County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OPERATIONS CLUSTER

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

DATE: June 5, 2014
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 – Gevork Simdjian

A) **Board Letter – AUTHORIZATION TO ACCEPT CALIFORNIA PAY FOR SUCCESS INITIATIVE AWARD**
CEO CFWB – Antonia Jiménez or designee

B) **Board Letter – ELECTRONIC PERMITTING AND INSPECTIONS SYSTEM FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES (EPIC-LA)**
DRP/CIO – Richard Bruckner and Richard Sanchez or designee(s)

C) **Board Letter – DEPARTMENT OF TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR REVISION TO THE ANNUAL TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR INVESTMENT POLICY**
TTC – Mark Saladino or designee

D) **Risk Management Presentation**
A/C – John Naimo or designee

E) **Upcoming IT Items**
CIO – Richard Sanchez or designee

2. Public Comment

3. Adjournment

County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
http://ceo.lacounty.gov

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

DRAFT

June 17, 2014

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

Dear Supervisors:

AUTHORIZATION TO ACCEPT CALIFORNIA PAY FOR SUCCESS INITIATIVE AWARD (ALL SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICTS) (3 VOTES)

SUBJECT

Request approval to accept the California Pay for Success (CA PFS) Initiative Award designed to provide technical assistance to support Los Angeles County's effort in the development of a Pay for Success Blueprint.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD:

1. Approve the acceptance of up to $300,000 for a California Pay for Success (CA PFS) Initiative Award from the Nonprofit Finance Fund which includes $200,000 that would be paid directly to Third Sector Capital Partners to provide best practices, help document benefits and risks, and provide general information on how these initiatives are being financed by other jurisdictions. If the Board approves the Blueprint, $100,000 will be used to conduct data analysis and establish a performance baseline for a selected Pay for Success initiative.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

On October 15, 2013, your Board directed the CEO to convene an Advisory Group with external PFS financing experts and County departments to develop a blueprint that includes: criteria for selection of a PFS intervention; contractual and financing guidelines; and recommendations for changes to County policies and procedures that would be required for implementation. The Blueprint Committee has done a significant amount of work establishing the framework for how the County, if approved by the

Board, can move forward in selecting an intervention and implementing a Pay for Success Initiative. Third Sector Capital Partners has provided technical assistance to many jurisdictions on such areas as: conducting a comprehensive cost benefit analysis; reviewing samples of financing models used by other jurisdictions; and providing information to establish projected savings associated with the selected intervention.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

The recommended actions support the Countywide Strategic Plan Goals: Goal 1: Operational Effectiveness; Goal 2: Fiscal Sustainability; and Goal 3: Integrated Services Delivery.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

CA PFS funding will disbursed in Two Phases. A total of $125,000 is proposed for Phase I for the development and approval of a blueprint; and $175,000 in Phase II for the selection and implementation of a PFS intervention. There is no impact on the County general fund.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Since the Board's October, 2013, motion, the PFS Blueprint Committee has worked diligently to develop a blueprint for your Board's consideration. In its work, the Committee has learned that the financing of PFS initiatives is unique and complex, requiring expertise that members of the Committee do not have.

To educate itself on the intricacies of PFS initiatives and their financing, the Committee explored efforts underway by other jurisdictions. In California, Santa Clara County currently has a Request for Proposal underway for one PFS initiative and is in the advanced planning stages for the release of another. It has obtained the Third Sector to assist with those efforts, particularly with structuring the financing of its initiatives and assisting with the finance community.

In February, 2014, the Nonprofit Finance Fund announced a $2.5 million funding opportunity to catalyze innovative approaches to paying for improved social services throughout California. NFF announced that it intended to select 3-8 leaders from the government or social service sector who are working to create, structure and close PFS agreements in their communities. The selected cohorts, of which the County is one subject to your Board's approval, are to receive financial, technical and other assistance to launch PFS projects.

The County's application emphasized the need for expert support to finalize the blueprint for your Board's consideration, particularly with respect to financing models for a potential PFS initiative. On that basis, the County's application was selected for funding.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES

Approval of the recommended actions will enable the CEO to develop a Blueprint, and identify and implement, after Board approval, PFS Intervention Initiatives.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Director

WTF:AJ:

Attachments (?)

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel

Pay for Success Initiative Award.bl

Richard J. Bruckner
Director

June 24, 2014 DRAFT

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

Dear Supervisors:

ELECTRONIC PERMITTING AND INSPECTIONS SYSTEM FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ("EPIC-LA")
(ALL DISTRICTS) (3 VOTES)

SUBJECT

Award a two-year contract to Tyler Technologies Inc. (Contractor), in the sum not to exceed ________________ to provide a commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) solution for the Electronic Permitting and Inspections System for the County of Los Angeles (EPIC-LA), formerly known as "PALMS."

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD:

1. Approve and instruct the Chair to execute the attached two-year contract between the County of Los Angeles and the Contractor, effective the day after Board's approval, with up to two one-year renewal options at a contract sum not to exceed $______________ plus ten percent contingency ($_______) for unforeseen additional work.

2. Authorize the Director of Planning or designee to increase the contract award by an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the total contract sum for unforeseen additional work within the scope of this contract.

3. Authorize the Director of Planning or designee to approve and execute amendments to incorporate necessary changes to the contract that do not significantly affect the scope of work or exceed the maximum contract sum of $_________________ plus ten percent contingency ($___________); and to

suspend work if, in the opinion of the Director of Planning, it is in the best interest of the County.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

In 2007, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors authorized the County to proceed with a Feasibility and Requirements Study (Study) for land use permitting functions, known as the Permit and Land Management Solutions (PALMS) Initiative, to identify, analyze, and implement improvements to the business processes and supporting technology that will increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the County's land entitlement permitting functions. This Study was completed in 2010.

Following the recommendations in the Study, the Department of Regional Planning (DRP) initiated and completed many process improvements and conducted market research to secure a COTS solution to replace DRP's current permit tracking system, known as KIVA, and that adheres to the best practices established by the Study and in the industry. The new COTS solution will become the Electronic Permitting and Inspections System for the County of Los Angeles, as "EPIC-LA."

This contract will enable DRP to move to the final phase of this long endeavor.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

This action is consistent with the Countywide Strategic Plan Goal No. 1 (Operational Effectiveness) – to maximize the effectiveness of processes, structure, and operations to support timely delivery of customer-oriented and efficient public services. The recommended action will allow DRP to secure an efficient and effective land management solution to improve the entitlement process and related customer service.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

The contract sum is $________, which is based on the work outlined in the Statement of Work and the price quoted by the Contractor. Funding is included in DRP's Fiscal Year 2013-2014 operating budget. Maintenance and support is approximately $132,000 per year and included throughout the term of the contract. Ongoing maintenance and support beyond the contract term will be included in DRP's operating budget.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The contract (Attachment I) contains all of the most recent required provisions including, but not limited to, Non-Responsibility and Debarment, Child Support Compliance, GAIN/GROW, Safely Surrendered Baby Law, and the provisions of Paid Jury Service time for the Contractor's employees.

This is a non-Prop A contract. Consequently, there are no departmental employee relations issues and the contract will not result in a reduction of County services. Furthermore, DRP evaluated and determined that the Living Wage Program (County

Code Chapter 2.201) does not apply to this contract. The award of this contract will not result in the displacement of any County employees.

Data regarding the proposers' minority participation is on file with DRP. The Contractor was selected upon final analysis and consideration without regard to race, creed, gender, or color.

