:

1. Operational Effectiveness/Fiscal Sustainability: Maximize the effectiveness of processes, structure, operations, and strong fiscal management to support timely delivery of customer-oriented and efficient public services. The contract will provide candidates, potential candidates, candidate controlled committees, treasurers, primarily formed committees, major donors, and independent expenditure committees with an improved web-based solution to file their campaign finance disclosure statements, County forms, and California Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) forms.

FISCAL IMPACT / FINANCING:

The System will be funded by Net County Cost (NCC) and has been included in the Department's FY 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 budgets. The contract sum of \$946,750.00 over the five year, six month term includes maintenance and support services.

The contract provides Board delegated authority to the RR/CC or designee to increase the contract sum of \$946,750.00 up to 10% for a maximum amount of \$1,041,425.00 over the term of the contract.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS / LEGAL REQUIREMENTS:

Your Board is authorized to approve this contract with persons specially trained and experienced to perform the services described in this Board letter pursuant to California Government Code section 31000.

The proposed contract will commence upon approval by your Board for a period of three years unless extended or sooner terminated in whole or in part, with two one-year and six one-month extension options, for an aggregate term of five years and six months.

The contract contains Board required contract provisions including those pertaining to consideration of qualified County employees targeted for layoff, qualified GAIN/GROW participants for employment openings, as well as compliance with the Jury Duty Ordinance, the Safely Surrender Baby Law, and the Child Support Program.

The RR/CC has determined that provisions of the County's Living Wage Program (County Code Chapter 2.201) do not apply to this contract. Also, the RR/CC has determined that provisions of the County's Low-Cost Labor Resource Program (Board Policy 5.030) do not apply to this contract.

CONTRACTING PROCESS:

The RR/CC issued an Invitation for Bid (IFB) solicitation to allow qualified vendors an opportunity to compete for this contract.

On August 13, 2015, the RR/CC Contracts Section released the IFB for a Campaign Finance and Proposition B Electronic Filing Solution through the County's Open Bids and Solicitations website to individuals and/or companies under categories which included project management and inventory management. Additionally, IFB release letters were sent to all twenty-four viable service providers found on the SOS's "Vendors and Service Providers Approved for Electronic Filing in California" webpage.

On August 27, 2015, potential bidder Larsen and Toubro Infotech submitted a Solicitation Requirements Review. However, upon further review, the bidder's assertions were unfounded and the solicitation continued unimpeded.

The mandatory proposers' conference was held on September 17, 2015 with representatives from five prospective proposers in attendance: Fortuna BMC, Netfile, PCC Technology Group, SouthTech Systems, and Quest. Operations staff summarized the project's scope of work and Contracts staff went over IFB requirements, selection criteria, important terms and conditions in the sample contract, and completed a Q&A session. Proposals were due by 12:00 P.M. PT on September 29, 2015. Three proposals were submitted by the following companies: Netfile, PCC Technology Group, and Quest.

In an IFB solicitation, the lowest cost bid that meets the minimum requirements, and is responsive and responsible, is recommended for a contract award per the County of Los Angeles Service Contracting Manual. Quest was recommended for award because this vendor submitted the lowest price and the County deemed them responsive and responsible.

On November 4, 2015 the RR/CC sent a letter to Quest outlining our intent to recommend them for a contract award to your Board. On November 9th and 10th, 2015, the unsuccessful bidders submitted Notice of Intent to Request a Proposed Contractor Selection Review forms pursuant to the Los Angeles County Services Contract Solicitation Protest Policy No. 5.005. Negotiations were held related to the recommended bidder's exceptions to the sample contract which concluded on February 11, 2016. The RR/CC subsequently received a Letter of Intent from Quest on February 12, 2016 to provide services pending your Board's approval.

Once negotiations were completed, County Counsel reviewed the recommended bid for potential redaction prior to it being sent to the unsuccessful bidders as required under the Notice of Intent to Request a Proposed Contractor Selection Review forms. No further protests were received from the unsuccessful bidders.. The RR/CC recommends the contract be awarded to Quest.

