

EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT COMMITTEE MAY 19, 2004

SUBJECT:

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) NUMBER TCP2610LASD

WITH LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSIT

COMMUNITY POLICING SERVICES

ACTION:

MODIFY MOU NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT FOR FY05 TRANSIT

COMMUNITY POLICING SERVICE LEVEL

RECOMMENDATION

Authorize the Chief Executive Officer to:

- A. Execute Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Modification No. 3 to MOU No. TCP2610LASD to provide funding for FY05 transit community policing services in the amount not-to-exceed \$49,794,668- \$49,054,950 for the period July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005; and increasing the Total Contract Value from \$55,081,812 to \$104,876,480 for the period July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005.
- B. Add the amount of \$500,000 to MOU TCP2610LASD for contingency funding to cover emergency services required for heightened security resulting from activities similar to the recent Madrid train bombing

Revising the Total Contract Value from \$55,081,812 to \$104,636,762.

RATIONALE

In February 2003, the Board approved a funding level for the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) in the amount not-to-exceed \$55,081,812. This amount included the FY04 funding level of \$47,212,982, \$4,148,995 for two months of services in FY03, and and \$3,719,835 in start-up capital costs. _\$7,868,830 for two months of service in FY03 inclusive of all start-up capital costs and annualized capital expenses. Although the Board approved the \$47.2 million funding level, staff negotiated \$43.8 million for FY04. Staff is required to come back for future year funding levels prior to the adoption of the budget. Because the LASD was able to ramp up more rapidly in the first two months than had anticipated initially, ensuring the highest level of security continued into the new contract period, expenditures actually reached \$6.2 million. This amount exceeded the FY03

funding level of \$4,148,995 by \$2.1 million. However, capital costs were negotiated to be paid in three equal installments of \$1,239,945 each. The first installment was paid in May 2003, the second payment will be paid in July 2004, and the third payment is scheduled for payment in July 2005. Payment of the first capital installment of \$1.2 million in FY03, instead of the original \$3.7 million lump sum, resulted in \$2.5 million in reduced utilization of Contract Authority. This offset the service level overexpenditure of \$2.1 million by approximately \$0.4 million. Therefore, the Board approved Contract Value of \$55,081,812 was not exceeded and the level of security did not lapse in the transition between LAPD and LASD.

For FY04, staff was successful in negotiating a service level amount of \$44.4 million, exclusive of capital. This amount is \$2.85 million less than the original \$47.2 million authorized by the Board.

For FY05, the recommended service level is \$51 million, which includes the second capital payment of \$1.23 million. Staff is also recommending inclusion of a contingency fund for unanticipated emergency expenses of \$500,000. This brings the proposed FY05 service level to \$51.5 million. The FY05 proposed service level revises the Total Contract Value from \$55,081,812 to \$104,636,762 (See Attachment B).

MOU Modification No. 3 to the LASD agreement is being recommended to add 60 security assistants (fare inspectors), supervision and support personnel to the Metro Blue and Green Lines and post a permanent LASD team at the Union Station Gateway (USG) complex.

Due to the success of the current fare inspection program (which includes 50 security assistants on the Metro Red and Pasadena Gold Lines) and the heightened security environment, it is essential that a significant law enforcement presence be maintained on the transit systems' rail lines. Security assistants provide a key element in that presence, observing their surroundings for unusual situations and persons as well as performing fare inspection. In FY05, staff is proposing the addition of 60 security assistants on the Blue and Green Lines enables deputies of the LASD, whose charge it is to maintain the safety and security of the transit system in Los Angeles County, to place their prime focus on preventing crimes including terrorist acts.

With regard to specific program enhancements, LASD has estimated that thorough coverage of Metro Blue and Green Lines by security assistants would necessitate an estimated 36 inspectors on the Blue Line and 24 on the Green Line, with supervision to be provided by one additional team leader and two additional sergeants. Additionally, as fare inspection will increase the number of citations written for fare evasion and the number of citizen complaints, two station clerks and a risk management sergeant are required to handle the resultant additional workload. Further, while LASD personnel patrol the USG building as part of their current deployments, it is now critical, in light of the Madrid commuter train bombing, that additional law enforcement resources be placed throughout the heavily trafficked USG complex. A security detail of two, twenty-four hour, seven-day per week deputies was put in place for the remainder of FY04. The proposed new team would consist of ten deputy sheriff generalists and four sergeants on a twenty-four hour, seven-day per week basis.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