DRP will not require the Contractor to perform services that exceed the Board-approved contract sum, scope of work, and/or contract term.

County Counsel has approved the contract as to form. The Chief Information Office (CIO) concurs with the Department's recommendation and that Office's Analysis is included as Attachment II.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The services provided through this contract will not have an effect on the environment and therefore, this contract is exempt from CEQA, pursuant to Section 15378 (b) (4) of the CEQA Guidelines.

CONTRACTING PROCESS

DRP conducted an open and competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) process to solicit the services in July 2013 for a period of four weeks. Interested parties were required to submit a proposal demonstrating their ability to provide the professional services, software, and hardware as outlined in the Statement of Work. The RFP was made available on the County's "Doing Business With Us" and DRP Websites. DRP received only one qualified proposal.

One of the DRP's objectives in a solicitation is to afford vendors ample but equal opportunity to do business with the County. Thus, DRP re-issued the RFP in October 2013 for a period of five weeks to afford interested vendors with more time to submit a proposal. In addition to posting on the ISD and DRP websites, the RFP was publicized in the Los Angeles Times for three consecutive days, and a mandatory proposers' conference was held. Thirty firms contacted DRP to request a copy of the RFP and two bidders attended the proposers' conference.

Two proposals were received by the November 12, 2013 deadline. Both proposals were reviewed for completeness. They were then reviewed using an initial "pass/fail" process to determine whether they met minimum mandatory requirements, consistent with the Selection Process and Evaluation Criteria set forth in the RFP. Both proposals met the minimum mandatory requirements.

A five-member evaluation committee was formed to evaluate the proposals. The committee was comprised of representatives from the County of Los Angeles CIO, DRP, and Public Works. The committee members objectively evaluated the proposals submitted by the following proposers:

1. Infor Public Sector (Infor)
2. Tyler Technologies, Inc. (Tyler)

The evaluation committee reviewed the proposals according to the selection process and evaluation criteria and took into consideration staff qualifications, project management methodologies, references, and a live demonstration. Each proposer conducted a demonstration of its proposed solution before the committee. Informed Averaging was used to calculate the final score for each proposer.

The representative from Public Works was absent during Infor's demonstration due to an unforeseeable emergency situation. The demonstration proceeded with a quorum of four evaluation committee members and with Infor's consent. Infor's proposal was evaluated based on the average of points awarded by the four members. DRP ensured that the absence of the Public Works representative did not have a negative impact on Infor's final score.

Following scoring of the proposals based on the evaluation criteria and guidelines, the evaluation committee recommended Tyler for award based on lowest cost and highest overall evaluation score.

(We are waiting for County Counsel to finalize contract terms. Will cite contract exceptions here if any.)

DEBRIEFING

On January 6, 2014, DRP notified Infor that it was not selected for contract award and offered to debrief on its proposal evaluation. Infor requested a debriefing, which was conducted on January 14, 2014. Infor was satisfied with the debriefing results, and informed DRP that it would not continue with the protest process.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

In addition to many productivity improvements, EPIC-LA will enhance our customers' experience by providing them with the ability to research, communicate, and initiate projects or request for services from any Internet connected device.

CONCLUSION

Upon approval of this contract, DRP will be able to move forward with the implementation of EPIC-LA which will greatly enhance the land entitlement process by providing a much better experience to our customers.

Upon the Board's approval, it is requested that the Executive Officer-Clerk of the Board return one adopted stamped copy of the Board letter and two executed copies of the Agreement to DRP for further processing.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD J. BRUCKNER
Director

Attachment

c Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
Chief Executive Office (Rita Robinson, Anthony Baker)
County Counsel

S_IFS_06242014_BL_EPIC LA

June 17, 2014

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

Dear Supervisors:

DEPARTMENT OF TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR
REVISION TO THE ANNUAL TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR
INVESTMENT POLICY
(ALL DISTRICTS) (3-VOTES)

SUBJECT

The Department of Treasurer and Tax Collector is requesting approval to make certain revisions to the County Investment Policy as authorized by California Government Code Section 53646.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Adopt the attached revised Treasurer and Tax Collector Investment Policy.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

Government Code Section 53646 permits your Board to approve annually the Investment Policy presented by the Treasurer and Tax Collector (Treasurer). Your Board adopted the most recent Investment Policy on March 18, 2014. Since that time, due to market conditions, the Treasurer has invoked his authority to make certain investments outside the limitations set forth within the Investment Policy. Specifically, due to a scarcity of permitted investments in the short-term fixed income market, the Treasurer authorized a temporary increase in the investment limits for four issuers of commercial paper notes. The temporary increase in investment limits was approved on April 2, 2014, for a period not to extend beyond June 30, 2014.

The market conditions that led to the above change in investment limits has remained consistent since April and warrant the development of a revised Investment Policy at this time. There has been a recurring shortage of supply in the short-end of the fixed income market due to regulatory changes and an increased reliance on cash to fund corporate expenditures. As a result, the number of issuers of short-term commercial paper and short-term certificates of deposit has decreased considerably. In order to maintain the liquidity needs of the County Treasury Pool (Treasury Pool), the Treasurer is seeking to amend the current Investment Policy and increase the limits on investments with maturities of 180 days or less. Such increases will impact both foreign and domestic issuers of Asset Backed Securities, Bankers Acceptance Notes, Certificates of Deposit, Commercial Paper, Corporate Notes, and Floating Rate Notes. Each of these changes is detailed in Attachments 1a and1b of the attached Investment Policy.

The most material increase in the investment limits is in relation to domestic issuers of commercial paper that maintain the highest credit ratings from both Moody's and Standard and Poor's. The limits for these investments are recommended to increase from $1.0 billion per issuer to $1.5 billion per issuer. These amounts remain well below the 10% portfolio limit established by the Government Code, which would allow commercial paper limits to increase as high as $2.35 billion per issuer in the Treasury Pool based on a three-month average Treasury Pool size of $23.5 billion.

In addition to increasing the limits for investments under 180 days, the Treasurer is also revising the guidelines for those securities with longer-term maturities. Specifically, the Treasurer is requiring that no more than 50% of the new issuer limits may be used for periods greater than 180 days. This change in the guidelines represents a tightening of the rules for longer-term investments and is appropriate given the higher risk-profile associated with these securities. One final change that is being recommended in the Investment Policy is to revise the weighted average maturity target for the Treasury Pool to a range of between 1.0 and 2.0 years. This range better reflects the Treasurer's need to manage liquidity in the Treasury Pool while still capturing the higher yield offered by longer maturities. The prior weighted average maturity target of 1.5 years did now allow for sufficient flexibility to address each of these investment objectives.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

This Investment Policy is in accordance with the Countywide Strategic Plan Goal #1: Operational Effectiveness/Fiscal Sustainability with regard to investing County funds and funds of other depositors in the County Treasury.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

There is no fiscal impact from this action.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Government Code Section 53646 permits the Treasurer to render annually to your Board a statement of Investment Policy, to be reviewed and approved at a public meeting. This Government Code Section also requires that any change in the Investment Policy also be submitted to your Board for review and approval at a public hearing.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES

There is no impact on current services.

Respectfully submitted,

MARK J. SALADINO
Treasurer and Tax Collector

MJS:NI:rkw

Attachments

c: Chief Executive Officer
County Counsel
Auditor-Controller

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR
INVESTMENT POLICY

Authority to Invest

Pursuant to Government Code Section 27000.1 and Los Angeles County Code 2.52.025, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors has delegated to the Treasurer the authority to invest and reinvest the funds of the County and the funds of the depositors in the County Treasury.