The Chief Executive Office (CEO) Risk Management Branch has reviewed and concurs with the provisions relating to insurance and indemnification. The CEO has reviewed and approved this Board letter. The Chief Information Office (CIO) has reviewed and approved this Board letter as well as provided a formal CIO Analysis (Attachment II) since the recommended action includes new information technology related to the contract. County Counsel has reviewed this Board letter and has approved the attached contract as to form.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES:

Approval of the recommended action will provide the RR/CC an improved web-based Campaign Finance and Proposition B Electronic Filing Solution to file their campaign finance disclosure statements, County forms, and California Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) forms.

Respectfully submitted,

Reviewed by:

DEAN C. LOGAN
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

PETER LOO
Acting Chief Information Officer

DCL:RF:FP
DB:JW

Attachment

c: Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
Chief Executive Officer
Chief Information Office
County Counsel

DRAFT



PETER LOO
ATG CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

DRAFT

Office of the CIO CIO Analysis

NUMBER: CA 14-00	DATE: 5/5/2016
----------------------------	-------------------

SUBJECT:

RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE CONTRACT WITH QUEST INFORMATION SYSTEMS (QUEST) FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE AND PROPOSITION B ELECTRONIC FILING SOLUTION

RECOMMENDATION:

- Approve Approve with Modification Disapprove

CONTRACT TYPE:

- New Contract Sole Source
 Amendment to Contract #: Enter contract #. Other: Describe contract type.

CONTRACT COMPONENTS:

- Software as a Service Hardware
 Telecommunications Professional Services

SUMMARY:

Department Executive Sponsor: Dean C. Logan, Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Description: The Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk is requesting approval to execute a new contract with Quest for a hosted Campaign Finance and Proposition B Electronic Filing Solution.
Contract Amount: \$1,041,425 Funding Source: NCC/Department Budget
 Legislative or Regulatory Mandate Subvened/Grant Funded: 0

Strategic and Business Analysis

PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:

The primary goal for this project is to implement an externally hosted, web-based Campaign Finance and Proposition B Electronic Filing Solution. This system will provide candidates, candidate controlled committees, treasurers, primarily formed committees, major donors and independent expenditure committees with a web-based solution to file their campaign finance disclosure statements, County forms, and California Fair Politics Practices Commissions forms. The project goals and objectives are clearly defined and reasonable.

BUSINESS DRIVERS:

The key business driver is to implement a solution as prescribed by the California Secretary of State. The Department's Campaign Finance Section enforces regulations and ensures compliance with applicable provisions of the Political Reform Act and the California Code of Regulations.

RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE CONTRACT WITH QUEST INFORMATION SYSTEMS (QUEST)
 FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE AND PROPOSITION B ELECTRONIC FILING
 SOLUTION

CA 14-00

	<p>PROJECT ORGANIZATION:</p> <p>Dean Logan and Jeramy Gray are the project sponsors, and a project manager will be assigned to manage the implementation. The department will use existing resources to implement this solution. The project will be managed utilizing a project management plan and schedule.</p>
	<p>PERFORMANCE METRICS:</p> <p>In order to measure the success of the project, the team will use a project management plan and structured software testing methodologies.</p>
	<p>STRATEGIC AND BUSINESS ALIGNMENT:</p> <p>This Contract supports the County’s Strategic Plan in the areas of Operational Effectiveness and Fiscal Sustainability. The solution also aligns with the Department’s Business Automation Plan (BAP) objectives by improving the customer experience through efficient utilization of public facing web technologies. It further aligns with the BAP by reducing the local data center footprint through the adoption of cloud-based technologies.</p>
	<p>PROJECT APPROACH:</p> <p>The Department performed a buy versus build analysis to determine the most effective approach for this project. This analysis included a review of the current business processes and requirements to determine the feasibility of developing the system in house. The analysis also included a market scan to determine the maturity of current commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) solutions. Based on these evaluations, the Department selected the software-as-a-service model.</p>
	<p>ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED:</p> <p>RR/CC issued an Invitation for Bid (IFB) solicitation for this solution. Three proposals were submitted by Netfile, PCC Technology Group and Quest. Based on the guidelines of the County’s IFB process, the Quest solution was selected.</p>
<p>Technical Analysis</p>	<p>ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED IT SOLUTION:</p> <p>The new web-based solution will replace the Department’s current legacy system, which has reached end of life. The Department believes that the current system is at risk of technical failure during critical election activities. The new solution will increase efficiencies and enhance the overall filing experience for candidates and elected officials to file their disclosure statements on-line. It will also allow the County to continue promoting transparency by allowing the public to view and search disclosure statements through a web interface.</p>

RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE CONTRACT WITH QUEST INFORMATION SYSTEMS (QUEST)
 FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE AND PROPOSITION B ELECTRONIC FILING
 SOLUTION CA 14-00

Financial Analysis	<p>BUDGET:</p> <p>Contract costs</p> <p>One-time costs:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Services \$ 695,750</p> <p>Ongoing annual costs:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Software \$ 251,000</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Sub-total Contract Costs: \$ 946,750</p> <p>Total one-time costs: \$ 695,750</p> <p>Total ongoing annual costs: \$ 251,000</p> <p>The solution will be funded by Net County Cost (NCC) and has been included in RR/CC's budget. The contract sum of \$946,750 over the term includes maintenance and support. The initial term is three years, followed by two one-year and six one-month extension options. The Board Letter requests delegated authority to the RR/CC or designee to increase the contract sum up to 10% for a maximum of \$1,041,425 over the contract term.</p>
Risk Analysis	<p>RISK MITIGATION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inherent in any externally hosted system is the risk associated with the breach of confidential or sensitive data. 2. The Department is currently working with Quest to ensure that the County's Security/Privacy Vendor Assessment Questionnaire has been satisfactorily completed, and approved by the Chief Information Security Officer.
CIO Approval	<p>PREPARED BY:</p> <p style="margin-top: 20px;"> Henry Balta 5/5/16 </p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Sr. Associate CIO Date</p> <hr/> <p>APPROVED:</p> <p style="margin-top: 20px;"> Peter Loo, Acting County CIO Date </p>

Please contact the Office of the CIO (213.253.5600 or info@cio.lacounty.gov) for questions concerning this CIO Analysis. This document is also available online at <http://ciointranet.lacounty.gov/>



DEAN C. LOGAN
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

June 7, 2016

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE REVISED BOARD POLICY NO. 3.040,
REGARDING COUNTY RECORDS MANAGEMENT AND ARCHIVE AND CREATE
NEW BOARD POLICY NO. 3.041 REGARDING THE PROTECTION OF RECORDS
CONTAINING PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION
(ALL SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICTS) (4 VOTES)**

SUBJECT

The Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk ("RR/CC") seeks approval of revised Board Policy No. 3.040 which involves the approval of the County General Records Retention Schedule and 36 Departmental Records Retention Schedules. Such approval will establish minimum retention periods for Official County records. Upon approval, these schedules will serve as the record retention schedules for each County department/agency and will supersede any other retention schedule currently in use.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Approve revised Board Policy No. 3.040 (Attachment I) General Records Retention and Protection of Records Containing Personal and Confidential Information by changing title to "Records Management and Archive of County Records" in order to support application of the record retention schedules.
2. Approve new Board Policy No. 3.041 (Attachment II) Protection of Records Containing

3. Approve the County General Records Retention Schedule ("GRRS") (Attachment III).
4. Approve the Departmental Records Retention Schedules ("DRRS") (Attachment IV) for the following departments/agencies: Agricultural Commissioner/Weights and Measures; Alternate Public Defender; Animal Care and Control; Arts Commission; Assessor; Auditor-Controller; Beaches and Harbors; Chief Executive Office; Child Support Services; Children and Family Services; Community and Senior Services; Consumer Affairs; Medical Examiner-Coroner; County Counsel; District Attorney; Executive Office of Board of Supervisors; Fire; Health Services; Human Resources; Internal Services; Mental Health; Military and Veteran Affairs; Museum of Art; Museum of Natural History; Parks and Recreation; Probation; Public Defender; Public Health; Public Library; Public Social Services; Public Works; Regional Planning; Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk; Sheriff; and Treasurer and Tax Collector (Attachment IV).
5. Approve Resolution (Attachment V) authorizing County departments to use the County record retention schedules and to destroy old, duplicate or reproduced Official Public Records.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