In July 2002 the Board adopted a comprehensive Security Policy addressing several aspects of the provision of law enforcement and security services to MTA patrons, employees and property. One of its goals was to bring MTA's law enforcement and security costs in line with comparable costs of other transit agencies and to target MTA enterprise fund-related security costs at 5% of the total operating expenditures. As a result of the State Budget Crisis, certain areas within our budget were reduced. However, security is important to maintain a safe and viable transportation system. Staff is projecting the FY05 budget to reach an estimated 6.35% of FY05 enterprise fund expenditures. Staff will strive to reduce the target through monitoring deployment of security services and associated costs.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The funding of \$51-\$49.0 million for this contract amendment exclusive of capital and the proposed contingency proposed security services and capital costs is included in the FY05 proposed budget in cost center 2610, Operations Security. Additionally, staff is requesting a contingency fund of \$500,000 to cover any unforeseen security related expenses. Staff will advise the Board via a Board Box in the event the contingency fund is required. The recommended amount includes a 2.18% increase in service unit rates over those included in the FY04 contract. Since this is a multi-year contract, the Project Manager and Deputy Chief Executive Officer, will be accountable for budgeting the cost in future years, including any options exercised.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

None. The LASD currently serves as MTA's contract agency for the provision of law enforcement services and is able to provide, on short notice, the requested personnel.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Procurement Summary
- A-1 Procurement History
- A-2 List of Subcontractors
- A-3 Level of Service Units
- B. Contract Value

Prepared by: Carolyn Flowers, Executive Officer, Operations Administration

John B. Gatoe, Jr.
Deputy Chief Executive Officer

Roger Snoble Chief Executive Officer

BOARD REPORT ATTACHMENT A PROCUREMENT SUMMARY

MOU NUMBER TCP2610LASD WITH LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSIT COMMUNITY POLICING SERVICES

| 1. | Contract Number: TCP2610 | LASD | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-------|-----------------------------|----------|----------------------|
| 2. | Recommended Vendor: Los | Angeles C | ount | y Sheriff's De | partm | ent |
| 3. | Cost/Price Analysis Informa | ation: | | | | |
| | A. Bid/Proposed Price: | | | Recommend | led Pri | ce: |
| | \$49,794,668 <u>*</u> | | | \$49,794,668 <u>3</u> | | |
| | B. Details of Significant Var | iances are | in At | tachment A-1 | .D | |
| 4. | Contract Type: Service Unit | t | | | | |
| 5. | Procurement Dates: | | | | | |
| | A. Issued: N/A | | | | | |
| | B. Advertised: N/A | | | | _ | |
| | C. Pre-proposal Conference | : N/A | | | | |
| | D. Proposals Due: N/A | | | | | |
| | E. Pre-Qualification Comple | | | | | |
| | F. Conflict of Interest Form | | to E | thics: | | |
| 6. | Small Business Participation | 1: | | | | |
| | A. Bid/Proposal Goal: | | Dat | te Small Busir | ness Ev | aluation Completed: |
| | N/A | | | | N/ | |
| | Small Business Commitmen | | | | ment A | 2 |
| 7. | Invitation for Bid/Request for | | | | | |
| | Notifications Sent: | Bids/Prop | posal | s Picked | Bids/ | Proposals Received: |
| | N/A | up: | | | | |
| _ | | | N/A | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | |
| 8. | Evaluation Information: | | 1 | | | D 1 1 1 0 CC |
| | A. Bidders/Proposers Nar | nes: | n. 1 | m 1 | | Best and Final Offer |
| | T A 1 G . C1 : C0 | | | /Proposal | | Amount: |
| | Los Angeles County Sheriff | S | | <u>10unt:</u> 9,794,668* | | \$ |
| | Department | | J45 | 7,734,000" | | |
| | B. Evaluation Methodology: | Details are | in A | ttachment A- | 1 C | <u> </u> |
| 9. | Protest Information: | Details are | 111 7 | ittaciiiiiciit 7x | 1.0 | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | A. Protest Period End Date: | N/A | | | | |
| | B. Protest Receipt Date: N/A | | | | | |
| | C. Disposition of Protest Da | | | | | |
| 10. | Contract Administrator: | | Τe | elephone Nun | nber: | |
| | Timothy Godfrey | | | 13) 922-2839 | | |
| 11. | Project Manager: | | | elephone Nun | nber: | |
| | Carolyn Flowers | | | 13) 922-2170 | | |

^{*} See explanation in Attachment A-1, Paragraph B Procurement Background

BOARD REPORT ATTACHMENT A-1 PROCUREMENT HISTORY

MOU NUMBER TCP2610LASD WITH LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSIT COMMUNITY POLICING SERVICES

A. <u>Background on Contractor</u>

The Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD) is the largest sheriff's department in the world. In addition to specialized services, the LASD currently operates and provides contract services throughout and within the many cities that comprise Los Angeles County; including the City of Los Angeles. In the City of Los Angeles, LASD provides services to the Los Angeles Community Colleges, Metrolink, and all of the Los Angeles County Courts. In addition, LASD Transit Services Bureau provided additional transit law enforcement services to the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) under Contract OP2610LASD over a five-year period, and Interim Contract PS2610LASD prior to the existing services being provided under the current Contract TCP2610LASD. LASD has provided satisfactory transit law enforcement services under these contracts.