Fundamental Investment Policy

The Treasurer, a trustee, is inherently a fiduciary and subject to the prudent investor standard. Accordingly, when investing, reinvesting, purchasing, acquiring, exchanging, selling, and managing investments, the investment decisions SHALL be made with the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing, that a prudent person acting in a like capacity and familiarity would use with like aims.

All investments SHALL be governed by the Government Code and comply with the specific limitations set forth within this Investment Policy. Periodically, it may be necessary and prudent to make investment decisions beyond the limitations set forth in the Investment Policy that are otherwise permissible by California Government Code. In these special circumstances, ONLY the Treasurer is permitted to give written approval to operate outside the limitations set forth within this Investment Policy.

Pooled Surplus Investment Portfolio

The Treasurer SHALL establish and maintain a Pooled Surplus Investment (PSI) portfolio. The PSI portfolio SHALL be used to provide safe, liquid investment opportunities for pooled surplus funds deposited into the County Treasury.

The investment policies of the PSI portfolio SHALL be directed by and based on three prioritized objectives. The primary objective SHALL be to ensure the safety of principal. The secondary objective SHALL be to meet the liquidity needs of the PSI participants, which might be reasonably anticipated. The third objective SHALL be to achieve a return on funds invested, without undue compromise of the first two objectives.

PSI revenue/loss distribution SHALL be shared on a pro-rata basis with the PSI participants. PSI revenue/loss distribution will be performed monthly, net of administrative costs authorized by Government Code Section 27013 which includes employee salaries and benefits and services and supplies, for investing, depositing or handling funds, and the distribution of interest income, based on the PSI participants' average daily fund balance as recorded on the Auditor-Controller's accounting records. Administrative costs SHALL be deducted from the monthly PSI revenue/loss distribution on the basis of one-twelfth of the budgeted costs and adjusted to actual costs.

Investments purchased with the intent to be held to maturity SHALL be accounted for in the Non-Trading partition of the PSI portfolio. Investments purchased with the intent to be sold prior to maturity SHALL be accounted for in the Trading partition of the PSI portfolio. The investments in the Trading partition SHALL NOT exceed $500 million without specific written approval of the Treasurer**.**

In the event that a decision is made to transfer a given security from one partition to another, it MAY be transferred at cost; however, the difference between the market value, exclusive of interest, at the time of transfer and the purchase price, exclusive of interest, SHALL be computed and disclosed as unrealized profit or loss.

All PSI investments SHALL be categorized according to the period of time from settlement date to maturity date as follows:

- SHORT-TERM investments are for periods of up to ONE YEAR.
- INTERMEDIATE-TERM investments are for periods of ONE YEAR to THREE YEARS.
- MEDIUM-TERM investments are for periods of over THREE YEARS to FIVE YEARS.
- LONG-TERM investments are for periods of over FIVE YEARS.

PSI investments SHALL be limited to the short-term category except that the Investment Office of the Treasurer's Office MAY make PSI investments in accordance with the limitations imposed in Attachments I, II, and III (all of which are attached hereto and incorporated by this reference.)

The weighted average maturity target of the PSI portfolio is a range between 1.0 and 2.0 years. For purposes of maturity classification, the maturity date SHALL be the nominal maturity date or the unconditional put option date, if one exists.

The total PSI portfolio investments with maturities in excess of one year SHALL NOT exceed 75% of the last three years' average minimum total cash and investments, after adjustments, as indicated in Attachment II.

Liquidity of PSI Investments

Short-term liquidity SHALL further be maintained and adjusted monthly so that sufficient anticipated cash is available to fully meet unanticipated withdrawals of discretionary deposits, adjusted for longer-term commitments, within ninety days.

Such liquidity SHALL be monitored where, at the beginning of each month, the par value for maturities in the next ninety days plus projected PSI deposits for ninety days, divided by the projected PSI withdrawals for ninety days plus discretionary PSI deposits, is equal to or greater than one.

The liquidation of investments is not required solely because the discretionary liquidity withdrawal ratio is less than one; however, investments SHALL be limited to a maximum maturity of thirty days until such time as the discretionary liquidity withdrawal ratio is equal to or greater than one.

The sale of any PSI instrument purchased in accordance with established policies is not required solely because an institution's credit rating is lowered after the purchase of the instrument.

Specific Purpose Investment Portfolio

The Treasurer SHALL maintain a Specific Purpose Investment (SPI) portfolio to manage specific investment objectives of the SPI participants. Specific investments may be made with the approval of the requesting entity's governing body and the approval of the Treasurer. Revenue/loss distribution of the SPI portfolio SHALL be credited to the specific entity for which the investment was made. The Treasurer reserves the right to establish and charge the requesting entity fees for maintaining the entity's SPI portfolio.

Investments SHALL be limited to the short-term category, as defined above in the previous section for PSI investments, except when requested by a depositing entity and with the approval of the Treasurer, a longer term investment MAY be specifically made and held in the SPI portfolio.

The sale of any SPI instrument purchased in accordance with established policies is not required solely because an institution's credit rating is lowered after the purchase of the instrument.

Execution, Delivery, and Monitoring of Investments

The Treasurer SHALL designate, in writing, personnel authorized to execute investment transactions.

All transactions SHALL be executed on a delivery versus payment basis.

The Treasurer or financial advisor, consultant or manager acting on behalf of the Treasurer, in purchasing or obtaining any securities in a negotiable, bearer, registered, or nonregistered format, requires delivery of the securities to the Treasurer or designated custodial institution, by book entry, physical delivery, or by third party custodial agreement.

All investment transactions made by the Investment Office SHALL be reviewed by the Internal Controls Branch to assure compliance with this Investment Policy.

Reporting Requirements

The Treasurer SHALL provide the Board of Supervisors with a monthly report consisting of, but not limited to, the following:

- All investments detailing each by type, issuer, date of maturity, par value, historical cost, market value and the source of the market valuation.

- Month-end bank balances for accounts under the control of the Treasurer.

- A description of funds, investments, or programs that are under the management of contracted parties, including lending programs for the Treasurer.

- A description of all investment exceptions, if any, to the Investment Policy.

- A statement denoting the ability of the PSI portfolio to meet the anticipated cash requirements for the participants for the next six months.

Discretionary Treasury Deposits and Withdrawal of Funds

At the sole discretion of the Treasurer, PSI deposits may be accepted from local agencies not required to deposit their funds with the Los Angeles County Treasurer, pursuant to Government Code Section 53684.

At the time such deposits are made, the Treasurer may require the depositing entity to provide annual cash flow projections or an anticipated withdrawal schedule for deposits in excess of $1 million. Such projections may be adjusted periodically as prescribed by the Treasurer but in no event less than semi-annually.

In accordance with Government Code Section 27136, all requests for withdrawal of such funds, for the purpose of investing or depositing these funds elsewhere SHALL be evaluated, prior to approving or disapproving the request, to ensure that the proposed withdrawal will not adversely affect the principal deposits of the other PSI participants.

If it is determined that the proposed withdrawal will negatively impact the principal deposits of the other PSI participants, the Treasurer may delay such withdrawals until the impact can be mitigated.