On October 3, 2006, your Board approved revised Policy No. 3.040 General Record Retention and Protection of Records Containing Personal and Confidential Information to establish guidelines for retaining Official Public Records, describe personal and confidential information and steps to protect such data, and mandate safeguards for the destruction of confidential records. These record retention guidelines were intended to remain in place until your Board approved the general retention schedules for common administrative Official Public Records applicable to all County departments, as well as retention schedules specific to the Official Public Records maintained by individual departments.

In April of 2013, Section 2.32.370 of the County Code was amended to direct the RR/CC to develop and administer a comprehensive county-wide records management program. As part of this directive, the RR/CC has consulted with County departments to develop a general as well as department specific record retention and disposition schedules for your Board's approval. Revised Board Policy No. 3.040, Records Management and Archive of County Records, sets forth these new record retention guidelines and how the retention schedules are to be used.

Record Retention Schedules

The GRRS relates to the retention and destruction of Official Public Records that are commonly produced county-wide. In order to produce a comprehensive general schedule, the RR/CC engaged all 36 County departments for their perspective and expertise. Through a focused and deliberative process, the RR/CC considered the feedback of all departments in authoring a schedule that provides an operationally appropriate retention period for County Official Public Record which is consistent with law.

The RR/CC has also coordinated the review and update of all Departmental Records Retention Schedules (DRRS). These schedules are meant to provide the authority for retention and disposition of Official Public Records unique to each department. Each schedule has been reviewed and approved by the respective Department Head..

These retention schedules are applicable to all Official Public Records regardless of the medium in which they are created or stored. Any future amendments to these schedules must be approved by the RR/CC under the authority provided for in Title 2, Administration, Section 2.32.370 of the County Code.

Recommended Revisions to County Policy 3.040

To support the application of these retention schedules, the RR/CC recommends revisions to County Policy 3.040. Additional materials are currently in development to further support and educate County departments in efficient records management and archiving practices.

All proposed changes are the culmination of a multi-departmental collaboration with the purpose of enhancing the overall effectiveness of Board Policy No. 3.040 through the formalized adoption of the County's first record retention schedules. Additionally, in concurrence with the County's Chief Information Security Officer, discussions have focused on providing more detailed content and guidance for the effective management of County Official Public Records and archival material. Also, these discussions have focused on the bifurcation of content within the existing policy to separate topics related to the management of County records management and archive from the topics related to the protection of personal and confidential information. Therefore, this bifurcation has resulted in the recommended creation of Board Policy No. 3.041 Protection of Records Containing Personal and Confidential Information.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

This request supports the County Strategic Plan Goal No. 1: Operational Effectiveness/Fiscal Sustainability, "Maximize the effectiveness of processes, structure, operations and strong fiscal management to support timely delivery of customer-oriented and efficient public services."

Upon approval of these schedules and policy revisions, departments will be required to follow a universal standard in the discharge of their records management and archives responsibilities, including the retention and disposition of Official Public Records.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING:

Financial relief to the County is expected as routine disposal of redundant, obsolete Official Public Records and non-records (transitory communications) will reduce the County's physical and digital storage demands required under inconsistent and/or non-existent disposition practices in the digital age. Furthermore, enhanced/streamlined management of electronic transitory communications will also reduce the costs associated with unnecessary or excessive digital storage and maintenance.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS:

Pursuant to Government Code section 26202, the Board of Supervisors may, by four-fifths vote, authorize the destruction of County Official Public Records, regardless of medium, where those Official Public Records have been maintained for the minimum period of time and prepared/received pursuant to State statute or County Charter. Upon your Board's approval of the attached resolution, the record retention schedules will serve as guidelines for departments to retain their respective Official Public Records and destroy them at the appropriate time. Additionally, approval of the resolution will also authorize departments, where appropriate and permissible, to reproduce (e.g., digitize) their Official Public Records, for County or public use, with any medium that is a trusted system which accurately reproduces the original; does not permit additions, deletions, or changes to the original, and complies with Government Code section 12168.7. Properly reproduced Official Public Records may be destroyed after a trustworthy digital surrogate is created and maintained per the County's record retention schedules.

