Pursuant to the Brown Act, this meeting also constitutes a meeting of the Board of Directors.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Thursday, April 16, 2015
6:00 P.M.

Regional Fire Operations and Training Center
Board Room
1 Fire Authority Road
Irvine, CA 92602

This Agenda contains a brief general description of each item to be considered. Except as otherwise provided by law, no action or discussion shall be taken on any item not appearing on the following Agenda. Unless legally privileged, all supporting documents, including staff reports, and any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Executive Committee after the posting of this agenda are available for review at the Orange County Fire Authority Regional Fire Operations & Training Center, 1 Fire Authority Road, Irvine, CA 92602 or you may contact Sherry A.F. Wentz, Clerk of the Authority, at (714) 573-6040 Monday through Thursday, and every other Friday from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. and available online at http://www.ocfa.org

If you wish to speak before the Fire Authority Executive Committee, please complete a Speaker Form identifying which item(s) you wish to address. Please return the completed form to the Clerk of the Authority prior to being heard before the Committee. Speaker Forms are available at the counters of both entryways of the Board Room.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, you should contact the Clerk of the Authority at (714) 573-6040.

CALL TO ORDER

INVOCATION by OCFA Chaplain Ken Krikac

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE by Director Spitzer

ROLL CALL
1. **PRESENTATIONS**
   No items.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Resolution No. 97-024 established rules of decorum for public meetings held by the Orange County Fire Authority. Resolution No. 97-024 is available from the Clerk of the Authority.

Any member of the public may address the Committee on items within the Committee’s subject matter jurisdiction but which are not listed on this agenda during PUBLIC COMMENTS. However, no action may be taken on matters that are not part of the posted agenda. We request comments made on the agenda be made at the time the item is considered and that comments be limited to three minutes per person. Please address your comments to the Committee as a whole, and do not engage in dialogue with individual Committee Members, Authority staff, or members of the audience.

The Agenda and Minutes are now available through the Internet at www.ocfa.org. You can access upcoming agendas on the Monday before the meeting. The minutes are the official record of the meeting and are scheduled for approval at the next regular Executive Committee meeting.

**REPORT FROM THE BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE CHAIR**

**REPORT FROM THE HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE CHAIR**

**FIRE CHIEF’S REPORT**

2. **MINUTES**

   A. **Minutes from the March 19, 2015, Regular Executive Committee Meeting**
      Submitted by: Sherry Wentz, Clerk of the Authority

      Recommended Action:
      Approve as submitted.

3. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

   All matters on the consent calendar are considered routine and are to be approved with one motion unless a Committee Member or a member of the public requests separate action on a specific item.

   A. **Monthly Investment Reports**
      Committee Recommendation: APPROVE
      Submitted by: Patricia Jakubiak, Treasurer

      Recommended Action:
      Receive and file the reports.
B. Sole Source Blanket Order Contracts – Information Technology  
Submitted by: Mike Schroeder, Assistant Chief/Support Services Department

Recommended Action: 
Approve and authorize the Purchasing Manager to renew and adjust sole source blanket order contracts for FATPOT Technologies, Verizon Inc., and Xerox Government Systems for up to three years to pay for annual software license and maintenance fees.

C. Blanket Order Contract – Information Technology  
Submitted by: Mike Schroeder, Assistant Chief/Support Services Department

Recommended Action: 
Approve and authorize the Purchasing Manager to extend the Systems Maintenance Services blanket order contract for two additional years for a price not to exceed $38,405.76 annually.

D. Award of Bid JA2019 – Purchase of 17 Chevrolet Colorados  
Submitted by: Mike Schroeder, Assistant Chief/Support Services Department

Recommended Action: 
Approve and authorize the Purchasing Manager to issue a purchase order to Winner Chevrolet in the amount of $444,989.95 (includes tax).

E. Award of Bid RO2009 - Personal Protective Equipment Maintenance and Repair  
Submitted by: Lori Zeller, Assistant Chief/Business Services Department

Recommended Actions:
1. Approve and authorize the Purchasing Manager to establish a blanket order contract with ECMS for an annual contract amount not to exceed $40,000.
2. Authorize the Purchasing Manager to extend the contract up to two additional years at $40,000 per year with annual increases not to exceed 3%.

F. Award of Bid RO2010 - EMS Nitrile Gloves  
Submitted by: Dave Thomas, Assistant Chief/Operations Department

Recommended Actions:
1. Approve and authorize the Purchasing Manager to establish a blanket order contract with Bound Tree Medical LLC., with an annual contract amount not to exceed $150,000.
2. Authorize the Purchasing Manager to extend the contract for up to two years at $150,000 per year with annual increases not to exceed 2%.

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR
4. DISCUSSION CALENDAR

A. Legislative Update AB 1217
   Submitted by: Sandy Cooney, Director/Communications and Public Relations

   Recommended Action:
   Inasmuch as the Executive Committee requested that this item be placed on a future agenda, further action is at its sole discretion.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

CLOSED SESSION
No items.

ADJOURNMENT – The next regular meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for Thursday, May 21, 2015, at 6:00 p.m.

AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING
I hereby certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing Agenda was posted in the lobby and front gate public display case of the Orange County Fire Authority, Regional Training and Operations Center, 1 Fire Authority Road, Irvine, CA, not less than 72 hours prior to the meeting. Dated this 9th day of April 2015.

Sherry A.F. Wentz, CMC
Clerk of the Authority

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Board of Directors Meeting Thursday, April 23, 2015, 6:00 p.m.
Human Resources Committee Meeting Tuesday, May 5, 2015, 12:00 noon
Budget and Finance Committee Meeting Wednesday, May 13, 2015, 12:00 noon
Claims Settlement Committee Meeting Thursday, May 21, 2015, 5:30 p.m.
There are no items for Section 1 PRESENTATIONS.
CALL TO ORDER
A regular meeting of the Orange County Fire Authority Executive Committee was called to order on March 19, 2015, at 6:04 p.m. by Chair Murray.

INVOCATION
Chaplain Bob George offered the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Director Shawver led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance to our Flag.

ROLL CALL

Present: Noel Hatch, Laguna Woods
         Gene Hernandez, Yorba Linda
         Jeffrey Lalloway, Irvine
         Jerry McCloskey, Laguna Niguel
         Al Murray, Tustin
         David Shawver, Stanton
         Todd Spitzer, County of Orange
         Beth Swift, Buena Park

Absent: None

Also present were:

         Deputy Chief Craig Kinoshita   Assistant Chief Lori Smith
         Assistant Chief Lori Zeller    Assistant Chief Dave Thomas
         Assistant Chief Brian Young    Human Resources Director Jeremy Hammond
         Assistant Chief Mike Schroeder  Communications Director Sandy Cooney
         Clerk of the Authority Sherry Wentz  General Counsel David Kendig
1. PRESENTATIONS
   No items.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (F: 12.02A3)

Chair Murray opened the Public Comments portion of the meeting.

Stephen Wontrobski, Mission Viejo resident, referenced past requests to review records in 2014, regarding salary/rates charged to the contract cities vs. cash cities. He also commented to the unfunded actuarial accrued liabilities (UAAL) structure.

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE CHAIR (F: 12.02A6)

Budget and Finance Committee Chair McCloskey reported at its March 11, 2015, meeting, the Committee voted unanimously to appoint Director Swift as Vice Chair to complete former Director Allevato’s term. The Committee reviewed the Financial Audit Services Contract Renewal, the Monthly Investment Reports, and the Updated Broker/Dealer List, and voted unanimously to direct staff to place these items on the agenda for the Executive Committee, with the recommendation that the Executive Committee approve the recommended actions. In discussing the Updated Broker/Dealer List, the Committee received a detailed report from OCFA’s Treasurer, Tricia Jakubiak who explained the information provided in the staff report, including the summary of FINRA reports, and answered several questions for the Committee. With the information provided, the Committee unanimously recommended approval. As Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, he stated the Executive Committee can be confident that the item was thoroughly vetted. Lastly, he reported that the Committee also reviewed the FY 2014/15 Mid-Year Budget Adjustment and the 2014 Homeland Security Grant Program Agreement and voted unanimously to direct staff to place these items on the agenda for the Board of Directors meeting of March 26, 2015, with the recommendation that the Board approve the recommended actions.

REPORT FROM THE HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE CHAIR (F: 12.02A6)

Human Resources Committee Chair Shawver reported the Human Resources Committee did not meet in the month of March; therefore there is nothing to report at this time.

FIRE CHIEF’S REPORT (F: 12.02A7)

Deputy Chief Kinoshita presented no report.
2. MINUTES

A. Minutes from the January 15, 2015, Regular Executive Committee Meeting
   (F: 12.02A2)

   On motion of Vice Chair Hernandez and second by Director Shawver, the Board voted
   unanimously to approve the Minutes from the January 15, 2015, regular Executive
   Committee meeting.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

   Agenda Item Nos. 3C, 3F, and 3G were pulled for separate consideration.

   A. Monthly Investment Reports (F: 11.10D2)

   On motion of Director Lalloway and second by Vice Chair Hernandez, the Executive
   Committee voted unanimously to receive and file the reports.

   B. Second Quarter Financial Newsletter (F: 15.07)

   On motion of Director Lalloway and second by Vice Chair Hernandez, the Executive
   Committee voted unanimously to receive and file the reports.

   C. Financial Audit Services Contract Renewal (F: 15.02A)

   Stephen Wontrobski, Mission Viejo resident, spoke in opposition to the item and
   addressed a request to review the working papers of Lance, Soll & Lunghard, LLP.

   On motion of Director Lalloway and second by Vice Chair Hernandez, the Executive
   Committee voted unanimously to approve and authorize the Purchasing Manager to
   execute Amendment Number One to the Professional Services Agreement with Lance,
   Soll & Lunghard, LLP, to renew the Agreement for two additional years in the aggregate
   amount of $141,844, and to clarify language regarding access to and ownership of auditor
   work papers used for testing.

   D. Amendment to Joint Agreement for the Operation, Maintenance and Financial
      Management of the Orange County 800MHz Countywide Coordinated
      Communications System (F: 18.04A)

   On motion of Director Lalloway and second by Vice Chair Hernandez, the Executive
   Committee voted unanimously to approve and authorize the Board Chair to execute the
   Amendment to the Joint Agreement for the Operation, Maintenance, and Financial
   Management of the Orange County 800MHz Countywide Coordinated Communications
   System and all related documents.
E. **Sole Source Blanket Order Contracts – Information Technology** (F: 15.09F)

On motion of Director Lalloway and second by Vice Chair Hernandez, the Executive Committee voted unanimously to:

1. Approve and authorize the Purchasing Manager to issue sole source blanket order contracts to FATPOT Technologies, TriTech Software Systems, Deccan International, and Westnet, Inc., for up to three years.
2. Approve and authorize the Purchasing Manager to redistribute or adjust funding between the four contracts as requested by the department so long as the aggregate amount of the contracts collectively does not exceed $85,000 annually.

F. **Blanket Order Contract Increase Special Litigation Counsel for Validation Proceedings** (F: 12.03E3d)

Stephen Wontrobski, Mission Viejo resident, spoke in opposition to this expenditure.

On motion of Director Lalloway and second by Director Shawver, the Executive Committee voted to authorize the Purchasing Manager to increase Blanket Order B01501 by $60,000 for T. Peter Pierce of Richards, Watson & Gershon for legal services in connection with the appeal process in the validation action. Director Spitzer abstained.

G. **Updated Broker/Dealer List** (F: 11.10D4)

Stephen Wontrobski, Mission Viejo resident, spoke in his continued opposition to this item.

On motion of Vice Chair Hernandez and second by Director McCloskey, the Executive Board voted to approve the proposed Broker/Dealer List to include the following three firms: FTN Financial, Raymond James, and UBS Financial Services. Director Spitzer opposed.