Broker/Dealer Section

Broker/Dealer SHALL be limited to primary government dealers as designated by the Federal Reserve Bank or institutions meeting one of the following:

A. Broker/Dealer with minimum capitalization of $500 million and who meets all five of the below listed criteria;

   1. Be licensed by the State as a Broker/Dealer, as defined in Section 25004 of the Corporations Code or a member of a Federally regulated securities exchange and;
   2. Be a member of the National Association of securities Dealers and;
   3. Be registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission and;
   4. Have been in operation for more than five years; and
   5. Have a minimum annual trading volume of $100 billion in money market instruments or $500 billion in U.S. Treasuries and Agencies.

B. Emerging firms with office(s) in California licensed by the State as a Broker/Dealer, as defined in Section 25004 of the Corporations Code or a member of a Federally regulated exchange with a minimum capitalization of $200,000 to a maximum capitalization of $5 million and have met the quality criteria of the Treasurer.

Commercial Paper and Negotiable Certificates of Deposit may be purchased directly from issuers approved by the Treasurer.

An approved Treasurer Broker/Dealer list SHALL be maintained. Firms SHALL be removed from the approved Broker/Dealer list and trading suspended with firms failing to accurately and timely provide the following information:

A. Confirmation of daily trade transactions and all open trades in effect at month-end.

B. Response to auditor requests for confirmation of investment transactions.

C. Response to the Internal Controls Branch requests for needed information.

Honoraria, Gifts, and Gratuities Limitations

The Treasurer, Chief Deputy Treasurer and Tax Collector and designated Treasurer and Tax Collector employees SHALL be governed by the provision of the State's Political Reform Act, the Los Angeles County Code relating to Lobbyists, and the Los Angeles County Code relating to postgovernment employment of County officials.

Investment Limitations

The Investment Office SHALL NOT invest in inverse floating rate notes, range notes, or interest only strips that are derived from a pool of mortgages.

The Investment Office SHALL NOT invest in any security that could result in zero interest if held to maturity.

For investment transactions in the PSI portfolio, the Investment Office SHALL obtain approval of the Treasurer before recognizing any loss exceeding $100,000 per transaction, calculated using amortized cost.

Proceeds from the sale of notes or funds set aside for the repayment of notes SHALL NOT be invested for a term that exceeds the term of the notes.

<u>Permitted Investments</u>

Permitted Investments SHALL be limited to the following:

A. Obligations of the United States Government, its agencies and instrumentalities.

1. Maximum maturity: None.

2. Maximum total par value: None.

3. Maximum par value per issuer: None.

4. Federal agencies: Additional limits in Section G apply if investments are Floating Rate Instruments.

B. Municipal Obligations from the approved list of municipalities (Attachment III)

1. Maximum maturity: As limited in Attachment III.

2. Maximum total par value: 10% of the PSI portfolio.

C. Asset-Backed Securities

1. Maximum maturity: Five years.

2. Maximum total par value: 20% of the PSI portfolio.

3. Maximum par value per issuer: Per limits outlined in Attachment I for issuer's current credit rating.

4. All Asset-Backed securities must be rated at least “AA” and the issuer's corporate debt rating must be at least “A”.

D. Bankers’ Acceptance Domestic and Foreign

1. Maximum maturity: 180 days and limits outlined in Attachment I for issuer's current credit rating.

2. Maximum total par value: 40% of the PSI portfolio.

3. Maximum par value per issuer: Per limits outlined in Attachment I for the issuer's current credit rating.

4. The aggregate total of Bankers’ Acceptances and Negotiable Certificates of Deposits SHALL NOT exceed:

   a) The total shareholders’ equity of depository bank.

   b) The total net worth of depository bank.

E. Negotiable Certificates of Deposit (CD)

1. Maximum maturity: Three years and limits outlined in Attachment I for issuer's current credit rating.

2. Maximum total par value: Aggregate total of Domestic and Euro CD's are limited to 30% of the PSI portfolio.

3. Maximum par value per issuer: Per limits outlined in Attachment I for the issuer's current credit rating.

4. Must be issued by:

   a) National or State-chartered bank, or

   b) Savings association or Federal association, or

   c) Federal or State credit union, or

   d) Federally licensed or State-licensed branch of a foreign bank.

5. Euro CD's:

   a) Maximum maturity: One year and limits outlined in Attachment I for issuer's current credit rating.

   b) Maximum total par value: 10% of the PSI portfolio.

   c) Maximum par value per issuer: Per limits outlined in Attachment I for issuer's current credit rating.

   d) Limited to London branch of National or State-chartered banks.

6. The aggregate total of Bankers Acceptances and Negotiable Certificates of Deposits SHALL NOT exceed:

   a) The total shareholders' equity of depository bank.

   b) The total net worth of the depository bank.

F. Corporate and Depository Notes

1. Maximum maturity: Three years and limits outlined in Attachment I for the issuer's current credit rating.

2. Maximum total par value: 30% of the PSI portfolio.

3. Maximum par value per issuer: Per limits outlined in Attachment I for the issuer's current credit rating.

4. Notes MUST be issued by:

   a) Corporations organized and operating within the United States.

   b) Depository institutions licensed by the United States or any State and operating within the United States

5. Additional limits in Section G apply if note is a Floating Rate Note Instrument.

G. Floating Rate Notes

Floating Rate Notes included in this category are defined as any instrument that has a coupon or interest rate that is adjusted periodically due to changes in a base or benchmark rate.

1. Maximum maturity: Seven years, provided that Board of Supervisors' authorization to exceed maturities in excess of five years is in effect, of which a maximum of $100 million par value may be greater than five years to maturity.

2. Maximum total par value: 10% of the PSI portfolio.

3. Maximum par value per issuer: Per limits outlined in Attachment I for the issuer's current credit rating.

4. Benchmarks SHALL be limited to commercially available U.S. Dollar denominated indexes.

5. The Investment Office SHALL obtain the prospectus or the issuer term sheet prior to purchase for all Floating Rate Notes and SHALL include the following on the trade ticket:

   a) Specific basis for the benchmark rate.

   b) Specific computation for the benchmark rate.

c) Specific reset period.

d) Notation of any put or call provisions.

H. Commercial Paper

1. Maximum maturity: 270 days and limits outlined in Attachment I for the issuer's current credit rating.

2. Maximum total par value: 40% of the PSI portfolio.

3. Maximum par value per issuer: The lesser of 10% of the PSI portfolio or the limits outlined in Attachment I for the issuer's current credit rating.

4. Credit: Issuing Corporation - Commercial paper of "prime" quality of the highest ranking or of the highest letter and number rating as provided for by a nationally recognized statistical-rating organization (NRSRO). The entity that issues the commercial paper shall meet all of the following conditions in either paragraph (a) or paragraph (b):

   (a) The entity meets the following criteria:

      1) Is organized and operating in the United States as a general corporation.

      2) Has total assets in excess of $500 million.

      3) Has debt other than commercial paper, if any, that is rated "A" or higher by NRSRO.

   (b) The entity meets the following criteria:

      1) Is organized in the United States as a Limited Liability Company or Special Purpose Corporation.

      2) Has program-wide credit enhancements including, but not limited to, over collateralization, letters of credit, or surety bond.

      3) Has commercial paper that is rated "A-1"or higher, or the equivalent, by a NRSRO.

I. Shares of Beneficial Interest

1. Money Market Fund (MMF) - Shares of beneficial interest issued by diversified management companies known as money market mutual funds, registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission in accordance with Section 270.2a-7 of Title 17 of the Code of Federal Regulation. The company SHALL have met

either of the following criteria:

a) Attained the highest possible rating by not less than two NRSROs.

b) Retained an investment adviser registered or exempt from registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission with not less than five years experience investing in the securities and obligations authorized in Government Code Section 53601 and with assets under management in excess of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

Maximum total par value: 15% of the PSI portfolio. However, no more than 10% of the PSI may be invested in any one fund.