In October 2014, an Official Public Records and Trusted Systems committee comprised of key departments was formed by the RR/CC to advocate/publish trusted system standards and establish a compliance process to certify trusted systems throughout the County.

These standards will guide individual departments who desire to reproduce their Official Public Records through a trusted system that complies with Government Code section 12168.7. Upon the Board's approval of the referenced drafted policies, this committee will continue to provide oversight of the Program and supporting the departments' efforts.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES:

As County departments improve the organization of Official Public Records, several enhancements to County efficiency and service will result, specifically in the records management areas of security, preservation, and customer service.

CONCLUSION:

Approve revised Board Policy No. 3.040 (Attachment I) General Records Retention Approval of Attachment I - Revised Board Policy No. 3.040, Attachment II - new Board Policy No. 3.041, Attachment III - General Records Retention Schedule, Attachment IV - 36 Departmental Records Retention Schedules, and Attachment V - Resolution (Attachment V) authorizing County departments to use the County record retention schedules and to destroy old, duplicate or reproduced Official Public Records, will support the County's responsibility in the creation/receipt, use, retention, and disposition of Official County records in an efficient, cost-effective and legally compliant manner.

Respectfully submitted,

Dean C. Logan
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

DCL:DM:TLS:es

Attachments

c: Chief Executive Office
County Counsel

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES APPROVING THE COUNTY'S RECORDS RETENTION SCHEDULES AND AUTHORIZING THE DESTRUCTION OF COUNTY RECORDS

WHEREAS, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") previously approved the County of Los Angeles' records retention/destruction policy; and

WHEREAS, the County of Los Angeles ("County") needs to insure the preservation and availability of historical documents and other official papers and artifacts of the County; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of a retention schedule is to establish a pattern for the orderly transfer, maintenance, and destruction of records on a continuing basis; and

WHEREAS, the County has an on-going obligation to maintain County records in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and accepted records management practices; and

WHEREAS, Government Code section 26200 et seq. provides the relevant procedures for destroying records that do not have to be filed or preserved; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code section 26201 the Board may authorize destruction of duplicate records, papers, or documents of originals or permanent reproductions which are on file with any officer or department of the County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code section 26202, the Board may authorize, by a majority vote, the destruction of records after two years which are not prepared or received pursuant to State statute or County Charter; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code section 26202 the Board may authorize, by four-fifths vote, the destruction of records after two years which are

prepared or received pursuant to State statute or County Charter and the Board has determined the retention of those records are no longer necessary or required for County purposes; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code sections 26205 and 26205.1 the Board may delegate to County officers the authority to destroy any record, paper, or document if the record, paper, or document is photographed, micro photographed, microfilmed, or otherwise reproduced in accordance with Government Code section 12168.7; and

WHEREAS, the County's retention schedules will be reviewed regularly by the respective County department head, in consultation with County Counsel, and approved by the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk ("RR/CC"); and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles approves the revised record retention/destruction policy, known as Board Policy No. 3.040 Records Management and Archive of County Records, and the County General Records Retention Schedule as well as the Department Records Retention Schedules and authorizes:

(1) County departments to destroy duplicate records, papers, or documents of originals or permanent reproductions which are on file with any office or department of the County.

(2) County departments to destroy any record, paper, or document, including originals or permanent reproductions, which do not have to be filed or preserved, once they have been retained for the total period set forth under the applicable records

retention schedule and those records are no longer necessary or required for County purposes.

(3) County departments to destroy any record, paper, or document, which is not required by law to be preserved in its original format, if the record, paper, or document is reproduced, for County or public use, with the use of photographic or micro-photographic film, optical disks, an electronic data processing system, or any other medium that is a trusted system which accurately reproduces the original, does not permit additions, deletions, or changes to the original, and complies with Government Code section 12168.7 and Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 22620.1 through 22620.8.

(4) Department heads to amend their respective departments' record retention schedules, in consultation with County Counsel and approval by RR/CC, so long as the amendment complies with state law.