4. **DISCUSSION CALENDAR**

A. **March 2015 Legislative Update** (F: 11.10F1)

Communications Director Sandy Cooney provided an overview of the legislative staff update.

On motion of Chair Murray and second by Director Shawver, the Board voted to take the following legislative positions: Support: AB 911, SB 787, AB 896, AB 203, AB 301 and AB 299 with amendments; Oppose: AB 295; and Monitor: AB 579 and AB 67. Directors Lalloway and Spitzer opposed taking the position of “monitor” for AB 67 and registered their opposition to this legislation.
B. Legislative Update AB 1217 (F: 11.10F4)

Communications Director Cooney presented the Legislative Update regarding Assembly Bill 1217.

Stephen Wontrobski, Mission Viejo resident, spoke in opposition to the proposed bill.

Ray Geagan, President of International Association of Firefighters (IAFF), Local 3631, spoke in favor of the proposed bill.

On motion of Director Lalloway and second by Vice Chair Hernandez, the Executive Committee voted unanimously to:
1. Table taking a formal position at this time.
2. Direct staff to take the following actions:
   a. Conduct an outreach to member agencies to solicit their formal positions on the proposed legislation.
   b. Schedule a meeting with Assemblyman Daly, the Board Chair, Vice Chair, Fire Chief, and OCFA staff to clarify the current Joint Powers Authority (JPA) membership, provide input, and discuss alternatives to the legislation.
   c. Direct staff to research (1) if there are other JPAs that have both SFF and cash contract members; and (2) come back with examples of how other JPAs structure their governing Boards.
   d. Reschedule this agenda item upon completion of the identified tasks for the Executive Committee’s consideration with the intent to forward the Committee’s recommendations to the full Board for its consideration.

C. Conducting Effective Board Meetings (F: 11.10)

Chair Murray introduced the staff report.

Director Lalloway suggested General Counsel provide a Closed Session briefing memo in advance of Closed Sessions, and also suggested minimizing future presentations to help expedite meetings.

On motion of Vice Chair Hernandez and second by Director Lalloway, the Executive Committee voted unanimously to direct staff to:
1. Include additional recommendations for the provision of a Closed Session summary of agendized items by General Counsel prior to the meeting and minimize formal presentations on agenda items.
2. Place the item on the Board of Directors meeting of March 26, 2015, with the Executive Committee’s recommendation that the Board of Directors direct staff to implement the suggested recommendations beginning in April 2015.
COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS (F: 12.02A4)

Director Shawver noted the OCFA staff did an outstanding job with scheduling the visits with our Orange County Board of Supervisors for the JPA validation meetings. He reported he has one last Supervisor who he had made contact with and will be meeting with in the near future.

Chair Murray thanked Assistant Chief Lori Zeller for her work in coordinating the meetings with the supervisors. He also thanked Deputy Chief Kinoshita for his years of service and noted attending the Deputy’s recent retirement event.

Director Spitzer stated he is proposing the Board of Supervisors follow suit to State Senator Bate’s legislation to bar State funded universities and colleges from banning the American flag.

Vice Chair Hernandez noting the growth in residential development in Yorba Linda, requested a letter from OCFA denouncing a recommendation by a non-OCFA retired firefighter to disregard evacuating a person’s home to save it during a fire.

Chair Murray thanked Communications Director Cooney for developing the upcoming community awareness program to prevent drowning.

CLOSED SESSION (F: 12.02A5)
No items.

ADJOURNMENT – Chair Murray adjourned the meeting at 7:24 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for Thursday, April 16, 2015, at 6:00 p.m.

______________________________
Sherry A.F. Wentz, CMC
Clerk of the Authority
Orange County Fire Authority
AGENDA STAFF REPORT

Executive Committee Meeting
April 16, 2015

Monthly Investment Reports

Contact(s) for Further Information
Patricia Jakubiak, Treasurer
Treasury & Financial Planning
tricijakubiak@ocfa.org 714.573.6301

Jane Wong, Assistant Treasurer
janewong@ocfa.org 714.573.6305

Summary
This agenda item is a routine transmittal of the monthly investment reports submitted to the
Committee in compliance with the investment policy of the Orange County Fire Authority and
with Government Code Section 53646.

Prior Board/Committee Action - Committee Recommendation: APPROVE
At its April 8, 2015, meeting, the Committee reviewed and unanimously recommended approval

Recommended Action(s)
Receive and file the reports.

Impact to Cities/County
Not Applicable.

Fiscal Impact
Not Applicable.

Background
Attached is the final monthly investment report for the month ended February 28, 2015. A
preliminary investment report as of March 20, 2015, is also provided as the most complete report
that was available at the time this agenda item was prepared.

Attachment(s)
Monthly Investment Report
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Final Investment Report

February 28, 2015
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Portfolio Activity & Earnings

During the month of February 2015, the size of the portfolio declined further to $156.5 million from $170.3 million. Significant receipts for the month included apportionments of property taxes and various contract and grant payments totaling $6.0 million. Significant disbursements included two biweekly payrolls, which were approximately $9.2 million each with related benefits. Total February cash outflows amounted to approximately $20.5 million. The portfolio’s balance is expected to stay about the same in the following month.

In February, the portfolio’s yield to maturity (365-day equivalent) rose by 2 basis points to 0.29%. The effective rate of return increased by 6 basis points to 0.30% for the month, and edged up by 1 basis point to 0.26% for the fiscal year to date. The average maturity of the portfolio lengthened slightly by 3 days to 151 days to maturity.

Economic News

The U.S. economy pulled back slightly in February 2015, although employment conditions continued to strengthen further. There were a total of 295,000 new jobs created for the month, a much stronger number than expected. The unemployment rate also improved better than expected declining by 2 basis points to 5.5% from 5.7% previously. The LEI (Leading Economic Index) increased further and the NFIB (National Federation of Independent Business) optimism index also rose slightly. Industrial production reversed and edged up a notch. Consumer confidence measures dropped in February and retail sales continued to decline. Non-manufacturing activity continued to pick up while manufacturing activity declined. Energy prices continued to drop in February causing producer prices to plunge further. Housing activity was mixed and remained slow. On March 18, 2015, at the second day of the Federal Open Market Committee’s meeting, the Committee voted to keep the federal funds rate unchanged at a target range of 0-0.25%. In its released statement, the Committee stopped using the word “patient”, which is being viewed by many market observers that the Committee is moving closer to raising rates. Current expectations remain for the first rate hike to take place in June.
BENCHMARK COMPARISON AS OF FEBRUARY 28, 2015

3 Month T-Bill: 0.02%
6 Month T-Bill: 0.07%

1 Year T-Bill: 0.22%
LAIF: 0.27%

OCFA Portfolio: 0.30%

PORTFOLIO SIZE, YIELD, & DURATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Prior Month</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book Value-</td>
<td>$156,514,261</td>
<td>$170,300,354</td>
<td>$121,167,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield to Maturity (365 day)</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Rate of Return</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days to Maturity</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Orange County Fire Authority

Portfolio Management
Portfolio Summary
February 28, 2015

## Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>% of Portfolio</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Days to Maturity</th>
<th>YTM/C 360 Equiv.</th>
<th>YTM/C 365 Equiv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money Mkt Mutual Funds/Cash</td>
<td>9,040,131.66</td>
<td>9,040,131.66</td>
<td>9,040,131.66</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency Coupon Securities</td>
<td>34,888,888.78</td>
<td>34,850,119.89</td>
<td>34,900,068.89</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency Disc. -Amortizing</td>
<td>62,000,000.00</td>
<td>61,995,420.00</td>
<td>61,067,630.00</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Funds</td>
<td>50,000,000.00</td>
<td>49,999,019.00</td>
<td>50,000,000.00</td>
<td>32.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>155,929,020.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>155,884,690.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>155,927,830.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.286</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.290</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cash

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passbook/Checking (not included in yield calculations)</th>
<th>680,597.00</th>
<th>680,597.00</th>
<th>680,597.00</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0.000</th>
<th>0.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash and Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>156,609,617.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>156,565,287.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>156,608,427.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.286</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.290</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total Earnings

- **February 28 Month Ending**
  - Current Year: 37,978.82
  - Fiscal Year To Date: 280,703.04
- **Average Daily Balance**: 166,027,962.81
- **Effective Rate of Return**: 0.30%

"I certify that this investment report accurately reflects all pooled investments and is in compliance with the investment policy adopted by the Board of Directors to be effective on January 1, 2015. A copy of this policy is available from the Clerk of the Authority. Sufficient investment liquidity and anticipated revenues are available to meet budgeted expenditure requirements for the next thirty days and the next six months."

Patricia Jakubich, Treasurer

3/6/15

---

**Cash and Investments with GASB 31 Adjustment:**

- **Book Value of Cash & Investments before GASB 31 (Above)**: $156,608,427.55
- **GASB 31 Adjustment to Books (See Note 3 on page 9)**: $(94,166.47)
- **Total**: $156,514,261.08
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>Investment #</th>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>Average Balance</th>
<th>Purchase Date</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Stated Rate</th>
<th>YTM/C</th>
<th>Days to Maturity</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money Mkt Mutual Funds/Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY5528</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>High Mark 100% US Treasury MMF</td>
<td>0.040,131.66</td>
<td>0.040,131.66</td>
<td>0.040,131.66</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal and Average</td>
<td>10,671,185.77</td>
<td>9,040,131.66</td>
<td>9,040,131.66</td>
<td>9,040,131.66</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Paper Disc. -Amortizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal and Average</td>
<td>5,356,857.14</td>
<td>9,040,131.66</td>
<td>9,040,131.66</td>
<td>9,040,131.66</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency Coupon Securities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3133ECM76</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>Federal Farm Credit Bank (Callable anytime) 04/25/2013</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,996,230.00</td>
<td>8,997,565.82</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>04/22/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3133804V6</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank (Callable anytime) 08/09/2012</td>
<td>6,000,000.00</td>
<td>6,000,300.00</td>
<td>6,000,000.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>08/09/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3133813R4</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank (Callable 3-9-15) 12/20/2012</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,951,490.00</td>
<td>9,007,924.50</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>11/09/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313360DC4</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank (Callable anytime) 03/15/2013</td>
<td>888,888.78</td>
<td>888,799.89</td>
<td>888,826.08</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>03/07/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3130A3RM8</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank (Callable 6-30-15) 12/30/2013</td>
<td>10,000,000.00</td>
<td>10,014,300.00</td>
<td>10,005,720.49</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>12/30/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal and Average</td>
<td>34,900,316.32</td>
<td>34,888,888.78</td>
<td>34,850,119.89</td>
<td>34,900,068.89</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency Disc. -Amortizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313312FH8</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>Farm Credit Disc Note 12/18/2014</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,999,370.00</td>
<td>8,997,620.00</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>05/08/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313399ECZ</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>Freddie Mac 10/27/2014</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>7,999,920.00</td>
<td>7,999,840.00</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>03/31/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313399ED1</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>Freddie Mac 12/18/2014</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,999,730.00</td>
<td>8,996,950.00</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>04/10/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313399FX6</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>Freddie Mac 12/18/2014</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,999,190.00</td>
<td>8,997,335.00</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>05/22/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313399GM9</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>Freddie Mac 12/18/2014</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,998,830.00</td>
<td>8,996,780.00</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>06/05/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313399DP1</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank 12/04/2014</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,999,910.00</td>
<td>8,999,545.00</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>03/27/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313399FN2</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank 02/03/2015</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,998,470.00</td>
<td>8,997,580.00</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>08/30/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal and Average</td>
<td>65,199,883.57</td>
<td>62,000,000.00</td>
<td>61,965,420.00</td>
<td>61,887,630.00</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS336</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>Local Agency Investmt Fund</td>
<td>50,000,000.00</td>
<td>49,990,019.00</td>
<td>50,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal and Average</td>
<td>50,000,000.00</td>
<td>49,990,019.00</td>
<td>50,000,000.00</td>
<td>50,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total and Average</td>
<td>168,027,962.81</td>
<td>165,929,020.44</td>
<td>155,884,890.55</td>
<td>155,927,830.55</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSIP</td>
<td>Investment #</td>
<td>Issuer</td>
<td>Average Balance</td>
<td>Purchase Date</td>
<td>Par Value</td>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>Book Value</td>
<td>Stated Rate</td>
<td>YTMIC 365</td>
<td>Days to Maturity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS10104</td>
<td>10104</td>
<td>American Benefit Plan Admin</td>
<td>07/01/2014</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS10033</td>
<td>10033</td>
<td>Revolving Fund</td>
<td>07/01/2014</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Union Bank</td>
<td>07/01/2014</td>
<td>395,597.00</td>
<td>395,597.00</td>
<td>395,597.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS361</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>CORVEL</td>
<td>07/01/2014</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash and Investments</td>
<td>166,027,962.91</td>
<td>156,608,517.44</td>
<td>156,565,287.55</td>
<td>156,608,427.55</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging Interval:</td>
<td>(03/01/2015 - 03/01/2015)</td>
<td>Maturity Par Value</td>
<td>Percent of Portfolio</td>
<td>Current Book Value</td>
<td>Current Market Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 days</td>
<td>6 Maturities</td>
<td>0 Payments</td>
<td>59,720,728.66</td>
<td>38.13%</td>
<td>59,720,728.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 30 days</td>
<td>2 Maturities</td>
<td>0 Payments</td>
<td>17,000,000.00</td>
<td>10.85%</td>
<td>16,999,386.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 60 days</td>
<td>1 Maturity</td>
<td>0 Payments</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
<td>8,998,950.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 91 days</td>
<td>2 Maturities</td>
<td>0 Payments</td>
<td>18,000,000.00</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
<td>17,994,956.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 - 121 days</td>
<td>2 Maturities</td>
<td>0 Payments</td>
<td>18,000,000.00</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
<td>17,993,400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 - 152 days</td>
<td>0 Maturities</td>
<td>0 Payments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 - 183 days</td>
<td>0 Maturities</td>
<td>0 Payments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184 - 274 days</td>
<td>0 Maturities</td>
<td>0 Payments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275 - 365 days</td>
<td>0 Maturities</td>
<td>0 Payments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366 - 1095 days</td>
<td>5 Maturities</td>
<td>0 Payments</td>
<td>34,888,888.78</td>
<td>22.28%</td>
<td>34,900,068.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096 days and after</td>
<td>0 Maturities</td>
<td>0 Payments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for 18 Investments 0 Payments**