B. <u>Procurement Background</u>

On February 27, 2003 the Board authorized the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the County of Los Angeles for Sheriff's Department Transit Community Policing services, for a period of five years, inclusive of two one-year options, not to exceed \$47,212,982 for FY04, and \$7,868,830 for two months service in FY03, inclusive of all start-up capital costs and annualized capital expenses, starting May 1, 2003. The total contract award amount is \$55,081,812. Contract No. TCP2610LASD, which is the MOU, was executed and made effective on May 1, 2003.

Although the Board approved the amount of \$47,212,982 for the service level for FY04, staff negotiated a service level for FY04 in the amount of \$43,838,944.

Modification No. 1 was executed on March 26, 2004 to add \$50,000 for effort related to the Accident Reduction Project along Wilshire Boulevard.

Modification No. 2 was executed on April 21, 2004 to increase the service level for the remainder of FY04 by the amount of \$473,973. This modification included the following service unit changes, which were effective on April 21, 2004:

| Service Unit Description | Service Unit Number | Service Unit Changes | Revised Service Unit Number |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 56 Hour One Deputy Unit | 40 | -1 | 39 |
| MET Deputy | 1 | +1 | 2 |
| Canine Deputy | 1 | +1 | 2 |
| Motor Team Leader | 0 | +1 | 2 |
| Motor Units | 22 | -2 | 20 |

- 2 Field Sergeants are converted to Motor Sergeants
- 1 Motor Generalist is converted to 1 Motor Team Leader
- 1 Deputy Generalist is converted to the Crisis Response Unit (CRU)
- 1 Motor Generalist is converted to the "Bark and Alert" detection Canine Unit.
- 1 Lieutenant has been added. The cost for the Lieutenant is included as part of the allocated overhead cost.

The Special Overtime Fund is increased to cover the two added 24-hours, 7 days per week security detail at USG complex, effective March 15, 2004, in the aftermath of the commuter train bombing in Madrid, Spain. The amount of \$300,000 is added to the Special Overtime fund amount of \$300,000 for a revised fund amount of \$600,000.

In addition, the amount for Canine Support is increased from \$6,502 to \$13,004.

Per the contract under Modification No. 3, the MTA shall establish an annual service level and budget for Transit Community Policing Services for FY05 for the period July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005. As shown in <u>Attachment B, the schedule below</u>, the proposed amount of \$49,794,668 for FY05 <u>plus the contingency amount of \$500,000 less the FY04 underutilized contract value of \$739,718 increases \$2,850,065</u> the Total Contract Value to \$104,876,480 \$104,636,762.

| Description | Board Original Award Amount | First Year Staff Negotiated Amount | Amend 1 | Amend-2 | First Year Revised Staff Negotiated Amount | Amend 3 Second Year Amount | Revised Total Contract Value |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|-----------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Start Up Capital Cost | \$ 3,719,836 | | \$ | \$ | \$ 1,230,945 | \$ 1,239,945 | \$ 2,479,890 |
| Fiscal Year 03 Services (2 months) | 4,148,995 | | | | 6,259,343 | | 6,259,342 |
| Subtotal | \$ 7,868,830 | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ 7,400,288 | \$ 1,239,945 | \$ 8,730,232 |
| Fiscal Year 04-Service | 47,212,08 2 | 43,838,944 | 50,000 | 473,973 | 44,362,917 | - | 44,362,917 |
| Fiscal Year 05 Service | | | | | | 49,794,668 | 49,794,668 |
| Total | \$ 55,081,812 | \$ 43,838,944 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 473,973 | \$ 51,862,205 | \$ 51,034,613 | 102,896,817 |
| Contingency | | | | | | 500,000 | 500000 |
| Total with Contingency | | | | | | \$ 51,534,613 | \$ 103,396,817.00 |
| Fy06-Capital Cost Total with | | | | | | | 1,239,945 |
| Contingency | | | | | | | 104,636,762 |

Note: As shown in the schedule above, the revised total amount of \$51,862,20552,231,747, which was negotiated by staff for the first year of services, inclusive of capitol expenses is \$3,219,6082,850,065 lower than the amount of \$55,081,812 that was approved by the MTA Board.