(5) The RR/CC to preserve historically valuable materials which document the origins, activities, and achievements of the County.

The foregoing resolution was on the _____ day of _____ 2016, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and ex officio the governing body of all other special assessment and taxing districts, agencies and authorities for which said Board so acts.

LORI GLASGOW
Executive Officer
Board of Supervisors

By _____
Deputy

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

MARY C. WICKHAM
County Counsel

By _____
VICKI KOZIKOUJEKIAN
Principal Deputy County Counsel
Board Liaison Division

VK

DRAFT



JIM JONES
Director

County of Los Angeles INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

1100 North Eastern Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90063

Telephone: (323) 267-2103
FAX: (323) 264-7135

"To enrich lives through effective and caring service"

May 12, 2016

To: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, Chair
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: Dave Chittenden
Chief Deputy Director

Joseph Kelly
Treasurer and Tax Collector

QUARTERLY REPORT ON COUNTY RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY ASSESSED CLEAN ENERGY (PACE) PROGRAM PROGRESS, CONSUMER PROTECTIONS AND PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

Background

On December 31, 2015, the Internal Services Department (ISD) and the Treasurer & Tax Collector (TTC) issued a report to your Board in response to issues raised about the residential PACE program at the November 3, 2015 Board Meeting. In that report, ISD and TTC indicated their intent to report back quarterly throughout 2016 on the status of the program and these improvements.

It is important to note that effective January 2016, we instituted a monthly in person meeting with an executive representative of each of the two Program Administrators, Renovate America/HERO and Renew Financial/CaliforniaFIRST. In certain instances, when an issue has warranted it, we have conducted teleconferences to disposition a matter apart from the regular meeting cycle. We also conducted site visits to each of the Program Administrator's offices. Collectively, these steps have helped to increase our level of understanding of each of the Program Administrator's administrative and compliance processes, particularly related to their disposition of consumer complaints and their monitoring of their contractor networks. We have committed to continue this partnership of communication at this executive level through the remainder of this calendar year, and further if warranted. This focus on executive level dialogue and program oversight has served to complement, not replace efforts at the staff level, and it has improved the overall coordination among the ISD, the TTC and the Program Administrators.

Program Progress Update

The County's residential PACE program continues to show market demand and growing participation. Relevant statistics are indicated in the table below.

DESCRIPTION: The data within this report is compiled from the two program administrators: Renovate America/HERO and Renew Financial/California First.					
PROGRAM DATA: (As of 03-31-2016)					
Applications Submitted	Applications Approved By ISD	Value Approved by ISD (\$)	Completed Projects	Value of Completed Projects (\$)	Avg. Value of Completed Projects (\$)
31,879	15,300	\$364,000,000	9,801	\$217,448,192	\$22,186
BY SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT:					
Supervisorial District	Applications Approved By ISD	Completed Projects	Value of Completed Projects (\$)	Avg. Value of Completed Projects (\$)	
District 1	2,807	1,596	\$33,573,00	\$21,076	
District 2	3,254	2,048	\$46,865,000	\$22,883	
District 3	2,397	1,400	\$36,008,000	\$25,720	
District 4	3,543	2,523	\$52,721,000	\$20,896	
District 5	3,574	2,234	\$48,266,000	\$21,605	

An emphasis in the December 31, 2015 report was on enhancing consumer protections and implementing improvements in the County's administrative processes. The table below indicates the total number of complaints received by the PACE Program Administrators since the program launch in June of 2015. The table also indicates the nature of the complaints and how the complaints have progressed through the complaint resolution processes.

COMPLAINT TRACKING: (As of 03-31-2016, due to variances in reporting, some resolution durations are estimated)

Complaint Type	Number of Complaints	Average Days Until Resolution	Closed in 7 or Less Days	Closed in 8-14 Days	Closed in 15+ Days	Still Unresolved
Contractor Conduct	59	11	32	4	23	7
Multiple Issues	10	19	3	3	4	0
Contracting/Financing Process	107	9	70	15	22	8
Terms of Financing	209	11	103	34	72	36
Project Workmanship	323	13	153	76	94	62
Grand Total	708	12	---	--	---	114

The definitions used in the table above are explained here.