100.00

156,608,427.55

156,585,287.55
NOTES TO PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT REPORT

Note 1: Market value of the LAIF investment is calculated using a fair value factor provided by LAIF. The MUFG Union Bank (formerly Union Bank) Trust Department provides market values of the remaining investments.

Note 2: Book value reflects the cost or amortized cost before the GASB 31 accounting adjustment.

Note 3: GASB 31 requires governmental entities to report investments at fair value in the financial statements and to reflect the corresponding unrealized gains/ (losses) as a component of investment income. The GASB 31 adjustment is recorded only at fiscal year end. The adjustment for June 30, 2014 includes an increase of $14,938 to the LAIF investment and a decrease of $(109,104) to the remaining investments.

Note 4: The Highmark money market mutual fund functions as the Authority’s sweep account. Funds are transferred to and from the sweep account to/from OCFA’s checking account in order to maintain a target balance of $1,000,000 in checking. Since this transfer occurs at the beginning of each banking day, the checking account sometimes reflects a negative balance at the close of the banking day. The negative closing balance is not considered an overdraft since funds are available in the money market mutual fund. The purpose of the sweep arrangement is to provide sufficient liquidity to cover outstanding checks, yet allow that liquidity to be invested while payment of the outstanding checks is pending.
Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF)

As of February 28, 2015, OCFA has $50,000,000 invested in LAIF. The fair value of OCFA’s LAIF investment is calculated using a participant fair value factor provided by LAIF on a quarterly basis. The fair value factor as of December 31, 2014 is 0.99998038. When applied to OCFA’s LAIF investment, the fair value is $49,999,019 or $981 below cost. Although the fair value of the LAIF investment is lower than cost, OCFA can withdraw the actual amount invested at any time.

LAIF is included in the State Treasurer’s Pooled Money Investment Account (PMIA) for investment purposes. The PMIA market valuation at February 28, 2015 is included on the following page.
## State of California
### Pooled Money Investment Account
#### Market Valuation
##### 2/28/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Accrued Interest Purch.</th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
<th>Accrued Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Treasury:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills</td>
<td>$ 10,236,556,460.97</td>
<td>$ 10,244,072,000.00</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>$ 18,764,204,456.73</td>
<td>$ 18,775,634,000.00</td>
<td>$ 17,408,015.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>$ 589,698,806.51</td>
<td>$ 584,595,567.73</td>
<td>$ 524,642.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBS-REMICs</td>
<td>$ 97,794,794.33</td>
<td>$ 104,020,812.14</td>
<td>$ 465,357.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debentures</td>
<td>$ 1,811,915,704.95</td>
<td>$ 1,810,622,650.00</td>
<td>$ 5,914,550.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debentures FR</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount Notes</td>
<td>$ 1,898,340,201.35</td>
<td>$ 1,898,741,000.00</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNMA</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supranational Debentures</td>
<td>$ 450,246,568.19</td>
<td>$ 450,073,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,060,784.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDs and YCDs FR</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Notes</td>
<td>$ 500,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 499,885,917.59</td>
<td>$ 243,388.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDs and YCDs</td>
<td>$ 9,450,046,920.49</td>
<td>$ 9,446,134,604.62</td>
<td>$ 5,666,423.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Paper</td>
<td>$ 5,343,355,278.35</td>
<td>$ 5,343,828,196.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds FR</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurchase Agreements</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse Repurchase</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Deposits</td>
<td>$ 5,266,540,000.00</td>
<td>$ 5,266,540,000.00</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 55 &amp; GF Loans</td>
<td>$ 3,263,089,523.59</td>
<td>$ 3,263,089,523.59</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 57,671,788,715.46</td>
<td>$ 57,887,237,272.32</td>
<td>$ 31,283,162.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fair Value Including Accrued Interest** $ 57,718,520,434.87

Repurchase Agreements, Time Deposits, AB 55 & General Fund loans, and Reverse Repurchase agreements are carried at portfolio book value (carrying cost).
Orange County Fire Authority

Preliminary Investment Report

March 20, 2015
# ORANGE COUNTY FIRE AUTHORITY

## Portfolio Management

### Portfolio Summary
March 20, 2015

(See Note 1 on page 16)  
(See Note 2 on page 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>% of Portfolio</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Days to Maturity</th>
<th>YTM/C 360 Equiv.</th>
<th>YTM/C 365 Equiv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money Mk Mutual Funds/Cash</td>
<td>4,620,168.48</td>
<td>4,620,168.48</td>
<td>4,620,168.48</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency Coupon Securities</td>
<td>34,888,888.78</td>
<td>34,868,597.67</td>
<td>34,899,051.85</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agency Disc.-Amortizing</td>
<td>81,000,000.00</td>
<td>80,988,120.00</td>
<td>80,986,373.90</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Funds</td>
<td>50,000,000.00</td>
<td>49,999,019.00</td>
<td>50,000,000.00</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>170,509,057.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>170,475,905.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>170,506,394.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>326</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.269</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.273</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passbook/Checking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not included in yield calculations)</td>
<td>571,185.80</td>
<td>571,185.80</td>
<td>571,185.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash and Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>171,080,243.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>171,047,090.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>171,077,580.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>326</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.269</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.273</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Earnings</th>
<th>March 20 Month Ending</th>
<th>Fiscal Year To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Year</td>
<td>25,735.01</td>
<td>306,438.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Balance</td>
<td>164,907,915.89</td>
<td>162,595,410.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Rate of Return</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"I certify that this investment report accurately reflects all pooled investments and is in compliance with the investment policy adopted by the Board of Directors to be effective on January 1, 2015. A copy of this policy is available from the Clerk of the Authority. Sufficient investment liquidity and anticipated revenues are available to meet budgeted expenditure requirements for the next thirty days and the next six months."