2. State of California's Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) pursuant to Government Code Section 16429.1.

3. Trust Investments – Shares of beneficial interest issued by a joint powers authority organized pursuant to Section 6509.7 that invests in securities and obligations authorized in Section 53601 (a) to (o) of the Government Code. To be eligible, the joint powers authority issuing the shares shall have retained an investment adviser that meets all of the following criteria:

   a) The adviser is registered or exempt from registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

   b) The adviser has not less than five years of experience investing in the securities and obligations authorized in Section 53601 (a) to (o) of the Government Code.

   c) The adviser has assets under management in excess of five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000).

J. Repurchase Agreement

1. Maximum maturity: 30 days.

2. Maximum total par value: $1 billion.

3. Maximum par value per dealer: $500 million.

4. Agreements must be in accordance with approved written master repurchase agreement.

5. Agreements must be fully secured by obligations of the United States Government, its agencies and instrumentalities. The market value of these obligations that underlie a repurchase agreement shall be valued at 102% or greater of the funds

borrowed against those securities and the value shall be adjusted no less than monthly. Since the market value of the underlying securities is subject to daily market fluctuations, the investments in repurchase agreements shall be in compliance if the value of the underlying securities is brought back up to 102% no later than the next business day. If a repurchase agreement matures the next business day after purchase, the repurchase agreement is not out of compliance with this collateralization requirement if the value of the collateral falls below the 102% requirement at the close of business on settlement date.

K. Reverse Repurchase Agreement

1. Maximum term: One year.

2. Maximum total par value: $500 million.

3. Maximum par value per broker: $250 million.

4. Dealers limited to those primary dealers or those Nationally or State chartered banks that have a significant banking relationship with the County as defined in Government Code Section 53601(j)(4)(B) approved specifically by the Treasurer.

5. Agreements SHALL only be made for the purpose of enhancing investment revenue.

6. Agreements must be in accordance with approved written master repurchase agreement.

7. Securities eligible to be sold with a simultaneous agreement to repurchase SHALL be limited to obligations of the United States Government and its agencies and instrumentalities.

8. The security to be sold on reverse repurchase agreement SHALL have been owned and fully paid for by the Treasurer for a minimum of 30 days prior to sale.

9. The proceeds of the reverse repurchase agreement SHALL be invested in authorized instruments with a maturity less than 92 days unless the agreement includes a codicil guaranteeing a minimum earning or spread to maturity.

10. The proceeds of the reverse repurchase agreement SHALL be invested in instruments with maturities occurring at or before the maturity of the reverse repurchase agreement.

11. In no instance SHALL the investment from the proceeds of a reverse repurchase agreement be sold as part of a subsequent reverse repurchase agreement.

L. Forwards, Futures and Options

Forward contracts are customized contracts traded in the Over The Counter Market where the holder of the contract is OBLIGATED to buy or sell a specific amount of an underlying asset at a specific price on a specific future date.

Future contracts are standardized contracts traded on recognized exchanges where the holder of the contract is OBLIGATED to buy or sell a specific amount of an underlying asset at a specific price on a specific future date.

Option contracts are those traded in either the Over The Counter Market or recognized exchanges where the purchaser has the RIGHT but not the obligation to buy or sell a specific amount of an underlying asset at a specific price within a specific time period.

1. Maximum maturity: 90 days.

2. Maximum aggregate par value: $100 million.

3. Maximum par value per counterparty: $50 million. Counterparties for Forward and Option Contracts limited to those on the approved Treasurer and Tax Collector list and must be rated “A” or better from at least one nationally recognized rating agency.

4. The underlying securities SHALL be an obligation of the United States Government and its agencies and instrumentalities.

5. Premiums paid to an option seller SHALL be recognized as an option loss at the time the premium is paid and SHALL not exceed $100,000 for each occurrence or exceed a total of $250,000 in any one quarter. Premiums received from an option purchase SHALL be recognized as an option gain at the time the premium is received.

6. Complex or hybrid forwards, futures or options defined as agreements combining two or more categories are prohibited unless specific written approval of the Treasurer is obtained PRIOR to entering into the agreement.

7. Open forward, future, and option contracts SHALL be marked to market weekly and a report SHALL be prepared by the Internal Controls Office.

8. In conjunction with the sale of bonds, the Treasurer MAY authorize exceptions to maturity and par value limits for forwards, futures and options.

M. Interest Rate Swaps

Interest Rate Swaps SHALL be used only in conjunction with the sale of bonds approved by the Board of Supervisors. In accordance with Government Code Section 53534, these agreements SHALL be made only if all bonds are rated in one of the three highest rating categories by two nationally recognized rating agencies and only upon receipt, from any rating agency rating the bonds, of written evidence that the agreement will not adversely affect the rating.

Further, the counterparty to such an agreement SHALL be rated “A” or better from at least one nationally recognized rating agency selected by the Treasurer, or the counterparty SHALL provide an irrevocable letter of credit from an institution rated “A” or better from at least one nationally recognized rating agency acceptable to the Treasurer.

N. Securities Lending Agreement

Securities lending agreements are agreements under which the Treasurer agrees to transfer securities to a borrower who, in turn agrees to provide collateral to the Treasurer. During the term of the agreement, both the securities and the collateral are held by a third party. At the conclusion of the agreement, the securities are transferred back to the Treasurer in return for the collateral.

1. Maximum term: 180 days.

2. Maximum par value: Maximum par value is limited to a combined total of reverse repurchase agreements and securities lending agreements of 20% of the base value of the portfolio.

3. Dealers limited to those primary dealers or those Nationally or State chartered banks that have a significant banking relationship with the County as defined in Government Code Section 53601(j)(4)(B) approved specifically by the Treasurer.

4. Agreements SHALL only be made for the purpose of enhancing investment revenue.

5. Securities eligible to be sold with a simultaneous agreement to repurchase SHALL be limited to obligations of the United States Government and its agencies and instrumentalities.

6. The security to be sold on securities lending agreement SHALL have been owned and fully paid for by the Treasurer for a minimum of 30 days prior to sale.

7. The proceeds of the securities lending agreement SHALL be invested in authorized instruments with a maturity less than 92 days unless the agreement includes a codicil guaranteeing a minimum earning or spread to maturity.

8. In no instance SHALL the investment from the proceeds of a securities lending agreement be sold as part of a subsequent reverse repurchase agreement or securities lending agreement.

O. Investment of Bond Proceeds

Funds from bond proceeds may be invested in accordance with Government Code Section 53601(m), which permits investment according to the statutory provisions governing the issuance of those bonds, or in lieu of any statutory provisions to the contrary, in accordance with the approved financing documents for the issuance.

County of Los Angeles
Treasurer and Tax Collector
ATTACHMENT 1 a.

MINIMUM CREDIT RATING
DOMESTIC ISSUERS

Bankers' Acceptance	**Certificates of Deposit**	**Corporate Notes, Asset Backed Securities (ABS) and Floating Rate Notes (FRN)**		**Limit**
Maximum maturity 180 days	Maximum maturity 3 years	Corporate: 3 years ABS: 5 years FRN: 5 years (1)		
Moody's	Moody's	S&P	Moody's	
P-1/Aaa	P-1/Aaa	A-1/AAA	P-1/Aaa	$750MM maximum, of which 50% may be over 180 days.
P-1/Aa	P-1/Aa	A-1/AA	P-1/Aa	$600MM maximum, of which 50% may be over 180 days.
P-1/A	P-1A	A-1/A	P-1/A	$450MM maximum, of which 50% may be over 90 days to a maximum of 180 days.