Complaint: A call received by the PACE Program Providers citing a specific issue that required escalation for resolution.

Resolution: The PACE Program Provider has acted on the complaint and received verification from the original caller that they are satisfied with the action.

Unresolved: The PACE Program Provider and the original caller are still discussing resolution.

The number of complaints expressed as a percentage of applications approved by ISD (15,300) is 4.6%, While we do not have a benchmark against which we could compare these statistics, each Program Administrator has established a reasonable consumer complaint investigation and disposition process, as required under the contract, which we reviewed on each of the site visits.

Consumer Protection and Program Improvements

In the December 31, 2015 report, we proposed the following actions in our continued efforts to enhance program oversight and consumer protections:

Review Marketing Materials to Limit Risks of Inability to Pay

Concerns were raised at the November 3, 2015 Board meeting regarding Program Administrator marketing materials and advertisements that used the County seal, that implied time constraints existed on applying for a PACE assessment, and that indicated the amount of financing available to a homeowner under PACE. As a result, ISD directed to both program providers that direct marketing and outreach mailings must be approved by ISD, TTC and the CEO Public Information Officer. Also, the Program Administrators were advised that they could not use the County seal in direct marketing and outreach without Board approval to do so (as recommended by County Counsel after the Board meeting). To date there have been no requests for this approval.

Additionally, we recommended a review and approval of all contractor marketing materials. However, the Program Administrators stated that they do not review all contractor marketing materials given the high volume of contractors enrolled in their programs and the rapid change in contractor marketing approaches. Rather, each Program Administrator issues contractor marketing guidelines, which are reviewed and approved by our offices. If a contractor fails to comply with the guidelines and that comes to the attention of the Program Administrator, each will review the matter and impose a corrective action which may include formal discipline of the contractor. In the few instances in which our offices became aware of such matters and referred them to one of the Program Administrators for review, the corrective action plan was developed timely and appeared reasonable.

Consumer Protections in All Phases of a PACE Project

PACE program providers have implemented senior advocacy processes within their respective programs to address specific concerns about seniors being targeted or oversold on PACE projects.

Also, in anticipation of questions and other inquiries that could arise when the PACE assessments appear on the 2016-2017 Annual Secured Property Tax Bills that the Tax Collector will mail in October 2016, both Program Administrators plan to send a notice to each homeowner who will have a PACE assessment reminding the homeowner that the homeowner elected to have the project's costs repaid over time through an assessment on the Annual Secured Property Tax Bill. The Tax Collector has reviewed and approved each notice.

Automating the County's review of the application process to free staff resources to review transactions that fall outside acceptable ranges and identify trends that indicate degradation of consumer protections.

Assessment Contract review: In November 2015, ISD reported that implementation of the electronic transfer of data and the development of programs to automate the review of assessment contracts was 'imminent'. Unanticipated technical issues and the need to

formalize this data transfer as a contractual agreement delayed the completion of this effort. ISD and Renovate America executed a Data Transfer Agreement in March 2015, which provides Assessment Contract information and detailed technical information about the improvement measures requested. Initial data transfers have been completed and ISD has confirmed the accuracy of the data. Programming work to automate the review of assessment contracts is expected to be completed in mid-May.

The Assessment Contract information described above omits other, key datasets about homeowners, property underwriting evaluations, and other information gathered and archived under different data systems. This was because the initial request was to only automate the assessment contract review process and to allow analyses of contractor behaviors and home improvement pricing trends.

ISD has requested each Program Administrator to consider a transfer of all the data collected with the exception of personally identifiable information (PII) or Sensitive Personal Information (SPI). This will allow ISD to establish a set of criteria that, when triggered during the assessment contract process, would invoke further analysis of the application by the Program Administrator or ISD. This could include the examples quoted in the December report, such as a senior, age 65 or older who has requested more than 50% utilization of the available credit line disclosed to him or her. A response has been requested by May 6, 2016 and if agreeable, changes to the aforementioned Data Transfer Agreement will be executed.