Patricia Jakubik, Treasurer  
3/27/15

---

**Cash and Investments with GASB 31 Adjustment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book Value of Cash &amp; Investments before GASB 31 (Above)</td>
<td>$ 171,077,580.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GASB 31 Adjustment to Books (See Note 3 on page 18)</td>
<td>$(94,168.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 170,983,413.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ORANGE COUNTY FIRE AUTHORITY
Portfolio Management
Portfolio Details - Investments
March 20, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>Investment #</th>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>Average Balance</th>
<th>Purchase Date</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Stated Rate</th>
<th>YTM/C</th>
<th>Days to Maturity</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYS528</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>High Mark 100% US Treasury MMF</td>
<td>10,120,275.19</td>
<td>4,620,168.48</td>
<td>4,620,168.48</td>
<td>4,620,168.48</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Federal Agency Coupon Securities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>Investment #</th>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>Average Balance</th>
<th>Purchase Date</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Stated Rate</th>
<th>YTM/C</th>
<th>Days to Maturity</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3133ECM76</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>Federal Farm Credit Bank (Callable anytime) 04/25/2013</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,097,030.00</td>
<td>8,997,712.81</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>04/22/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3133804V6</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank (Callable anytime) 08/09/2012</td>
<td>6,000,000.00</td>
<td>6,000,000.00</td>
<td>6,000,000.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>08/09/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3133813R4</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank (Callable 4-9-15) 12/20/2012</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,966,610.00</td>
<td>9,007,760.77</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>11/09/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313382O4C</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank (Callable anytime) 03/15/2013</td>
<td>888,888.78</td>
<td>898,657.67</td>
<td>898,831.40</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>03/07/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3130A3RM8</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank (Callable 6-30-15) 12/30/2014</td>
<td>10,000,000.00</td>
<td>10,015,100.00</td>
<td>10,026,546.87</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>12/30/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal and Average** 34,899,954.95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>Investment #</th>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>Average Balance</th>
<th>Purchase Date</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Stated Rate</th>
<th>YTM/C</th>
<th>Days to Maturity</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>313312FH8</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>Farm Credit Disc Note 12/18/2014</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,999,370.00</td>
<td>8,998,320.00</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>05/08/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313398ED1</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>Freddie Mac 12/18/2014</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,999,910.00</td>
<td>8,999,475.00</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>04/10/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313398FX6</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>Freddie Mac 12/18/2014</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,999,190.00</td>
<td>8,997,965.00</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>05/22/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313396CM9</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>Freddie Mac 12/18/2014</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,998,380.00</td>
<td>8,997,435.00</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>06/05/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313384DP1</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank 12/04/2014</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,999,650.00</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>03/27/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313384HN2</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank 03/03/2015</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,997,750.00</td>
<td>8,997,980.00</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>09/03/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3133965H8</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank 03/09/2015</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,998,020.00</td>
<td>8,998,875.00</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>06/19/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313384HN2</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank 03/12/2015</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>9,000,000.00</td>
<td>8,999,366.75</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>09/30/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313384HN2</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>Fed Home Loan Bank 03/18/2015</td>
<td>8,000,000.00</td>
<td>7,998,000.00</td>
<td>7,998,092.23</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>09/30/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal and Average** 69,887,685.75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>Investment #</th>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>Average Balance</th>
<th>Purchase Date</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Stated Rate</th>
<th>YTM/C</th>
<th>Days to Maturity</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYS336</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>Local Agency Invest Fund</td>
<td>60,000,000.00</td>
<td>49,999,019.00</td>
<td>50,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal and Average** 60,000,000.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>Investment #</th>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>Average Balance</th>
<th>Purchase Date</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Stated Rate</th>
<th>YTM/C</th>
<th>Days to Maturity</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYS336</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>Local Agency Invest Fund</td>
<td>60,000,000.00</td>
<td>49,999,019.00</td>
<td>50,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total and Average** 164,907,315.89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>Investment #</th>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>Average Balance</th>
<th>Purchase Date</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Stated Rate</th>
<th>YTM/C</th>
<th>Days to Maturity</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYS336</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>Local Agency Invest Fund</td>
<td>170,509,057.28</td>
<td>170,475,905.15</td>
<td>170,608,394.23</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORANGE COUNTY FIRE AUTHORITY  
Portfolio Management  
Portfolio Details - Cash  
March 20, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>Investment #</th>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>Average Balance</th>
<th>Purchase Date</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Stated Rate</th>
<th>YTM/C 365</th>
<th>Days to Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYS10104</td>
<td>10104</td>
<td>ABPA (Acct Closed)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>07/01/2014</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS10033</td>
<td>10033</td>
<td>Revolving Fund</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>07/01/2014</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Union Bank</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>07/01/2014</td>
<td>551,185.80</td>
<td>551,185.80</td>
<td>551,185.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS361</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>CORVEL (Acct Closed)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>07/01/2014</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cash and Investments  | 164,907,915.89 | 171,080,243.06 | 171,047,090.95 | 171,077,580.03 | 0.273 | 143  |
(This Page Intentionally Left Blank)
ORANGE COUNTY FIRE AUTHORITY
Aging Report
By Maturity Date
As of March 21, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aging Interval</th>
<th>Maturity Par Value</th>
<th>Percent of Portfolio</th>
<th>Current Book Value</th>
<th>Current Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 days (03/21/2015 - 03/21/2015 )</td>
<td>6 Maturities 0 Payments</td>
<td>55,191,354.28 32.26%</td>
<td>55,191,354.28</td>
<td>55,190,373.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 30 days (03/22/2015 - 04/20/2015 )</td>
<td>2 Maturities 0 Payments</td>
<td>18,000,000.00 10.52%</td>
<td>17,999,370.00</td>
<td>17,999,910.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 60 days (04/21/2015 - 05/20/2015 )</td>
<td>1 Maturities 0 Payments</td>
<td>9,000,000.00 5.26%</td>
<td>8,998,320.00</td>
<td>6,998,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 91 days (05/21/2015 - 06/20/2015 )</td>
<td>3 Maturities 0 Payments</td>
<td>27,000,000.00 15.78%</td>
<td>26,994,295.00</td>
<td>26,995,580.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 - 121 days (06/21/2015 - 07/20/2015 )</td>
<td>3 Maturities 0 Payments</td>
<td>27,000,000.00 15.78%</td>
<td>26,994,388.90</td>
<td>26,993,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 - 152 days (07/21/2015 - 08/20/2015 )</td>
<td>0 Maturities 0 Payments</td>
<td>0.00 0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 - 183 days (08/21/2015 - 09/20/2015 )</td>
<td>0 Maturities 0 Payments</td>
<td>0.00 0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184 - 274 days (09/21/2015 - 12/20/2015 )</td>
<td>0 Maturities 0 Payments</td>
<td>0.00 0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275 - 365 days (12/21/2015 - 03/20/2016 )</td>
<td>1 Maturities 0 Payments</td>
<td>888,886.76 0.52%</td>
<td>888,831.40</td>
<td>888,657.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366 - 1095 days (03/21/2016 - 03/20/2018 )</td>
<td>4 Maturities 0 Payments</td>
<td>34,000,000.00 19.88%</td>
<td>34,011,020.45</td>
<td>33,979,940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096 days and after (03/21/2018 - )</td>
<td>0 Maturities 0 Payments</td>
<td>0.00 0.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 20 investments 0 Payments</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>171,077,580.03</td>
<td>171,047,090.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES TO PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT REPORT

Note 1:  Market value of the LAIF investment is calculated using a fair value factor provided by LAIF. The MUFG Union Bank Trust Department provides market values of the remaining investments.

Note 2:  Book value reflects the cost or amortized cost before the GASB 31 accounting adjustment.

Note 3:  GASB 31 requires governmental entities to report investments at fair value in the financial statements and to reflect the corresponding unrealized gains/ (losses) as a component of investment income. The GASB 31 adjustment is recorded only at fiscal year end. The adjustment for June 30, 2014 includes an increase of $14,938 to the LAIF investment and a decrease of $(109,104) to the remaining investments.

Note 4:  The Highmark money market mutual fund functions as the Authority’s sweep account. Funds are transferred to and from the sweep account to/from OCFA’s checking account in order to maintain a target balance of $1,000,000 in checking. Since this transfer occurs at the beginning of each banking day, the checking account sometimes reflects a negative balance at the close of the banking day. The negative closing balance is not considered an overdraft since funds are available in the money market mutual fund. The purpose of the sweep arrangement is to provide sufficient liquidity to cover outstanding checks, yet allow that liquidity to be invested while payment of the outstanding checks is pending.
Contact(s) for Further Information
Mike Schroeder, Assistant Chief  
michaelschroeder@ocfa.org  
714.573.6008
Support Services Department
Joel Brodowski, IT Manager  
joelbrodowski@ocfa.org  
714.573.6421

Summary
This agenda item seeks approval to renew and increase sole source blanket orders for FATPOT Technologies, Verizon Inc., and Xerox Government Systems LLC to pay annual software license and maintenance fees.

Prior Board/Committee Action
Not Applicable.

Recommended Action(s)
Approve and authorize the Purchasing Manager to renew and adjust sole source blanket order contracts for FATPOT Technologies, Verizon Inc., and Xerox Government Systems for up to three years to pay for annual software license and maintenance fees.

Impact to Cities/County
Not Applicable.

Fiscal Impact
Funding is included in the General Fund budget.

Background

FATPOT Technologies
The OCFA uses FATPOT Technologies software for the regional Automatic Vehicle Location system (AVL) that identifies and locates all OCFA emergency vehicles, and several important software interfaces including: the regional CAD-to-CAD interfaces with the other dispatch agencies in Orange County, interfaces with the ambulance transportation providers, and interface to the OCMEDS regional electronic patient care reporting system. These systems are proprietary to FATPOT and require a sole source contract for maintenance and support. On May 22, 2014, the Executive Committee approved the current blanket order in the amount of $87,307 annually. The implementation of the new TriTech CAD system on September 9, 2014, required new software interfaces to be developed and implemented to connect the four current ambulance transportation providers, the other three Emergency Dispatch Center CAD systems in Orange County, and the OCMEDS system. These new interfaces increased the annual software license and maintenance fees from $87,307 to $102,820. Staff is requesting approval of the increased blanket order value for three renewal years (See Attachment).
Verizon Inc.
Verizon Inc. provides support and maintenance for the OCFA’s Emergency 9-1-1 (E9-1-1) phone system in the Emergency Command Center, and the PBX/Admin phone system that OCFA employees use to conduct business. On June 26, 2014, the Executive Committee approved the current blanket order through June 30, 2015. This support and maintenance contract is required until the current E9-1-1 telephone system is replaced. This contract will be terminated after the PBX/Admin telephone system is upgraded and then support and maintenance will transition to manufacturer warranty and maintenance contracts.

On November 20, 2014, IT staff provided a status update to the Executive Committee on the E9-1-1 phone replacement. This replacement has been approved by the California Office of Emergency Services (CalOES) and the equipment has been ordered from the manufacturer with a tentatively scheduled implementation after August 2015. The PBX Admin phone system is budgeted for a major upgrade in the FY 2015/16 budget and is tentatively scheduled to occur in the third quarter. Staff is requesting approval of the blanket order for one additional year to provide support during the transition to the new system (See Attachment).

Xerox Government Systems
Xerox Government Systems LLC provides the licenses for the Banner Financial/Human Resources software system utilized by the OCFA which is used for payroll and financial processes that include purchasing, accounts payable, general accounting, and accounts receivable. The original purchase of this system was approved by the Executive Committee in 1996, and subsequent amendments to the original contract have been processed with management approval for ongoing licensing and maintenance. Due to the changes in the Roles and Responsibilities Matrix, staff is requesting approval to extend the current blanket order contract for the two additional renewal years remaining on contract amendment five (See Attachment).

Attachment(s)
Proposed Blanket Order Contracts
## Orange County Fire Authority
### Sole Source Blanket Order Contracts – Information Technology
#### Proposed Renewals and Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendors &amp; Blanket Orders</th>
<th>Contract End Dates for Annual Renewal Options</th>
<th>Original BO Amount</th>
<th>New Annual Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FATPOT Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>License and maintenance fees for regional Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) system, regional CAD2CAD system, Ambulance and OCMEDS software interfaces.</em></td>
<td>05/31/2015</td>
<td>$ 87,307.50</td>
<td>$ 102,820.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05/31/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05/31/2017</td>
<td>$71,895.76</td>
<td>$71,895.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05/31/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verizon Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>OCFA Emergency 911 (E911) phone system and the PBX Business phone system maintenance and support fees.</em></td>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>$100,278.38</td>
<td>$100,278.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06/30/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerox Government Systems LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>License and maintenance fees for the Banner HRMS software used by the Human Resources and Finance Sections for payroll employee records and financial processes.</em></td>
<td>04/30/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/30/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/30/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blanket Order Contract  
Information Technology

**Contact(s) for Further Information**

- Mike Schroeder, Assistant Chief  
  michaelschroeder@ocfa.org  
  714.573.6008  
  Support Services Department

- Joel Brodowski, IT Manager  
  joelbrodowski@ocfa.org  
  714.573.6421

**Summary**

Due to the changes in the Roles and Responsibilities Matrix effective July 1, 2014, this agenda item is submitted for approval to renew and extend the blanket order contract BO1516-1 with Systems Maintenance Services (SMS) for two additional years at not to exceed amount of $38,405.76 annually.

**Prior Board/Committee Action**

Not Applicable.

**Recommended Action(s)**

Approve and authorize the Purchasing Manager to extend the Systems Maintenance Services blanket order contract for two additional years for a price not to exceed $38,405.76 annually.

**Impact to Cities/County**

Not Applicable.

**Fiscal Impact**

Funding is included in the General Fund budget.

**Background**

On April 3, 2014, an RFP was issued for a maintenance and repair contract for HP and Cisco equipment. Over 570 vendors were invited to participate; however SMS was the only firm that submitted a proposal. SMS agreed to hold their pricing for three years. On May 21, 2014, a maintenance and repair contract for computer servers and data network equipment was awarded to Systems Maintenance Services in the annual amount of $38,405.76. Since the three year total value of this contract exceeds $100,000, staff is requesting approval from the Executive Committee to extend the contract for two additional years and for a not to exceed amount of $38,405.76 annually.

**Attachment(s)**

None.
Executive Committee Meeting
April 16, 2015

AGENDA STAFF REPORT

Award of Bid JA2019 – Purchase of 17 Chevrolet Colorados

Contact(s) for Further Information
Mike Schroeder, Assistant Chief  
michaelschroeder@ocfa.org
714.573.6008
Support Services Department

Rick Oborny, Fleet Services Manager  
rickoborny@ocfa.org
714.573.6651

Summary
This agenda item is submitted for the approval of a bid award to purchase 17 2015 Chevrolet Colorados from Winner Chevrolet, the lowest responsive bidder.

Prior Board/Committee Action
Not Applicable.

Recommended Action(s)
Approve and authorize the Purchasing Manager to issue a purchase order to Winner Chevrolet in the amount of $444,989.95 (includes tax).

Impact to Cities/County
Not Applicable.