C. <u>Evaluation of Proposals</u>

MTA's review of the proposal received from LASD for FY05 service level under the subject contract was limited to a mathematical accuracy check, reconciliation of proposed rates to supporting documents and reviewing the allocation methodology used for proposed support staff positions.

D. <u>Cost/Price Analysis Explanation of Variances</u>

The recommended price has been determined to be fair and reasonable based upon cost analysis. Staff performed a cost comparison analysis of the proposed service level costs for FY05 in the amount of \$49,794,668 with historical service level costs associated with FY04 in the amount of \$44,362,916 (see Attachment A-3). The cost analysis disclosed that the proposed service unit rates for FY05 are slightly lower than the service unit rates for FY04, due to a change in the proposed support positions. However, the total amount for FY05 is \$5,431,752 or approximately 12% higher than the amount for FY04 due to an increase in the level of service units requested, in the aftermath of the commuter train bombing in Madrid, Spain and terrorist threats around the world.

| Bid/Proposal Amount | MTA Estimate | Recommended/Negotiated |
|---------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| | | Amount |
| \$49,794,668* | \$ | \$49,794,668* |

* excludes capital expenses for FY05 of \$1,239,945

BOARD REPORT ATTACHMENT A-2 LIST OF SUBCONTRACTORS

MOU NUMBER TCP2610LASD WITH LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSIT COMMUNITY POLICING SERVICES

PRIME CONTRACTOR -

<u>Small Business Commitment</u> <u>Other Subcontractors</u>

N/A N/A

Total Commitment 0%

BOARD REPORT ATTACHMENT A-3 LEVEL OF SERVICE UNITS

MOU NUMBER TCP2610LASD WITH LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT (LASD) FOR TRANSIT COMMUNITY POLICING SERVICES

| FY04 Service Units | 担合 | Armal | FY04 Revised Service Units | Crait | Armual | Proposed FY05 Service Units | 持ら | it Armal | [a |
|--|-----------------------|------------|---|----------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------|---------|
| (FY02-03 Rates) | Number Cost | Cost | (FY03-04 Rates) | Number Cost | Cost | (FY04-05 Rates) | Number Cost | st Cost | # |
| 56 Fbur Two Deputy Units | 49 471,593 | 23,108,057 | 56 Hour Two Deputy Units | 49 473,465 | | 23,199,785 56 Hour Two Deputy Units | 52 469,861 | 861 24,432,772 | 2,772 |
| 56 Hour One Deputy Units | 40 235,797 | | 9,431,880 56 Hour One Deputy Units | 39 236,732 | | 9,232,548 56 Hbur One Deputy Units | 39 234,930 | | 2,270 |
| Non-Relieved Deputy Units | 13 153,115 | | 1,990,495 Non-Relieved Deputy Units | 13 153,722 | 1,998,386 | 1,998,386 Non-Relieved Deputy Urits | 13 152, | 152,552 1,983,176 | 3,176 |
| MET Deputy | 1 162,092 | | 162,092 MET Deputy | 2 162,686 | | 325,372 MET Deputy | 2 161, | 161,783 323, | 323,566 |
| TeamLeaders | 9 162,092 | 1,458,828 | Team Leaders | 9 162,686 | | 1,464,174 Team Leaders | 10 161, | 161,783 1,617,830 | 7,830 |
| Team Leader - Motor Office | 0 | 0 | Team Leader - Motor Officer | 1 169,396 | | 169,396 Team Leader - Motor Officer | 1 168, | 168,653 168, | 168,653 |
| Carrine Deputy | 1 162,092 | | 162,092 Carrine Deputy | 2 162,686 | | 325,372 Carrine Deputy | 2 161, | 161,783 323, | 323,566 |
| Motor Units | 22 162,092 | | 3,566,024 Motor Urits | 20 162,686 | | 3,253,720 Motor Urits | 20 158,918 | 918 3,178,360 | 3,360 |
| Security Assistant | 50 72,960 | 3,648,000 | Security Assistant | 50 73,686 | | 3,684,300 Security Assistant | 110 71, | 71,642 7,880,620 |),620 |
| | | 43,527,468 | | | 43,653,053 | | | 49,070,813 |),813 |
| Special Overtime Fund | 250,000 | | Special Overtime Fund | 000'009 | | Special Overtime Fund | 900,009 | 000 | |
| Workers Compensation | 8.652% 21,630 | | Workers Compensation | 8.652% 51,912 | • | Workers Compensation | 10.916% 65, | 65,496 | |
| Carrine Support | 6,502 | | Carnine Support | 13,004 | | Carrine Support | 13, | 13,004 | |
| Subtotal | 278,132 | | Subtotal | 664,916 | | Subtotal | 678,500 | 200 | |
| Liability Insurance | 3.000% 8,344 | | Liability Irsurance | 3.000% 19,947 | | Liability Insurance | 3.000% 20, | 20,355 | |
| Training Fund | 25,000 | | Training Fund | 25,000 | | | 25, | 25,000 | |
| Total Supplemental Cost | | 311,476 | Total Supplemental Cost | | 709,863 | Total Supplemental Cost | | 723, | 723,855 |
| Total Contract Cost | | 43,838,944 | Total Contract Cost | | 44,362,916 | Total Contract Cost | | 49,794,668 | 899,1 |
| | | | Change from FY04 | | 523,973 | 523,973 Change from FY04 Revised | | 5,431,752 | 1,752 |
| | | | Percent Change | | 1.2% | Percent Change | | 12 | 12.2% |
| Start-Up Costs (1) | 3,719,835 | 1,239,945 | 1,239,945 Start-Up Costs (1) | 3,719,835 | 1,239,945 | 1,239,945 Start-Up Costs (1) | | 1,239,945 | 945 |
| First Year Total Costs | | 45,078,889 | First Year Total Costs | | 45,602,861 | Second Year Total Costs | | 51,034,613 | 1,613 |
| (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) | 1 | | | | - | 11. 0 (1) | - | | |
| (1) Start-Up costs to be paid in trice arrulal paymeris. | id in unee ariinal pa | yrrerus. | (1) Start-Opcosis to be pard in three atmital payments. | ın unee arınmaı payı | rerus. | (1) Start-Up costs to be paid in three aminal payments. | itmee ammali | ayments. | |
| 1.1. | 1 1 | 1111 | 1: | | | | | | 7 |