Commercial Paper		**Limit**
Maximum maturity 270 days		
S&P	Moody's	
A-1/AAA	P-1/Aaa	$1.5 Billion maximum, of which 50% may be over 180 days.
A-1/AA	P-1/Aa	$1 Billion maximum, of which 50% may be over 180 days.
A-1/A	P-1/A	$750MM maximum, of which 50% may be over 90 days to a maximum of 180 days.

(1) Seven years, if Board of Supervisors' authorization to exceed maturities in excess of five years is in effect, of which a maximum of $100 MM (million) par value may be greater than five years to maturity.

County of Los Angeles
Treasurer and Tax Collector
ATTACHMENT 1 b.

MINIMUM CREDIT RATING
FOREIGN ISSUERS

Bankers' Acceptance		**Commercial Paper**		**Certificates of Deposit**		**Corporate Notes, Asset Backed Securities (ABS) and Floating Rate Notes (FRN)**		**Limit**
Maximum maturity 180 days		Maximum maturity 270 days		Maximum maturity 3 years		Corporate: 3 years ABS: 5 years FRN: 5 years (1)		
Fitch	Moody's	S&P	Moody's	Fitch	Moody's	S&P	Moody's	
aaa	P-1/Aaa	A-1/AAA	P-1/Aaa	aaa	P-1/Aaa	A-1/AAA	P-1/Aaa	$600MM maximum, of which 50% may be over 180 days.
aa-				aa-				$500MM maximum, of which 50% may be over 180 days.
a	P-1/Aa	A-1/AA	P-1/Aa	a	P-1/Aa	A-1/AA	P-1/Aa	$450MM maximum, of which 50% may be over 180 days.
a-				a-				$350MM maximum, of which 50% may be over 90 days to a maximum of 180 days.
bbb	P-1/A	A-1/A	P-1/A	bbb	P-1/A	A-1/A	P-1/A	$300MM maximum, of which 50% may be over 90 days to a maximum of 180 days.

(1) Seven years, if Board of Supervisors' authorization to exceed maturities in excess of five years is in effect, of which a maximum of $100 MM (million) par value may be greater than five years to maturity.

County of Los Angeles
Treasurer and Tax Collector
Investment Policy
ATTACHMENT II

LIMITATION CALCULATION FOR
INTERMEDIATE-TERM, MEDIUM-TERM AND LONG-TERM HOLDINGS
(Actual $)

	2013	**2012**	**2011**
Minimum invested balance and available cash	$22,466,113,765	$21,059,006,042	$22,563,000,277
Less:			
▪ Discretionary deposits	(1,874,746,587)	(1,995,760,144)	(2,145,967,200)
Minimum available balance	$20,591,367,177	$19,063,245,898	$20,417,033,077
Average minimum available balance			$20,023,882,051
Multiplied by the percent available for investment over one year			75%
Equals the available balance for investment over one year			$15,017,911,538
Intermediate-Term (from one to three years) ▪ One-third of the available balance for investment			$5,005,970,513
Medium-Term and Long-Term (greater than three years) ▪ Two-thirds of available balance for investment (1)			$10,011,941,025

(1) Any unused portion of the Medium-Term and Long-Term available balance may be used for Intermediate-Term investments.

APPROVED LIST OF MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS

1. Any obligation issued or caused to be issued by the County of Los Angeles on its behalf or on behalf of other Los Angeles County affiliates. If on behalf of other Los Angeles County affiliates, the affiliate must have a minimum rating of "A3" (Moody's) or "A-" (Standard and Poor's or Fitch). The maximum maturity is limited to 30 years.

2. Any short- or medium-term obligation issued by the State of California or a California local agency with a minimum Moody's rating of "MIG-1" or "A2" or a minimum Standard and Poor's rating of "SP-1" or "A." Maximum maturity limited to five years.

County of Los Angeles
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

RISK MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW
June 2014

Purpose

The Risk Management Plan (RMP) is intended to provide County of Los Angeles (County) department management with an objective method to evaluate their risk management program, including liability claims, occupational safety, and workers' compensation claim performance. In addition, RMP provides County departments with a systematic risk management planning process. The Program involves the development and implementation of an annual risk management and occupational safety/liability loss control planning and objective completion tracking tool.

General Information

Risk exposure to the Department includes work-related injuries, facilities issues, and lawsuits related to property taxes.

The Department has made significant improvements in controlling liability costs by conducting quarterly facilities inspections at all office locations, conducting ergonomic evaluations, providing risk management training for all employees, closely monitoring and evaluating causes of opened liability claims and operating an effective Return-to-Work (RTW) Program.

For Fiscal Year 2013-14, the Department continued to concentrate on enhancing the Health and Safety Program and the RTW Program.

The greatest risk exposure for the A-C involves lawsuits arising from property tax issues, which we have little or no ability to influence or prevent. The leading cause for such claims is attributable to divergent interpretations of the Revenue and Taxation and Health and Safety Codes (Code). These lawsuits are generally filed by cities and redevelopment agencies because they disagree with newly enacted legislation or the Code language is not clearly defined.

While the A-C does not engage in lobbying activity, have a formal role in the legislative process, we do try to ensure that changes and revisions to the Code do not have a negative impact on the County in general, or departments responsible for administering the Code. The A-C's Property Tax Division participates in the State Auditor-Controller's Association, Legislative Committee which monitors proposed legislation and advocates to ensure counties are not negatively impacted by pending legislation, and that Code language is clear, unambiguous and can be easily interpreted. The Committee provides suggestions and input on proposed Code changes before they are enacted by State lawmakers.

	Name
Risk Management Coordinator:	Margarita Sarkisian
Safety Officer/Coordinator:	Margarita Sarkisian
Return-to-Work Coordinator:	Margarita Sarkisian

County of Los Angeles
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

RISK MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW
June 2014

Risk Issues, Plans, and Mitigation Measures

RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUE #1
Issue: Workers' Compensation claims for Repetitive Motion Trauma and Performance Management issues
Risk Management Plan / Mitigation Measure: RTW Coordinator along with the Head of Performance Management developed training to focus on the Department's liability risks in the areas of health and safety in the work place, leaves, performance management including equity policy for the new and existing employees.
Responsible Party: RTW Coordinator and Head of Performance Management
Completion Date: 06/30/2014
RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUE #2
Issue: Purchasing costly equipment by Third Party Administrator (TPA) and A-C
Risk Management Plan / Mitigation Measure: RTW Coordinator with the assistance of the CEO Risk Management Analyst Implemented the New Ergonomic Task Force Project to reduce workers' compensation ergonomic equipment costs. • Developed a product standard list for all ergonomic equipment as well as general purchasing • Met with TPA, Procurement, Facilities, RTW and Safety Coordinator, CEO Loss Prevention Control to coordinate the new procedure • Met with vendors to review products
Responsible Party: RTW Coordinator
Completion Date: 03/01/2014

DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

Statistical Information (*** data to be provided when available)