Fiscal Impact
Funding is included in the FY 2014/15 Vehicle Replacement Fund (133) budget.

Background
Each year, the Fleet Services Manager reviews the vehicles identified for replacement in the OCFA’s vehicle replacement plan. This evaluation considers the vehicle’s current age, mileage, and repair history. Based on the review, seven mid-size 4x4 pickup trucks utilized by Safety Training, nine mid-size 2x2 pickup trucks utilized by Fire Prevention, and one mid-size pickup truck utilized by Fleet Services were approved for replacement and budgeted in the FY 2014/15 budget.

On March 12, 2015, an invitation for bid (IFB) was issued and 183 vendors were notified. Five bids were received on March 25, 2015, the bid due date. Winner Chevrolet was the lowest responsive responsible bidder. Therefore, staff is recommending the award to Winner Chevrolet for the purchase of the seventeen 2015 Chevrolet Colorados.

Attachment(s)
Vehicles Scheduled for Replacement with Bid Results
Orange County Fire Authority
Vehicle Replacement Schedule and Bid Results

Vehicles Scheduled for Replacement:
The seven mid-size 4x4 units that are scheduled for replacement are:

1. Unit #2155 2002 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 214,000 miles
2. Unit #2158 2007 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 128,000 miles
3. Unit #2159 2006 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 117,200 miles
4. Unit #2262 2007 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 139,800 miles
5. Unit #2264 2007 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 120,000 miles
6. Unit #2165 2007 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 107,150 miles
7. Unit #2166 2007 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 143,000 miles

The nine mid-size 2x2 units that are scheduled for replacement are:

8. Unit #2260 2002 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 135,915 miles
9. Unit #2263 2003 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 129,000 miles
10. Unit #2264 2002 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 102,695 miles
11. Unit #2266 2002 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 91,375 miles
12. Unit #3109 2001 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 114,000 miles
13. Unit #3110 2001 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 106,000 miles
14. Unit #3150 2001 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 107,000 miles
15. Unit #3225 2001 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 70,343 miles
16. Unit #3227 2001 Chevrolet S10 Blazer 105,000 miles

The one mid-size Crew Cab 2x2 unit that is scheduled to be replaced is:

17. Unit #2208 2001 Chevrolet 1500 pickup 108,500 miles

The lower mileage units will be rolled into the relief pool fleet and older high-mileage units will be sold through auction.

Bid Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Winner Chevrolet</th>
<th>Lake Chevrolet</th>
<th>Penske Chevrolet</th>
<th>Rotolo Chevrolet</th>
<th>Reynold Buick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 Chevrolet Colorado 4wd Crew Cab w/ 5’ bed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$192,666.25*</td>
<td>$197,269.52*</td>
<td>$199,950.52*</td>
<td>$203,481.25*</td>
<td>$214,716.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Chevrolet Colorado 2wd Extended Cab w/ 6’ bed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$195,198.75*</td>
<td>$199,410.84*</td>
<td>$205,211.34*</td>
<td>$205,917.75*</td>
<td>$199,338.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Chevrolet Colorado 2wd Crew Cab w/ 6’ bed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$24,173.75*</td>
<td>$24,817.75*</td>
<td>$24,465.25*</td>
<td>$25,408.75*</td>
<td>$26,703.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,951.20</td>
<td>$33,707.95</td>
<td>$34,358.27</td>
<td>$34,784.62</td>
<td>$35,248.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$444,989.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>$455,206.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>$463,985.38</strong></td>
<td><strong>$469,592.37</strong></td>
<td><strong>$476,007.55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes a non-taxable tire fee of $8.75 per vehicle
Award of Bid RO2009
Personal Protective Equipment Maintenance and Repair

Contact(s) for Further Information
Lori Zeller, Assistant Chief lorizeller@ocfa.org 714.573.6020
Business Services Department
Debbie Casper, Purchasing Manager debbiecasper@ocfa.org 714.573.6641

Summary
This agenda item is submitted for the award of a blanket order contract for the maintenance and repair of personal protective equipment (PPE) to ECMS Inc. (ECMS), the lowest responsive and responsible bidder.

Prior Board/Committee Action
Not Applicable.

Recommended Action(s)
1. Approve and authorize the Purchasing Manager to establish a blanket order contract with ECMS for an annual contract amount not to exceed $40,000.
2. Authorize the Purchasing Manager to extend the contract up to two additional years at $40,000 per year with annual increases not to exceed 3%.

Impact to Cities/County
Not Applicable.

Fiscal Impact
Funding is included in the General Fund budget.

Background
It is necessary to have PPE maintained and repaired on a regular basis to maintain the integrity and life of the equipment consistent with National Fire Protection Association Standards (NFPA 1851). Some basic cleaning and repairs are done in-house by Service Center personnel and more advanced repairs and maintenance are contracted out. ECMS has been providing these services for the past five years as a result of a competitive bid process. On February 11, 2015 an Invitation for Bid (IFB) was issued and 229 vendors were notified. On February 26, 2015, bids were received from ECMS, Turnout Maintenance, and Thermo Fisher Scientific. ECMS offered the lowest responsive responsible bid. The ECMS submittal was 35% less than the next lowest bidder and provided a savings of approximately 20%, or $10,000 from the previous contract.
Staff recommends award of this contract to ECMS Inc. as the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for an amount of $40,000.00 annually.

Attachment(s)
Bid Results
Orange County Fire Authority  
RO2009 – Repair and Maintenance of PPE  
Bid Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ECMS Inc.</th>
<th>Turnout Maintenance Co.</th>
<th>Thermo Fisher Scientific</th>
<th>ECMS Inc. (Previous Contract)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced cleaning of turnout coat/pant per NFPA 1851</td>
<td>$18.50</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$25.26</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of turnout jacket zipper</td>
<td>$18.50</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$23.15</td>
<td>$18.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Velcro on turnout pant flap</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$9.47</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Velcro on turnout coat pocket</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$7.36</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Velcro on collar storm flap of turnout coat</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$12.63</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair of moisture liner (large patch)</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$18.94</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Nomex wristlet with thumbhole</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$14.21</td>
<td>$3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of channel knee patch</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$30.52</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Velcro on glove holder</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.26</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Velcro on turnout coat/pant inner and outer shell interface</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$12.63</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole patch on outer shell (large)</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$15.26</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture barrier patch (large)</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$18.94</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lengthen Turnout Pant Legs 1&quot;</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$99.89</td>
<td>$46.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Turnout Coat Chest 2&quot;</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$157.89</td>
<td>$41.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lengthen Turnout Coat Arms 1&quot;</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$89.47</td>
<td>$46.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Award of Bid RO2010 - EMS Nitrile Gloves

Contact(s) for Further Information
Dave Thomas, Assistant Chief  
davidthomas@ocfa.org  714.573.6012  
Operations Department
Bill Lockhart, Battalion Chief  
billockhart@ocfa.org  714.573.6071  
Emergency Medical Services Section

Summary
This agenda item is submitted for the award of a blanket order contract for the purchase of Digitcare Apex Pro nitrile gloves to Bound Tree Medical LLC.

Prior Board/Committee Action
Not Applicable.

Recommended Action(s)
1. Approve and authorize the Purchasing Manager to establish a blanket order contract with Bound Tree Medical LLC., with an annual contract amount not to exceed $150,000.
2. Authorize the Purchasing Manager to extend the contract for up to two years at $150,000 per year with annual increases not to exceed 2%.

Impact to Cities/County
Not applicable.

Fiscal Impact
Funding is included in the General Fund budget.

Background
The blanket order for medical gloves with PH&S has an expiration of March 31, 2015. Concurrent with this end of contract, the EMS Section determined that only latex free (nitrile) gloves would be ordered in the future due to increasing concerns regarding allergies and skin irritation to latex; this transition to nitrile products is now the standard in the health care environment. Although the elimination of latex products provides for increased patient and provider safety, it also results in the need for a more expensive nitrile product. The EMS Section worked with OCFA Risk Management to determine the minimum requirements for medical gloves which include NFPA 1999 certification, a minimum thickness of 7mm, an extended cuff, and a design meant for pre-hospital environments.
The EMS Section obtained ten different specification sheets from five vendors. Six gloves meeting the minimum requirements were field tested by members of the EMS Committee. The glove samples were evaluated for fit, sensitivity, dexterity, and durability. As a result of this field study and approval by Risk Management, the Digitcare Apex Pro glove was selected.

On February 9, 2015, an Invitation for Bid (IFB) was issued and 252 vendors notified. Two addendums were issued to update estimated quantities and to allow for alternative products that may not have been previously tested.

Eight bids were received and two deemed nonresponsive due to gross pricing errors. The two lowest bidders offered substitutions to the requested product. These alternative gloves were further evaluated by EMS and it was determined that they did not meet OCFA specifications for the following reasons:

**Comade Inc.** submitted samples and pricing for the Clean Safety exam glove. Upon evaluation, this product was not confirmed as NFPA 1999 compliant. In addition, the glove did not meet the department expectations for dexterity and durability. When donned, the glove was susceptible to tearing.

**National Environmental Inc.** submitted samples and pricing for the Innovative Nitriderm EP glove. Upon evaluation, the department determined that these gloves did not meet the minimum thickness of 7mm. This product also failed to meet the dexterity required for performing required EMS procedures.

As a result of bidding and evaluations, staff is recommending approval of this contract award to Bound Tree Medical LLC., the lowest responsive and responsible bidder of the specified product for an amount of $150,000.00 annually.

**Attachment(s)**
Bid Results
Orange County Fire Authority  
RO2010 – EMS Nitrile Gloves  
Bid Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comade Inc.*</th>
<th>National Environmental Inc.*</th>
<th>Bound Tree Medical LLC</th>
<th>MMS</th>
<th>CalOlympic Glove &amp; Safety</th>
<th>Performance Safety Group*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digitcare Apex Pro Glove - 100 per box</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$8.91</td>
<td>$10.75</td>
<td>$11.46</td>
<td>$12.94</td>
<td>$10.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates a substitute was offered
Executive Committee Meeting
April 16, 2015

Legislative Update AB 1217

Contact(s) for Further Information
Sandy Cooney, Director
Communications and Public Relations
sandycooney@ocfa.org
714.573.6801

Jay Barkman, Legislative Analyst
jaybarkman@ocfa.org
714.573.6048

Summary
This item is submitted to review input provided on AB 1217 and provide direction to OCFA staff on its position.

Prior Board/Committee Action
Staff was directed to solicit input, request a meeting with Assemblyman Tom Daly (D-Anaheim) and conduct research on other joint powers authorities and their structure.

At its April 9, 2015, meeting, the City Managers’ Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed and discussed AB 1217. The TAC indicated that it is opposed to the bill on the grounds that it would be an unprecedented, intrusive legislative action to change the terms of the JPA, especially when the members have the ability to change the terms locally through the JPA itself (Attachment 1).

Recommended Action(s)
Inasmuch as the Executive Committee requested that this item be placed on a future agenda, further action is at its sole discretion.

Impact to Cities/County
Specific impacts are discussed under the background.

Fiscal Impact
Not Applicable.

Background
AB 1217 (Daly)
Subject: OCFA Board of Directors
Recommended Position: Pending recommendation of the Executive Committee
Summary:
At its March 19, 2015, meeting, the Executive Committee directed staff to solicit input from OCFA’s member agencies. Several member cities have considered the matter, with outcomes summarized on the attached Matrix of Member Agency Input (Attachment 2). In addition, several cities have provided letters stating their position (Attachment 3). At the time of writing this report some member cities had not yet considered this matter so any additional input received will be provided at the April 23 Board meeting presented orally.
In addition, staff has attached a Matrix of Fire Agencies, Special Districts, JPAs and Governance summarizing the structures of other regional fire agency Boards (Attachment 4).