Note: Figures may be slightly off from original schedules due to rounding.

| | Board | FY04 Actual | | _ | Revised FY04 Actual | Difference between Board | | Remaining | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|------------------|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Description | Contract Authority | Contract Amount | Mod 1 | Mod 2 | Contract Amount | Authorized and Actual | Ref. | Authorized Amount | FY05 Proposed Amount | FY06 Capital Payment | Total Contract Value |
| FTY03 Services (2 months) First 1/3 Capital | 4,148,995 | 6,259,342 | ' ' | 1 1 | 6,259,342 | (2,110,347) | Note 1 Note 2 | | | | į |
| Subtorial FY04 Services Total Approved Amount | 7,868,830 47,212,982 55,081,812 | 7,439,287 43,838,944 51,338,231 | 50,000 50,000 | 473,973 473,973 | 7,499,287 44,362,917 51,862,204 | 369,543 2,850,065 3,219,608 | | \$ (2,110,347) \$ 2,850,065 \$ 739,718 | | | |
| FY04: FY04 Modification 1 FY04 Modification 2 Modification Subtotal FY04 Services Revised FY04 Services | | 50,000 473,973 523,973 43,888,944 44,362,917 | | | | | | | | | |
| FTY03 Services (2 months) First 1/3 Capital FY04 Revised Actual Amount | · | 6,259,342 1,239,945 51,862,204 | | | | | | | | | |
| FV05: Proposed Funding Level Underutilization of Original Contract Value Subtotal Second 1/3 Capital Proposed Funding Level Subtotal Contingency FY05 Proposed Cost | | | | | | | | | 49,794,668 (739,718) 49,054,950 1,239,945 50,294,895 500,000 50,794,895 | | |
| Contract Value: Board Approved Contract Value | 55,081,812 | | | | | | | ' | | | |
| Total Negotiated Contract Value | | 51,862,204 | | | | | \$ 739,718 | | \$ 50,794,895 | \$ 1,239,945 | \$ 104,636,762 |
| Difference FY04 Board v. Negotiated Unused Authorized Amount Revised Total Contract Value | | 3,219,608 | | | | | | | II . | | |

1 LASD was able to ramp up more rapidly in the first two months than had been anticipated. Initially. The actual invoiced amount for the first two months was \$6.2 million. This amount is \$2.1 million higher than the original estimate of \$4.1 million.

² Capital costs were negotiated to be paid in three installments. The \$2.5 million is the total of the second and third remaining capital payments