Claim Performance (data provided by CEO; see footnotes)				
Measure	**FY 2010-11**	**FY 2011-12**	**FY 2012-13**	**3-Year Average**
WORKERS' COMPENSATION				
1. Number of Workers' Compensation claims filed during the period	13	15	24	17.3
2. Number of employees as of June 30	546	541	531	539.3
3. Workers' Compensation Claim Report Rate (number of claims reported per 100 employees) for the period	2.38	2.77	4.52	3.21
Benchmark: Countywide Average Workers' Compensation Claim Report Rate (all departments)	11.68	11.19	11.40	11.42
Benchmark: Countywide Average Workers' Compensation Claim Report Rate (all departments, excluding Fire, Probation, Sheriff)	6.67	6.83	6.86	6.79
Benchmark: Countywide Average Workers' Compensation Claim Report Rate (Fire, Probation, Sheriff only)	25.04	22.78	23.46	23.76
4. Workers' Compensation expense paid during the period (including final accounting of allocated and unallocated expenses)	$201,350	$324,678	$427,557	$317,862
5. Workers' Compensation Expense Rate (expenses paid per current employee) for the period	$369	$600	$805	$591
Benchmark: Countywide Average Workers' Compensation Expense Rate (all departments)	$3,266	$3,505	$3,633	$3,468
Benchmark: Countywide Average Workers' Compensation Expense Rate (all departments, excluding Fire, Probation, Sheriff)	$2,179	$2,258	$2,273	$2,237
Benchmark: Countywide Average Workers' Compensation Expense Rate (Fire, Probation, Sheriff only)	$6,167	$6,822	$7,241	$6,743
6. Salary Continuation and Labor Code 4850 paid during the period (100%IA, 70%IA, MegaIA)	$364	$8,195	$84,147	$30,902
AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY				
7. Number of Automobile Liability claims filed during the period	0	0	0	0.0
8. Automobile Liability indemnity (OC) paid during the period	$935	$0	$0	$312
9. Automobile Liability legal fees and costs (SS) paid during the period	$0	$0	$0	$0
GENERAL LIABILITY				
10. Number of General Liability claims filed during the period	10	10	82	34.0
11. General Liability indemnity (OC) paid during the period	$0	$0	$0	$0
12. General Liability legal fees and costs (SS) paid during the period	$263,920	$27,805	$198,003	$163,243

MEDICAL MALPRACTICE				
13. Number of Medical Malpractice claims filed during the period	0	0	0	0.0
14. Medical Malpractice indemnity (OC) paid during the period	$0	$0	$0	$0
15. Medical Malpractice legal fees and costs (SS) paid during the period	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL CLAIMS AND EXPENSE				
16. Total number of claims filed during the period	23	25	106	51.3
17. Total expenses paid during the period	$466,569	$360,678	$709,733	$512,327
18. Department operating budget	$85,058,000	$81,842,000	$85,203,000	$84,034,333
19. Cost of Risk (% total expenses paid / operating budget)	0.55%	0.44%	0.83%	0.61%
Benchmark: Countywide Cost of Risk	**2.10%**	**2.21%**	**2.19%**	**2.17%**

- All workers' compensation loss information is available on the CEO Risk Management Branch RECAP intranet site.
- The number of employees is the sum of currently filled full-time and part-time positions (see monthly payroll report).
- The number of liability claims is the total of all claims (including all suffixes) entered into the Risk Management Information System (RMIS) during the fiscal year (see monthly Cognos report).
- Total paid for liability is based on transaction dates within each fiscal year as listed in RMIS (see monthly Cognos report).

Vehicle and Fleet Safety Performance (data maintained at the department level)

Measure	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	3-Year Average
DEPARTMENT-OWNED VEHICLES				
20. Number of Department-owned vehicles as of June 30	3	3	4	3.3
21. Total number of vehicle accidents involving Department–owned (or leased) vehicles	0	0	1	0.3
22. Total cost paid for damage involving Department-owned (or leased) vehicles (not including third party claim/damage cost)	$0	$0	$978	$326
23. Number of miles driven by Department-owned (or leased) vehicles (Department started tracking miles as of 7/1/2012)	0	0	17,215	5,738.3
24. Number of vehicle accidents involving Department-owned (or leased) vehicles per 100,000 miles	0.00	0.00	5.81	1.94
Benchmark: Countywide	1.60	1.78	1.45	1.61
OCCASIONAL DRIVERS				
25. Number of Department occasional drivers as of June 30	546	541	531	539.3
26. Total number of vehicle accidents involving occasional drivers	7	0	1	2.7
27. Total cost paid for damage involving vehicles driven by occasional drivers (not including third party claim/damage cost)	$2,552	$0	$648	$1,067

28. Number of occasional miles driven during period	84373	72550	52434	69,785.7
29. Number of vehicle accidents involving occasional drivers per 100,000 miles	8.30	0.00	1.91	3.4
Benchmark: Countywide	1.95	2.02	1.70	1.89
Return-to-Work Performance (industrial and non-industrial) (data maintained at the department level)				
Measure	**FY 2010-11**	**FY 2011-12**	**FY 2012-13**	**3-Year Average**
30. Number of active return-to-work cases as of June 30	80	63	59	67.3
31. Number of employees on medical leave (excluding pregnancy) as of June 30	13	12	16	13.7
32. Number of employees on work hardening transitional assignment agreements as of June 30	6	3	8	5.7
33. Number of employees on conditional assignment agreements as of June 30	14	10	5	9.7
34. Number of return-to-work cases closed as of June 30	15*	133	177	155.0
*Changed methodology to include all cases including FMLA				
Short Term Disability (data provided from Sedgwick except for #41 which is from payroll)				
Measure	**FY 2010-11**	**FY 2011-12**	**FY 2012-13**	**3-Year Average**
35. Number of active claims as of June 30	8	5	4	5.7
36. Number of closed claims reaching maximum benefit duration during the fiscal year	1	1	4	
37. Number of claims converted to LTD during the fiscal year	1	1	3	1.7
38. Number of new claims during the fiscal year	29	38	23	30.0
39. Number of lost workdays paid under STD during the fiscal year	1,166	1,386	1,406	1,319.3
40. Number of lost calendar days, including elimination period, for closed claims	1,642	2,334	2,229	2,068.3
41. Total payments for all STD claims paid during the fiscal year	$285,427	$298,875	$363,453	$315,918
42. Number of paid lost workdays for closed claims	1,000	1,436	1,429	1,288.3
Long Term Disability (data provided from Sedgwick)				
Measure	**FY 2010-11**	**FY 2011-12**	**FY 2012-13**	**3-Year Average**
43. Number of active claims as of June 30	10	10	13	11.0
44. Number of claims opened during the fiscal year	6	3	10	6.3
45. Total payments for all claims paid during the fiscal year	$254,095	$227,178	$249,722	$243,665
46. Total payments to date on LTD claims closed during the fiscal year	$12,403	$100,385	$19,649	$44,146