Staff was also directed to engage Assemblyman Daly’s staff to request a meeting for the Board Chair, Board Vice-Chair, and Fire Chief. This meeting has been scheduled for Friday, April 24, 2015. Staff has been informed that amendments are under consideration although no official language has been made public at the writing of this report. Following is the information provided to the Executive Committee and OCFA’s member agencies regarding the bill as introduced:

AB 1217 has been introduced by Assemblyman Daly to alter the composition of OCFA’s Board of Directors. The legislation is similar to the process by which OCTA board members are selected. AB 1217 would reduce the number of OCFA directors to 13, including three county supervisors and 10 city representatives. The bill directs that the city representatives are to be elected by an OCFA City Selection Committee created by the legislation. The selection committee would be made up of one representative from each city that contracts with OCFA. Under the proposed bill, five of the city representatives shall be elected, one from each supervisorial district, on a population weighted basis. The remaining five city representatives are to be elected, also one from each supervisorial district, on a “one city, one vote” basis. The bill specifies that all 13 directors shall serve a two-year term. The bill would go into effect January 1, 2018.

AB 1217 would alter the form and make-up of the OCFA Board of Directors, and it would be contrary with the terms of the existing Joint Powers Agreement. Under the current JPA, the member agencies are empowered to amend the agreement and adjust the composition of the governing body through a two-thirds vote of all members. AB 1217 imposes changes to the JPA and places member agencies at risk of losing key contract terms that were specifically negotiated by members, for members.

The bill proposes selection of city representatives within supervisorial districts, but this does not account for the fact that the number of cities in each district is not equal. The bill also fails to specify how the three supervisors are to be selected; by the Board of Supervisors or via the OCFA City Selection Committee created by the bill. The committee itself is not comprised of any supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
<th>District 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

§ Italicized text denotes cash contract city
§ Asterisk denotes city in two districts and the smaller portion of city that would not be counted as part of that district for voting purposes under bill.

Attachment(s)
1. Position Letter from OCFA City Managers’ Technical Advisory Committee
2. Matrix of Member Agency Input
3. Position Letters (received to date) from OCFA Member Agencies
4. Matrix of Fire Agencies and Governance
April 15, 2015

Al Murray, Chair
Orange County Fire Authority Board of Directors
1 Fire Authority Road
Irvine, CA 92612

Dear Chair Murray & Board of Directors:

On behalf of the Orange County Fire Authority City Managers’ Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), I would like to hereby notify the Board of Directors that following a review and discussion by a majority of our membership, the TAC is opposed to AB 1217 (Daly). Furthermore, the TAC’s recommendation to the OCFA Board of Directors is to formally oppose this legislation.

As you know, the Orange County Fire Authority was formed as a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) with the foundational purpose to provide a means for member cities to formally and equally share governance for fire and emergency medical services, including the appointment of a Board member and alternate to represent each member city on the Board of Directors. Our JPA has been in place for over 20 years, and member agencies, under the JPA, have the authority and ability to change the composition of the OCFA Board of Directors by a two-thirds vote. Regardless of the merits of the proposed changes, the TAC is opposed to AB 1217 first and foremost on the grounds that it would be an unprecedented, intrusive legislative action to change the terms of our JPA when our members have the ability to change the terms locally through the JPA itself. This legislation, if passed, could have far-reaching consequences for any and all JPAs throughout the state.

Therefore, the Orange County Fire Authority City Managers Technical Advisory Committee hereby opposes AB 1217 and any additional attempts to legislatively alter the composition, structure or selection process of the OCFA Board of Directors. This decision should remain locally with the OCFA JPA and all 25 of its Board of Director representatives, especially given that legislative action through special legislation is not necessary to effectuate any change.
Sincerely,

Jill R. Ingram
Chair
OCFA City Managers Technical Advisory Committee

cc: Orange County Fire Authority Board of Directors
OCFA City Managers Technical Advisory Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Agency</th>
<th>Mayor/Chair</th>
<th>OCFA Director</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aliso Viejo</td>
<td>William Phillips</td>
<td>Phillip Tsunoda</td>
<td>4/15 – 5-0 Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Park</td>
<td>Arthur Brown</td>
<td>Elizabeth Swift</td>
<td>4/14 – 5-0 Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Orange</td>
<td>Todd Spitzer</td>
<td>Lisa Bartlett</td>
<td>3/24 – &quot;Watch&quot; (Sup. Bartlett &quot;highly concerned with negative impacts&quot; upon 5th Sup. District cities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>Rob Johnson</td>
<td>Rob Johnson</td>
<td>4/13 – 5-0 Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Point</td>
<td>Carlos Olvera</td>
<td>Joseph Muller</td>
<td>4/7 – 5-0 Opposed (unless amended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>Steven Choi</td>
<td>Jeffrey Lalloway</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Palma</td>
<td>Peter Kim</td>
<td>Gerard Goedhart</td>
<td>4/7 – 5-0 Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Hills</td>
<td>Dore Gilbert</td>
<td>Don Sedgwick</td>
<td>4/14 – 5-0 Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Niguel</td>
<td>Jerry McCloskey</td>
<td>Jerry McCloskey</td>
<td>4/7 – 5-0 Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Woods</td>
<td>Cynthia Conners</td>
<td>Noel Hatch</td>
<td>4/15 – 5-0 Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest</td>
<td>Scott Voigts</td>
<td>Dwight Robinson</td>
<td>4/7 – 5-0 Opposed (unless amended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos</td>
<td>Richard Murphy</td>
<td>Warren Kusumoto</td>
<td>4/13 – 5-0 Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Viejo</td>
<td>Cathy Schlicht</td>
<td>Ed Sachs</td>
<td>4/6 – 5-0 Opposed (also on 4/20 agenda for additional direction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>Chad Wanke</td>
<td>Craig Green</td>
<td>4/21 – Agenda w/recommended oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Santa Margarita</td>
<td>Bradley McGirr</td>
<td>Carol Gamble</td>
<td>4/8 – 5-0 Opposed (direction to consider south county JPA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Matrix of Member Agency Input

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Agency</th>
<th>Mayor/Chair</th>
<th>OCFA Director</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Clemente</td>
<td>Chris Hamm</td>
<td>Bob Baker</td>
<td>4/21 – Agenda w/recommended oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Capistrano</td>
<td>Derek Reeve</td>
<td>John Perry</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>Miguel Pulido</td>
<td>Angelica Amezcua</td>
<td>4/7 – 7-0 Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal Beach</td>
<td>Ellery Deaton</td>
<td>David Sloan</td>
<td>4/13 – 5-0 Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>Alexander Ethans</td>
<td>David Shawver</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>Charles Puckett</td>
<td>Al Murray</td>
<td>4/21 Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Park</td>
<td>Diana Fascenelli</td>
<td>Rick Barnett</td>
<td>4/28 Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Tri Ta</td>
<td>Tri Ta</td>
<td>4/15 – 5-0 Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>Gene Hernandez</td>
<td>Gene Hernandez</td>
<td>4/7 – 5-0 Opposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Position Totals:**

- **15** Opposed
- **1** Support
- **1** Watch
- **4** Scheduled for consideration (Date of Meeting)
- **3** Not yet scheduled (TBD)
April 8, 2015

The Honorable Tom Daly
Assembly member, 69th District
California State Assembly
California State Capitol
P.O. Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249-0069

RE: AB 1217 - LEGISLATION CHANGING ORANGE COUNTY FIRE AUTHORITY’S (OCFA) BOARD COMPOSITION

Dear Assembly member Daly,

At our April 7, 2015 City Council meeting, the Dana Point City Council took unanimous action to oppose your Bill (AB 1217) as it is currently written. AB 1217 severely and disproportionately diminishes the voice of many member cities, and especially for those with smaller populations, like Dana Point. Under the proposed legislation, one of the two representatives from each County District would be appointed on a population-weighted basis. Dana Point has the third lowest population of the member cities in District 5 (ahead of Laguna Hills and Laguna Woods). Thus, Dana Point’s representation on the Board would be even further diminished.

Dana Point has for years been second only to Irvine in the amount of property taxes paid by its’ residents that exceeds OCFA’s actual cost to provide service to Dana Point. In short, Dana Point is one of the few “donor” cities, second only to Irvine, that continually pays in more than it costs to provide fire protection service to the City (@$3 million annual surplus). Restated, this proposal takes the second largest donor city, and reduces its representation on the governing body to an inconsequential level. Staff feels that, at a minimum, any changes to the OCFA Board structure imposed by legislation should consider and ensure that any city that is a donor city would be guaranteed a seat on the governing board.

Nearly half of the current OCFA member cities are in County District 5, and the resulting fallout from AB 1217 would be that 10 of 23 current member cities would on be represented by only two cities. The real effect is the diminution of control of OCFA board seats for all these cities, from the current combined 40 percent of the OCFA Board’s representation, down to only 15 percent. The shift of representation is simply too much, especially without allowing the affected cities to be part of the decision.

While the Dana Point City Council appreciates that concerns exist regarding the ability of the OCFA Board to effectively operate in light of its size, it does not believe that the
proposed legislation is in the City's best interest. In addition, the other 13 non-County District 5 member cities would get eight representatives. The result is an increase from 52 percent to 61.5 percent control. Further, County District 1 and County District 4 only have 2 member cities, and would each be given the same proportionate number of seats as the ten cities in District 5.

For your reference, I have included a copy of the staff report that Dana Point took unanimous action on. As Assembly Bills work their way through the legislative process, they are often edited based upon input from local agencies and constituents. I would ask that you take our concerns into account and edit the Bill to allow Dana Point the representation on the OCFA Board that it is rightfully entitled. Should these edits be made, I am sure that our City Council would revisit its current position. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our City Manager, Doug Chotkevys, at 949.248.3513.

Sincerely,

Carlos N. Olvera
Mayor

Attachment

C: Pat Bates, California State Senator, 36th District
   Bill Brough, California State Assembly member, 73rd District
   Supervisor Todd Spitzer, Chairman Orange County Board of Supervisors
   Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Fifth District Orange County Board of Supervisors
   Supervisor Andrew Do, First District Orange County Board of Supervisors
   Supervisor Michelle Steel, Second District Orange County Board of Supervisors
   Supervisor Todd Spitzer, Third District Orange County Board of Supervisors
   The Honorable Mayor and Dana Point City Council
   Douglas C. Chotkevys, Dana Point City Manager
   A. Patrick Munoz, Dana Point City Attorney
   Orange County Fire Authority Board
   Chief Jeff Bowman, Orange County Fire Authority
April 9, 2015

Hon. Young Kim
California State Assembly
PO Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249=0065

RE: Oppose AB 1217 (Daly)

Dear Assemblywoman Kim:

On behalf of the City Council of the City of La Palma, I ask that you oppose AB 1217 (Daly) dealing with the restructuring of the Orange County Fire Authority Board of Directors.

This bill would reduce the size of the Board of Directors of this locally created joint powers authority, actually increasing the representation of the County Board of Supervisors (to a quorum of the supervisors) and reducing the number of city representatives to ten. Currently every member city, whether a structural fire agency or a contract agency, have one elected member on the board. This would not only impact the voice of cities in general, but specifically the voice of smaller cities such as La Palma.

As you know, the City Council has protection of local authority and control as a key provision and this bill undermines that control by imposing a structure on the OCFA different from the one which the members have chosen for themselves. This is a particular concern when the services being rendered are as basic to healthy communities as fire prevention, protection and emergency medical services.

Should this bill come before you, I would ask that you vote no given these concerns. Thank you for your consideration of these issues and your steadfast support for our community.

Sincerely,

Peter Kim
Mayor
City of La Palma

cc: Assemblyman Daly
OCFA
Tony Cardenas, League of California Cities
Diana Coronado, ACC-OC
April 8, 2015

The Honorable Tom Daly
California State Assembly- 69th
District California State Capitol,
Room 3126 Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB 1217 (Daly) OCFA Board of Directors Composition - OPPOSE

Dear Assemblyman Daly:

The City of Laguna Niguel opposes AB 1217 that will reduce the number of directors governing the Orange County Fire Authority.

