

**A. OPENING PROCEDURES**

**A.1 Call to Order h8(E)TJ ( mc 0 Tw 5.435 0 2.56 )Tj EMCe1 Tc -424**







### **5. Approach – Part II**

Ms. Block and Ms. Ricco gave both firms a 5. Ms. Cuevas gave Kawahara 5, and Rehon Roberts 4.

### **5. Approach – Part III**

Ms. Block said this part raised the issue of use of litigation to obtain information from third parties. She thought they would be only looking in the records to see if they supported the allegations.

Ms. Ricco said the Kawahara outline was a very basic approach that they will probably have to amend.

Ms. Cuevas agreed with Ms. Ricco and said she was not ready to score either firm on this item until she speaks to them.

Ms. Ricco scored Kawahara 1, and Rehon Roberts 5. She said that while they may have overstated it, they appear closer to what the committee expects.

Ms. Block said she gave Rehon Roberts a 5, but she gave Kawahara a big question mark, because she really didn't know.

Ms. Ricco scored Kawahara 1 and Rehon Roberts 5.

### **6. Other Factors**

Ms. Ricco scored Kawahara 1 and Rehon Roberts 5.

Ms. Cuevas gave Mr. Kawahara 8 based on his experience with the Inspector General's office. She scored Rehon Roberts higher because of the FCMAT experience.

Ms. Block questioned whether obtaining cooperation of outside contractors would be outside the process. Ms. LeBlanc said the attorney along with the audit firm would identify the scope. Ms. Block said Kawahara clearly had good experience and gave him an 8.

Ms. Block said she did not fully understand what was meant by "has the strengths not captured by other categories." Ms. LeBlanc said an example would be do they have the capacity to be able to work on this type of issue.

Ms. Block said she thinks it is a good thing that Rehon Roberts defines itself as part of a Bay Area community.

Ms. Cuevas asked whether they will be adding up the numbers, which would be over 100.

Ms. Block said rather than pay attention to the numbers answer the question of whether we want to bring one or both to the interview. She believes both should be interviewed.

Ms. Ricco said both should be present for the interview( a )§ BDC 0.0 w 18.eaa(s)BD21 BDw(8(w)102 1)1114

their three or four most important questions, to make sure to ask the same questions to each firm.

**Board Comment:**

Ms. Cuevas and Ms. Block raised the issue of whether to provide the Clay documents.

Mr. Freiman said if the documents have been made publicly available already t/P ~~1(d)~~12(y)3( t/P ~~1(d)~~m110



Ms. Ricco asked how they will make the selection process following the interviews.

Ms. Block asked Ms. LeBlanc for clarification on the process.

Ms. LeBlanc will invite the two firms for the interviews. The subcommittee will make a recommendation on one firm. The recommendation will go to the Board for approval. At the time of the meeting, the selection will be read into the record, and enter into a contract for attorney services, which may include some back and forth communication.

### **Agenda for July 20th Subcommittee Meeting**

Discussion continued on whether the attorneys will be available for the interviews.

Ms. LeBlanc said she would contact the firms via telephone and check on their availability and will let the committee members know if there is a conflict.

Mr. Freiman said that since they will be taking action, there needs to be an opportunity for public comment on that action. He suggested that the interviews take place with the public present, the interviews will then be closed, and then move to the action item, have public comment, make a motion and recommendation with discussion and action.

There was consensus among subcommittee members to have public comment after the interviews.

Mr. Freiman clarified that technically there only needs to be one public comment.

Ms. LeBlanc recommended the meeting start at 1:00 PM as planned, with opening procedures and the first interview beginning at 1:15, followed by the second interview, and then public comment.

There was consensus among committee members there will be public comment during opening procedures. Ms. LeBlanc said she will send a proposed agenda to Chairperson Block.



Ms. Block suggested setting a date for the next meeting and asked for availability on Monday, July 27, at 6:30 PM.

Ms. Ricco said she would confirm her availability as soon as possible.

Ms. Block set the next meeting for July 27, pending Ms. Ricco's availability.

Ms. Block inquired about an alternative location for the interviews, and Ms. LeBlanc said she would inquire about another location.