Board IT Agenda Items

Department	Board IT Agenda Item	Description	Amount	CEO Cluster	New Term	Planned Hearing Date
DHS	Amendment to Agreement with Lancet Technology for TEMIS	Approval of an Amendment of the Agreement with Lancet Technology for work on the Trauma and Emergency Medicine Information System (TEMIS) for DHS' Emergency Medical Services Agency. **Funding Source: DHS FY 2014-15 Operating Budget (100% offset by Trauma Center and Base Hospital Fees)** **Existing Agreement: H-212780**	$4.644M	Health & Mental Health Services	2 years + three (3) automatic 1-year extensions	6/4/2014
DHS	Amendment No. 5 to Agreement with Philips Healthcare and Successor Agreement with Fujifilm Medical Systems	Amendment No. 5 to Agreement with Philips Healthcare to extend Agreement for the period of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2019, for medical equipment maintenance and support, software maintenance and support for Xcelera and professional services. Successor Agreement with Fujifilm Medical Systems for the period of July 1, 2014 thrugh June 30, 2021 for the provision of preventative equipment maintenance, software maintenance adnd support, and professional services. **Funding Source: DHS FY 2014-15 Operating Budget** **Existing Agreement: H701585 (Philips)**	$7.03M/yr. for Philips / $1.93M (first year) + $2.03M (subsequent years) for Fujifilm	Health & Mental Health Services	5 yrs. (Philips) / 7 yrs. (Fujifilm)	6/4/2014
CDC	Data Center Support Services Contract with CDWG	Approval of a contract with CDW Government LLC for data center technical and support services. **Funding Source: CDC FY 2014-15 Operating Budget. No NCC** **Existing Agreement: N/A**	$1.403M	Operations	5 Years	6/17/2014
CDC	Agreement with CWD Goverment for purchase of Laserfiche Rio Software and related hardware	Approval for the purchase of Laserfiche Rio ECM software and related hardware from CWDG for records management. **Funding Source: CDC FY 2014-15 Operating Budget. No NCC** **Existing Agreement: N/A**	$1.462M	Operations	5 years	6/17/2014
CDC	Contract with Mythics, Inc. for PeopleSoft Software Upgrade	Approval for the upgrade of CDC's Peoplesoft financial, supply chain management and human capital management software to version 9.2 **Funding Source: CDC FY 2014-15 Commission General Fund. No NCC** **Existing Agreement: N/A**	$3.623M	Operations	4 years	6/17/2014

Department	Board IT Agenda Item	Description	Amount	CEO Cluster	New Term	Planned Hearing Date
CDC	Agreement with Xerox for Print Solution Services	Approval for CDC to issue a PO through the ISD's Master Agreement with Xerox for print solution services and associated lease services. **Funding Source: CDC FY 2014-15 Operating Budget. No NCC** **Existing Agreement: N/A**	$1.089M	Operations	4 years	6/17/2014
DRP	Electronic Permit and Inspection Management (EPIC-LA) System	Award a two-year contract to Tyler Technologies Inc. to provide a commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) solution for the (EPIC-LA) Implementation Project. **Funding Source: DRP FY 2013-14 Operating Budget** **Existing Agreement: N/A**	$1.5M	Operations	2 years	6/24/2014
PD	Contract Between the County of Los Angeles and PCG Technology Consulting for Public Defender Case Management System Consulting Services	Analyze Case Management System alternatives, develop strategy and make recommendations. **Funding Source: Department's FY 2014-15 Operating Budget** **Existing Agreement: N/A**	$252,785	Public Safety	Phase I of a 3-year Agreement with an additional 1-year option	7/1/2014
DCFS	Amendment 1 to Contract with IBM for Continued Technical Support for Child Welfare Services/Case Management System	Requesting 1) 14 month term extension effective October 1, 2014, through November 30, 2015, with four one-year renewal periods through November 30, 2019 for continued technical support to maintain CWS/CMS at DCFS; and 2) delegated authority to exercise the renewal options. **Funding Source: Federal Title IV-E, State, and NCC** **Existing Agreement: 77253**	$775,000	Children & Families Well-being, Health & Mental Health Services	14 months with four one-year options	7/8/2014

Department	Board IT Agenda Item	Description	Amount	CEO Cluster	New Term	Planned Hearing Date
CIO/CEO/DHS/DMH & DCFS	Countywide Master Data Management (CWMDM)	Implement a Master Data Management solution for the entire County, to include: 1. Development and maintenance of a catalog of enterprise data objects. (Data entities, Authoritative sources, Attributes, Values, Access control and policies). 2. Development and maintenance of a catalog of existing system interfaces. 3. Development of policies for enterprise information management. 4. Building of an Enabling Infrastructure (shared service) for enterprise information management, including Master Data Management; Enterprise Messaging and Service Bus; and Data Analytics. **Funding Source: ITF, CEO IT Fund, and PIF** **Existing Agreement: N/A**	TBD	Operations	TBD	7/15/2014
CIO	Approval of Revisions to Board IT Security Policies 6.100-6.112	All of the Board's Information Technology (IT) Security Policies have been revised to address currency and technology evolution. Some of the major revisions to highlight are: consistent use of language, newly defined terms, appropriate use of technology, further clarification of the Countywide Information Security Program, and support of recent IT capabilities in the area of mobile and portable devices (i.e., County-owned only), internet, social media, and internet storage websites. **Funding Source: N/A** **Existing Agreement: N/A**	$0	Operations	N/A	7/29/2014
RRCC	Sole Source Agreement with IDEO for VSAP Phase 3	Sole source Agreement with IDEO for the design and engineering of a new voting system for LA County. **Funding Source: RRCC's FY 2014-15 Operating Budget.** **Existing Agreement: N/A**	TBD	Operations	TBD	8/19/2014
DPSS	DPSS LEADER Amendment 16	Amendment 16 will extend the LEADER contract with Unisys an additional 2 years to cover LRS' design, developement and implementation window **Funding Source: No NCC (Subvented 100% by State and Federal revenue)** **Existing Agreement: 68587**	$54M	Children & Families Well-being	2 additional years	9/16/2014

Department	Board IT Agenda Item	Description	Amount	CEO Cluster	New Term	Planned Hearing Date
RRCC	Sole Source maintenance agreement with DIMS for VIMS	Sole source extenstion of maintenance and support agreement with Data Information Management Systems, LLC (DIMS) for the Voter Information Management (VIMS). **Funding Source: RR/CC FY 2015-16 Operating Budget** **Existing Agreement: 76010**	TBD	Operations	3 years, with 2 one-year options	11/12/2014
CIO	Enterprise IT Security and Privacy Awareness Training Content	Acquisition, content customization, and implementation of the enterprise IT Security and Privacy Awareness training content for use in the County's Learning Net (or Library Management System - LMS). This training content includes HIPAA/HITECH, security best practices, etc. to support Board Policy # 6.111 Security Awareness Training. **Approx. Board Date: TBD** **Funding Source: ITF** **Existing Agreement: N/A**	$240,000	Operations	N/A	
CIO-LASD-FIRE-OEM	County Mass Notification System (Alert LA)	Purchase of a replacement Mass Notification System (Alert LA), which is used to notify County residents and businesses of emergencies, and to provide information regarding necessary actions to take in those emergencies, such as evacuations. The Office of Emergency Management (OEM) will assume administrative management of the System, while the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department will continue in its role and responsibility of operating the System 24/7. **Approx. Board Date: TBD** **Funding Source: TBD** **Existing Agreement: 76945, which will terminate upon execution of a new agreement.**	$3M (Approx.)	Public Safety	7 .5 years	
LASD	Multimodal Biometric Identification System (MBIS)	Development of an automated biometric identification system to replace current Cogent system. **Approx. Board Date: TBD** **Funding Source: RAND Board** **Existing Agreement: N/A**	TBD	Public Safety	TBD	

Department	Board IT Agenda Item	Description	Amount	CEO Cluster	New Term	Planned Hearing Date
FIRE	Mobile Electronic Patient Care Reporting System (e-PCR)	Purchase of a Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) Mobile Electronic Patient Care Reporting System **Approx. Board Date: TBD** **Funding Source: TBD** **Existing Agreement: N/A**	TBD	Public Safety	7 years	