We believe that local municipalities should have direct representation on the Board of Directors. OCFA’s foundation is built on its partners having an explicit voice in the governance of its public safety provider. AB 1217 will impede our ability for expression of concerns with regard to policy, deployment, and financial sustainability. Under the proposed legislation, the 5th District would be disproportionately under represented with the Board composition representing south Orange County cities being reduced from its current 11 Directors to only two (2) Directors. This will significantly impede and negatively affect the ability of the south Orange County contract cities from having a meaningful and equal voice in OCFA.

Thank you for considering the comments of our City and I encourage your reconsideration of the proposed legislation. Please feel free to contact Assistant City Manager Daniel Fox at (949) 362-4300 with any questions you may have about our position on this issue.

Sincerely,

Jerry McCloskey
Mayor

Cc: Senator Patricia Bates, California’s 36th Senate District Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Orange County’s 5th District Chairman Al Murray, OCFA Board of Directors Vice-Chair Gene Hernandez, OCFA Board of Directors Fire Chief Jeff Bowman, Orange County Fire Authority
April 14, 2015

Honorable Tom Daly
P.O. Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249

SUBJECT: OPPOSE – AB 1217 (Daly) REGARDING THE ORANGE COUNTY FIRE AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Assemblyman Daly,

At its April 13, 2015, the City of Los Alamitos unanimously voted to oppose AB 1217 (Daly), a bill that would alter the composition of OCFA's Board of Directors. The legislation mirrors the process by which OCTA board members are selected. AB 1217 would reduce the number of OCFA directors to 13; three county supervisors and 10 city representatives.

Importance of OCFA Board of Directors to the City of Los Alamitos
AB 1217 would alter the form and make-up of OCFA Board of Directors and it would impair the terms of the existing Joint Powers Agreement. Under the current JPA, the Board of Directors is empowered to amend the agreement and adjust the composition of the governing body through a two-thirds vote of all members. AB 1217 imposes changes to the JPA and places board members at risk of losing key contract terms that were specifically negotiated by members, for members.

AB 1217 proposes selection of city representatives within Supervisory districts, but this does not account for the fact that the number of cities in each district is not equal. The bill also fails to specify how the three supervisors are to be selected; by the Board of Supervisors or via the OCFA City Selection Committee created by the bill. The committee itself is not comprised of any supervisors.

AB 1217 would unequivocally marginalize the voice of the City of Los Alamitos and other small cities in Orange County. The City of Los Alamitos remains committed to legislation that advocates fair and proportionate representation on countywide and regional boards. For this and the reasons described above, the City of Los Alamitos respectfully opposes AB 1217.

Sincerely,

CITY OF LOS ALAMITOS

Richard D. Murphy
Mayor

cc: Senator Bob Huff
Senator Janet Nguyen
Assembly Member Ling Ling Chang
Assembly Member Don Wagner

Senator Tony Mendoza
Assembly Member Travis Allen
Assembly Member Young Kim
Supervisor Michelle Steel
April 9, 2015

The Honorable Tom Daly
Assemblymember, District 69
State Capitol
P.O. Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249-0069

RE: AB 1217 (Daly). Notice of Opposition.

Dear Assemblymember Daly:

On behalf of the City of Rancho Santa Margarita, I would like to inform you of our City Council’s opposition to AB 1217 as it relates to the Orange County Fire Authority Board of Directors. This bill creates several inequities in the selection process and Board composition, and would severely limit City representation on the OCFA Board. We respectfully urge you to withdraw your legislation and, instead, allow the OCFA member agencies to decide if and how any changes to the Board should be made.

First and foremost, there is no indication of any current problem with the Board structure or selection process that needs to be addressed by state legislation. The OCFA itself has the authority and ability to make changes to its composition and selection process by a 2/3 vote of the membership. This decision should remain with OCFA and its representatives; legislative action by way of special legislation is not necessary to effectuate any change.

Second, the Board structure proposed by AB 1217 would drastically alter the balance of representation in favor of the Orange County Board of Supervisors, which would be disproportionate to the populations served by OCFA. Presently, the Board of Supervisors has two of the 25 Board seats, accounting for approximately eight percent of the Board, and the population they represent accounts for approximately seven percent of the total population served by OCFA. Under AB 1217, the Board of Supervisors would have three of the 13 seats, accounting for 23 percent of the Board. Yet, they would still represent only seven percent of the total population served by OCFA, resulting in a disproportionate number of seats to the population served.
Third, the proposed selection process is unequitable and unbalanced. AB 1217 seeks to create a new selection system based on the supervisory district. There would be two seats in each supervisory district; one would be selected on a population weighted vote and the second would be selected on a one-city, one-vote basis. Because not every city is a member of OCFA, each of the supervisory districts has a different population. The average population of each district is between 590,000 and 610,000, or roughly 20 percent of the County's total population. However, for the purposes of AB 1217, the populations served in each district range from approximately 109,977 in District 4 to approximately 600,000 in District 5. The cities and residents in those supervisory districts with higher populations served by OCFA will have less representation on the OCFA Board of Directors on a proportional basis than those supervisory districts with smaller populations served by OCFA.

There is also a concern that cash contract cities will have a disproportionate number of seats on the Board under the proposed structure, in which four cash contract cities would presumably have guaranteed seats – Santa Ana, Westminster, Buena Park and Placentia – representing 30 percent of the Board. Similarly, the selection process could result in one city having two representatives on a seat by receiving both the population weighted vote and the per-city vote for their supervisory district. The impact of this disproportionate selection system could undermine the service goals and objectives of structural fire fund cities.

Finally, the proposed Board composition and selection process is similar, although not identical, to the Board composition and selection process for the Orange County Transportation Authority, which is cited as the example for this change. There are significant dissimilarities between OCFA and OCTA therefore, applying the OCTA Board structure to OCFA is inappropriate.

Cities do not contract with the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) and they do not provide funding directly from city General Fund budgets to OCTA, nor do residents pay directly from their property taxes into OCTA. General funding for OCTA comes from Measure M (sales tax) funds, federal funds, and service fees (i.e. bus/Metrolink fares). OCTA, while it manages the transportation systems for the entire county and administers various grant funds that are provided to cities, does not provide decisions at its Board level that have a direct contractually fiscal impact on their participating cities. Additionally, all cities are essentially "members" of OCTA and the supervisory districts account for equal population in each district.
By contrast, not all Orange County cities are members of OCFA and a selection system based on supervisorial districts does not work since some supervisorial districts will have different member populations than others. Moreover, cities that contract with OCFA do provide funding as a line item in their General Fund budgets for those services. Similarly, residents in structural fire fund cities (SFF) pay a portion of their property taxes directly to OCFA. In either case, the budgetary and/or service level decisions made by the OCFA Board need to have input by all cities that they serve, not just the cash contract cities or a small handful of cities.

In closing, I would also like to remind you that the changes to the OCTA Board composition and selection process that were made nearly 15 years ago were initiated by the member cities themselves and no other means were available other than special legislation. The selection process and Board structure were the result of many discussions and compromises by the various cities who agreed to the bill language that was ultimately signed into law.

Again, the City Council of the City of Rancho Santa Margarita is opposed to AB 1217 and we respectfully request that you reconsider this bill in its entirety.

Sincerely,

Bradley J. McGirr
Mayor

Enclosure

Cc: OCFA Board of Directors
    Orange County Board of Supervisors
    League of California Cities
    Assemblymember Bill Brough
RESOLUTION NO. 15-04-08-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA, CALIFORNIA, OPPOSING ASSEMBLY BILL 1217 (DALY)

The City Council of the City of Rancho Santa Margarita, California, hereby finds, determines, declares, and resolves as follows:

WHEREAS, the City of Rancho Santa Margarita (City) is a member of the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA), a Joint Powers Authority that provides regional fire suppression and emergency medical service; and

WHEREAS, OCFA is governed by a 25-member Board of Directors, comprised of one representative from each of its 23 member cities and two members of the Orange County Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, the City Council annually selects at a regularly scheduled City Council meeting its representative to serve on the OCFA Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, the members of the OCFA Board of Directors convene both as a general body and in committees to discuss the operations and finance of OCFA; and

WHEREAS, the member agencies may change the composition of the OCFA Board of Directors by a two-thirds vote; and

WHEREAS, Assemblymember Tom Daly (D-Anaheim) has authored legislation to significantly alter the composition and structure of the OCFA Board, known as Assembly Bill 1217; and

WHEREAS, AB 1217 would reduce the number of seats from 25 to 13, increasing the proportional representation of the County Board of Supervisors from two to three, and decreasing the proportional representation of cities from 23 to 10; and

WHEREAS, AB 1217 would also change the process by which representatives are selected by creating a new city selection committee to vote on two seats per supervisorial district, one on a weighted population basis and one on a one-city, one-vote basis; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Board composition, structure and selection process would disproportionately favor the County Board of Supervisors, who represent approximately seven percent of the population served by OCFA, but under AB 1217 would account for nearly one-quarter of the Board membership; and

WHEREAS, the selection process of seats by supervisorial district severely skew the representation among and between districts with vastly different population figures served by OCFA, resulting in the disenfranchisement of several cities and their residents, primarily in the Fifth District representing South Orange County cities; and
WHEREAS, these proposed changes, if approved by the Legislature, would harm member cities of OCFA by reducing their representation of their citizens and minimizing their opportunities for input into important service, operational and budgetary matters relating to fire suppression and emergency medical service.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA, CALIFORNIA, DOES RESOLVE, DECLARE, DETERMINE, AND ORDER AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. That the City Council hereby opposes Assembly Bill 1217 and any further or additional attempts to legislatively alter the composition, structure and selection process of the Orange County Fire Authority Board of Directors.

SECTION 2. That the City Council hereby authorizes the Mayor and the City's representative on the OCFA Board of Directors to sign a letter opposing AB 1217, and further directs staff to send a copy of this resolution and the opposition letter to Assemblymember Daly and other interested parties.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED THIS 8th DAY OF April, 2015.

BRADLEY J. MCGIRR, MAYOR

CERTIFICATE OF ATTESTATION AND ORIGINALITY

I, Amy Diaz, City Clerk of the City of Rancho Santa Margarita, California, hereby attest to and certify that the foregoing resolution is the original resolution adopted by the Rancho Santa Margarita City Council at its regular meeting held on the 8th day of April, 2015, by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Gamble, Vaughn, Mayor Pro Tempore Beall and Mayor McGirr (4)

NOES: None (0)

ABSTAIN: None (0)

ABSENT: Council Member Holloway (1)

AMY DIAZ, CITY CLERK
April 15, 2015

The Honorable Tom Daly
2400 E. Katella, Ste. 640
Anaheim, CA 92806

RE: City of Santa Ana Support for Assembly Bill 1217

Dear Assemblymember Daly,

On April 7, 2015 the Santa Ana City Council voted unanimously to support your legislation, Assembly Bill 1217, which restructures and modernizes the governing structure of the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA). After twenty years in existence, it is appropriate that the current twenty-five member OCFA governing board structure be reviewed.

Assembly Bill 1217 proposes a smaller, streamlined board of 13 members. Modeled after the Orange County Transportation Authority, this structure will ensure that the City of Santa Ana has a stronger voice on policy matters considered by the OCFA Board of Directors. A smaller board also facilitates consensus and governing for a crucially important agency serving over 1.7 million residents.

In 2012, the Santa Ana City Council joined the Orange County Fire Authority. This decision has saved Santa Ana millions of dollars annually while maintaining all ten of our city’s fire stations. The Orange County Fire Authority has provided great service to the city — in fact, one out of five residents served by OCFA lives in Santa Ana.