Branding the County's PACE website, LAPACE.org, as a County-sanctioned information one-stop on PACE.

The LAPACE.org website has been modified and is being referenced and offered to the public as a County-sanctioned source for PACE information on program risks, repayment of the project costs through the annual property tax bill, and information on various consumer protection measures, including dispute resolution processes. We have requested that each Program Administrator reference the website on all their marketing materials that are specific to Los Angeles County, and that they revise the marketing guidelines for their contractor networks to require the same.

Establishing and funding a position in Consumer and Business Affairs focused on handling PACE inquiries and complaints, and passing information to ISD related to Program enhancements for review and possible implementation.

ISD has established a positive dialogue with the Department of Consumer and Business Affairs (DCBA) about certain program matters. However, initial efforts by ISD focused on establishing a County-maintained PACE consumer hot-line (877-785-2237) and meeting with the Program Administrators to understand their processes related to reviewing and

dispositioning consumer complaints on the various issues listed in the table above. Because of the low number of complaints and the high percentage of complaints resolved, ISD has not pursued a more formal role for the DCBA in this area. ISD will continue to monitor this on an ongoing basis.

Development of Industry Best Practices

The County's two Program Administrators have undertaken efforts to develop Industry Best Practices related to PACE consumer protection standards, ostensibly for adoption by PACE Program Administrators statewide. This represents their effort to develop high, consistent standards across the PACE industry. On March 22, 2016 your Board directed ISD to determine and report back in 60 days how the County could implement Industry Best Practices throughout the County for all residential PACE providers, including those that are offering residential PACE programs to cities within the County, operating under other PACE administrative contracts; i.e. programs where the County has no control over program administration, implementation, and consumer protections.

While ISD will respond to this motion timely, ISD is also reviewing its existing Agreement with the two PACE providers to implement elements of the Industry Best Practices into those agreements.

The existing PACE provider Agreements will be amended to include additional program requirements especially around PACE provider marketing and outreach, contractor marketing and outreach management, provision of PACE project data, and enhanced consumer protections actions and reporting. ISD expects to implement these changes into the existing PACE provider Agreements by June 1, 2016.

ISD Staffing Adjustments for Improved Administration of the PACE Program

As the program has grown, it became apparent that staffing changes were needed to separate ongoing operational duties from financial and administrative management responsibilities. To that end, ISD is realigning financial processes from the County Officer of Sustainability (COS) to ISD's Administration and Finance Service (AFS) and is requesting additional staffing to handle increased workload in FY 2016-17 budget.

Also, effective May 9, 2016 ISD is allocating an internal resource to provide needed contract compliance monitoring. We are also adding a resource to provide overall PACE Program Management for ISD. None of these changes will incur any cost to the County as they will be funded from the administrative fees collected from the Program Administrators.

Bond Authority

It is noteworthy that the total dollar value of financed projects plus projects that have already been approved is approaching the program's current bond authority limit of \$500 million. A request to increase this limit will be brought to your board in the near future. However; as mutually agreed upon by ISD and TTC, the amount of this increase may be limited until the program enhancements discussed in this report are implemented and, if program quality and protection concerns are not ensured to the Board's, ISD's or TTC's satisfaction, the County residential PACE program may be slowed over the short term.

Conclusion

Consumer protection and contractor compliance are this program's highest priorities. The steps taken since program inception, and the additional steps being implemented and considered have contributed to the program's relatively successful accomplishments to date. However, we will continue to focus on ensuring long-term program quality and a positive consumer experience, all within a consumer's ability to repay the project's costs through the Annual Secured Property Tax Bill.

We will continue to report to your Board on a quarterly basis through the calendar year 2016 on the status of the PACE program.

Should you have any questions, please contact Dave Chittenden at (323) 267-2103, or via email dchittenden@isd.lacounty.gov. You may also contact Joseph Kelly at (213) 974-2101, or via email at jkelly@ttc.lacounty.gov.

DC:JK:HC:sg

c: Assessor
ISD Board Deputies
Chief Executive Officer
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
Auditor-Controller
County Counsel
Consumer and Business Affairs
Public Information Officer