Sincerely,

Miguel A. Pulido
Mayor

cc: Chair Al Murray, Board of Directors, Orange County Fire Authority
Deputy Chief Devin Leonard, OCFA
Orange County Legislative Delegation
Santa Ana City Council
Santa Ana City Manager
April 15, 2015

Honorable Tom Daly
P.O. Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249

RE: AB 1217 (Daly). Orange County Fire Authority.
POSITION: OPPOSE

Dear Assemblyman Daly,

On April 13, 2015, the Seal Beach City Council unanimously voted to oppose AB 1217 (Daly), a bill that would alter the composition of the Orange County Fire Authority’s Board of Directors.

The City Council has always advocated for local control with the specific goal of preserving and protecting the City’s powers, duties and prerogatives to enact legislation and policy direction concerning local affairs, and oppose any legislation that would preempt local authority. AB 1217 undermines local control and diminishes the voice of smaller cities such as Seal Beach.

The Orange County Fire Authority was formed in 1995 as a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) with the foundational purpose to provide a means for member cities to formally and equally share governance for fire and emergency medical services, including the appointment of a Board member and alternate to represent each member city on the Board of Directors. The JPA has been in place for over 20 years, and member agencies, under the JPA, have the authority and ability to change the composition of the OCFA Board of Directors by a two-thirds vote. AB 1217 would eliminate Board representation for 57 percent of partner cities who currently contract with OCFA, thus denying their contractual right to provide direction, oversight and accountability for the service they pay OCFA to provide.

While the argument of supporters is that the new structure is the same as that in place for the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), the provision of fire, rescue, and emergency services to local communities is substantially different than the provision of transportation planning and transit services. Additionally, cities do not contract with OCTA and they do not provide funding directly from city General Fund budgets to OCTA. General funding for OCTA comes from Measure M (sales tax) funds, federal funds, and service fees (i.e. bus/Metrolink...
fares). OCTA, while it manages the transportation systems for the entire County and administers various grant funds that are provided to cities, the decisions at the OCTA Board level do not have a direct contractually fiscal impact on their participating cities.

Moreover, OCFA is an opt-in service agency that provides a specific public safety service on a 24/7 basis to a city that pays for it from their local funds. OCTA is a regional planning authority that was formed to create integrated Countywide transportation solutions and does not require any of the cities in its service area to opt-in or pay for their services.

Through the JPA, each partner city appoints a representative to the Board of Directors in exchange for paying OCFA for its service. AB 1217 eliminates that critical commitment for no sound policy reason, and if approved will only question the value for partner cities to continue contracting for fire and emergency medical services through OCFA, thus needlessly putting OCFA in structural disarray and compromise their ability to provide these critical services. Furthermore, the City of Seal Beach opposes AB 1217 and any additional attempts to legislatively alter the composition, structure or selection process of the OCFA Board of Directors. This decision should remain locally with the OCFA JPA and all 25 of its Board of Director representatives, especially given that legislative action through special legislation is not necessary to effectuate any change.

AB 1217 would unequivocally marginalize the voice of the City of Seal Beach and other small cities in Orange County. The City of Seal Beach remains committed to legislation that advocates fair and proportionate representation on Countywide and regional boards. Thus, for the reasons described above, the City of Seal Beach respectfully opposes AB 1217.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mayor Ellery A. Deaton

Cc: Senator Bob Huff
    Senator Janet Nguyen
    Senator Tony Mendoza
    Assemblymember Ling-Ling Chang
    Assemblymember Travis Allen
    Assemblymember Young Kim
    Supervisor Michelle Steel
    OCFA Board of Directors
Fire Agencies exist in various models and structures. The municipal fire agency is likely the most common and familiar type in California. In this case, the Fire Chief typically reports to a City Manager/Administrator, or in some cases, directly to the Mayor in cities with a “Strong Mayor” model.

Alternatively, fire agencies may be organized as a Special District. The main provision governing this formation is the Fire District Law of 1987 (Health and Safety Code 13800 et seq). Fire Districts have a long history in California that significantly predates 1987, when the last major reform and revision was conducted. The other alternative for local agencies with the authority to provide fire service is to join together under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (JPA). Under the JPA model, the forming agencies are free to define their governance structure.

Listed below are a few fire districts, special districts, and one JPA with a summary of their size and governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sac Metro Fire</td>
<td>Special District</td>
<td>• 42 stations covering two cities, 14 communities, and unincorporated areas of Sacramento County.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.metrofire.ca.gov/">http://www.metrofire.ca.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Fire</td>
<td>Special District</td>
<td>• 170 Fire Stations • 57 cities and unincorporated areas.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fire.lacounty.gov/home/about-us/">http://www.fire.lacounty.gov/home/about-us/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Corridor Agencies</td>
<td>Double JPA</td>
<td>Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency and San Joaquin Hills Transportation Corridor Agency; formed to manage planning, financing, const., and operation of state routes 73, 133, 241 and 261 (The Toll Roads)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.thetollroads.com/">https://www.thetollroads.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore-Pleasanton Fire JPA</td>
<td>City Joint Powers Authority</td>
<td>• 10 Stations</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cityoflivermore.net/citygov/fire/about/administration.asp">http://www.cityoflivermore.net/citygov/fire/about/administration.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraga Orinda Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Special District</td>
<td>5 members elected in specific districts to four year terms.  &lt;br&gt;• Funded by property taxes.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mofd.org/board/directors">http://www.mofd.org/board/directors</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino Valley Fire District</td>
<td>Special District</td>
<td>5 members elected to four year terms.  &lt;br&gt;• Offers contract fire services to two cities and unincorporated communities.  &lt;br&gt;• Funded by property taxes and contract city payments.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.chinovalleyfire.org/Index.aspx?NID=204">http://www.chinovalleyfire.org/Index.aspx?NID=204</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno County Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Special District</td>
<td>7 members appointed by County Board of Supervisors to serve identified areas.  &lt;br&gt;• Funded by property taxes.</td>
<td><a href="http://fresnocountyfire.org/">http://fresnocountyfire.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Water District</td>
<td>Special District</td>
<td>37-member board appointed by the district’s 26 member agencies.  &lt;br&gt;• Certain member agencies, (like Municipal Water of Orange County below), have multiple board members.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mwdh2o.com/">http://www.mwdh2o.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Water of Orange County</td>
<td>Special District</td>
<td>7-member board, each is elected to a four-year term by voters who reside within one of seven divisions in the service area. Four reps also are appointed by the board to serve on the Met Board.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mwdoc.com/">http://www.mwdoc.com/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Committee Meeting
April 16, 2015

AGENDA STAFF REPORT

AGENDA STAFF REPORT

Legislative Update AB 1217

Contact(s) for Further Information
Sandy Cooney, Director sandycooney@ocfa.org 714.573.6801
Communications and Public Relations
Jay Barkman, Legislative Analyst jaybarkman@ocfa.org 714.573.6048

Summary
This item is submitted to review input provided on AB 1217 and provide direction to OCFA staff on its position.

Prior Board/Committee Action
Staff was directed to solicit input, request a meeting with Assemblyman Tom Daly (D-Anaheim) and conduct research on other joint powers authorities and their structure.

Recommended Action(s)
Inasmuch as the Executive Committee requested that this item be placed on a future agenda, further action is at its sole discretion.

Impact to Cities/County
Specific impacts are discussed under the background.

Fiscal Impact
Not Applicable.

Background
AB 1217 (Daly)
Subject: OCFA Board of Directors
Recommended Position: Pending recommendation of the Executive Committee
Summary:
At its March 19, 2015, meeting, the Executive Committee directed staff to solicit input from OCFA’s member agencies. At the time of writing this report some member cities had not yet considered this matter so any input received will be presented orally. In addition, staff has attached a Matrix of Fire Agencies and Governance summarizing the structures of other regional fire agency Boards.

Staff was also directed to engage Assemblyman Daly’s staff to request a meeting for the Board Chair, Board Vice-Chair, and Fire Chief. This meeting has been scheduled for Friday, April 24, 2015.
Staff has been informed that amendments are under consideration although no official language has been made public at the writing of this report. Following is the information provided to the Executive Committee and OCFA’s member agencies regarding the bill as introduced:

AB 1217 has been introduced by Assemblyman Daly to alter the composition of OCFA’s Board of Directors. The legislation is similar to the process by which OCTA board members are selected. AB 1217 would reduce the number of OCFA directors to 13, including three county supervisors and 10 city representatives. The bill directs that the city representatives are to be elected by an OCFA City Selection Committee created by the legislation. The selection committee would be made up of one representative from each city that contracts with OCFA. Under the proposed bill, five of the city representatives shall be elected, one from each supervisorial district, on a population weighted basis. The remaining five city representatives are to be elected, also one from each supervisorial district, on a “one city, one vote” basis. The bill specifies that all 13 directors shall serve a two-year term. The bill would go into effect January 1, 2018.

AB 1217 would alter the form and make-up of the OCFA Board of Directors, and it would be contrary with the terms of the existing Joint Powers Agreement. Under the current JPA, the member agencies are empowered to amend the agreement and adjust the composition of the governing body through a two-thirds vote of all members. AB 1217 imposes changes to the JPA and places member agencies at risk of losing key contract terms that were specifically negotiated by members, for members.

The bill proposes selection of city representatives within supervisorial districts, but this does not account for the fact that the number of cities in each district is not equal. The bill also fails to specify how the three supervisors are to be selected; by the Board of Supervisors or via the OCFA City Selection Committee created by the bill. The committee itself is not comprised of any supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
<th>District 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. San Clemente</td>
<td>11. San Juan Capistrano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Italicized text denotes cash contract city  
Asterisk denotes city in two districts and the smaller portion of city that would not be counted as part of that district for voting purposes under bill.

Attachment(s)
Matrix of Fire Agencies and Governance
Fire Agencies exist in various models and structures. The municipal fire agency is likely the most common and familiar type in California. In this case, the Fire Chief typically reports to a City Manager/Administrator, or in some cases, directly to the Mayor in cities with a “Strong Mayor” model.

Alternatively, fire agencies may be organized as a Special District. The main provision governing this formation is the Fire District Law of 1987 (Health and Safety Code 13800 et seq). Fire Districts have a long history in California that significantly predates 1987, when the last major reform and revision was conducted. The other alternative for local agencies with the authority to provide fire service is to join together under the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (JPA). Under the JPA model, the forming agencies are free to define their governance structure.

Listed below are a few fire districts and one JPA with a summary of their size and governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Fire</td>
<td>Special District</td>
<td>• 170 Fire Stations • 57 cities and unincorporated areas • 5 County Board of Supervisors • Offers contract services. • Funded by property taxes, voter approved special property tax assessment (Proposition E) and contract city payments.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fire.lacounty.gov/home/about-us/">http://www.fire.lacounty.gov/home/about-us/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore-Pleasanton Fire JPA</td>
<td>City Joint Powers Authority</td>
<td>• 10 Stations • 7 member JPA Board • Mayor, councilmember, city manager from each of the two cities (6) + Fire Chief • Funded by each city.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cityoflivermore.net/citygov/fire/about/administration.asp">http://www.cityoflivermore.net/citygov/fire/about/administration.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraga Orinda Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Special District</td>
<td>• 5 Stations • 5 members elected in specific districts to 4 year terms. • Funded by property taxes.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mofd.org/board/directors">http://www.mofd.org/board/directors</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Chino Valley Fire District** | Special District  
• 7 Stations | 5 members elected to 4 year terms.  
• Offers contract fire services to two cities and unincorporated communities.  
| **Fresno County Fire Protection District** | Special District  
• 13 Stations | 7 members appointed by County Board of Supervisors to serve identified areas.  
• Funded by property taxes. | [http://fresnocountyfire.org/](http://fresnocountyfire.org/) |