



Orleans Parish Communication District Hexagon Contract

Final Report

December 5, 2024

Edward Michel, CIG

Inspector General





December 5, 2024

Re: Orleans Parish Communication District Hexagon Contract

I certify that the inspector general personnel assigned to this project are free of personal or other external impairments to independence.

Edward Michel
Inspector General

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY3

I. OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODS5

II. INTRODUCTION6

III. PROCUREMENT8

Finding 1: The OPCD used a non-transparent process that violated its own internal purchasing policy when obligating more than six million dollars in the Hexagon contract. 9

Recommendation 1: OPCD should revise its procurement policies to include internal controls for documentation and the approval process..... 10

IV. EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS13

Finding 2: The OPCD purchased an RMS product that did not meet the needs identified by the organization..... 14

Recommendation 2: The OPCD should adopt an evaluation process for all competitive procurements that is consistent with best practices to ensure the selection of products that meet the needs of the organization. 18

V. INTERNAL CONTROLS AND BOARD GOVERNANCE.....20

Finding 3: The OPCD’s former executive director signed the Hexagon contract without prior approval and altered board documents. 20

Recommendation 3: The OPCD should clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the board of commissioners and the executive director. Further, the OPCD should establish a formal process for entering collaborative partnerships with other governmental entities. 25

VI. CONCLUSION.....28

APPENDIX A. TIMELINE OF KEY DATES29

OFFICIAL COMMENTS FROM THE ORLEANS PARISH COMMUNICATION DISTRICT30

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Unmet or Undemonstrated NOPD Technical Requirements..... 17

On December 31, 2020 the Orleans Parish Communication District (OPCD) entered into a \$6M contract for Hexagon OnCall Records (Hexagon), cloud-based software intended to manage data for the New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) and the Orleans Parish Sheriff's Office (OPSO). Two and a half years later, after spending a significant amount of public money, the OPCD cancelled the contract. The Office of Inspector General for the City of New Orleans (OIG) conducted an evaluation of the Hexagon contract to assess whether the OPCD complied with state or local procurement law with regard to the Hexagon contract, review the use of public funds in the project, and assess whether Hexagon was suitable to meet the City's needs for records management.

At the time the contract was cancelled, Hexagon had not launched, leaving the City without a comprehensive Records Management System (RMS), and the OPSO without a Jail Management System (JMS). In reviewing documents related to the Hexagon contract, the OIG found that the OPCD failed to follow standardized processes and their own internal policies for vendor selection. Further, pursuant to a contract that had no approval or selection process, and for which a board resolution was altered to secure financing, the City spent \$1,021,614.33 on RMS/JMS capabilities that never materialized, while the OPCD spent \$1,956,161.27 and still owed an additional \$805,345.73.

Specifically, the OIG found:

- The OPCD used a non-transparent process that violated its own internal purchasing policy when obligating more than six million dollars in the Hexagon contract;
- The OPCD purchased an RMS product that did not meet the needs identified by the organization; and
- The OPCD's former executive director signed the Hexagon contract without prior approval and altered board documents.

Based on these findings, the OIG made the following recommendations:

- The OPCD should revise its procurement policies to include internal controls for documentation and the approval process.
- The OPCD should adopt an evaluation process for all competitive procurements that is consistent with best practices to ensure the selection of products that meet the needs of the organization.
- The OPCD should clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the Board of Commissioners and the executive director. Further, the OPCD should establish a formal process for entering collaborative partnerships with other governmental entities.

In its official response, the OPCD accepted these recommendations and noted several steps the agency had already taken to improve internal controls. The OIG is encouraged by the OPCD's efforts to implement stronger procurement policies and procedures.

I. OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODS

The Office of Inspector General of the City of New Orleans (OIG) conducted an evaluation of the Orleans Parish Communication District's (OPCD) Hexagon contract for the reporting period January 2020 through September 2023. The objectives of the evaluation was to assess the process used to procure Hexagon OnCall Records (Hexagon), review the use of public funds in the project, and examine whether Hexagon was suitable to meet the needs identified by the OPCD.

In conducting the evaluation, OIG staff reviewed financial records, video recordings of the OPCD's board meetings, and OPCD email communications. Evaluators also reviewed state laws, the OPCD's internal policies, federal consent decrees, and best practices for public procurement.

Pursuant to Sections 2-1120(12) and (20) of the Code of the City of New Orleans and La. R.S. 33:9613, evaluators obtained documents from and interviewed current employees of the OPCD. Additionally, the OIG interviewed current and former employees of the City of New Orleans (City) Office of Information Technology and Innovation and the New Orleans Police Department.

This evaluation was performed in accordance with Principles and Standards for Offices of Inspector General for Inspections, Evaluations, and Reviews.¹ OIG evaluators were greatly assisted in the preparation of this report by the full cooperation of OPCD employees and City of New Orleans staff.

¹ Association of Inspectors General, "Quality Standards for Inspections, Evaluations, and Reviews by Offices of Inspector General," *Principles and Standards for Offices of Inspector General* (New York: Association of Inspectors General, 2014).

II. INTRODUCTION

A total of 192 people died by homicide in New Orleans in 2023.² An additional 1,137 people reported sexual assault, and nearly 7,000 vehicles were stolen from city streets.³ In the same year, the New Orleans Police Department (NOPD), the entity charged with protecting the lives and property of New Orleanians, experienced significant difficulties maintaining the size of its force and recruiting new officers. By April 2023, the city’s police force had decreased to 917 officers, considerably fewer than the 1,200 officers NOPD leadership identified as adequate.⁴ The NOPD faced these challenges while working to comply with federal consent decree provisions that required improved documentation and analysis of police activities.

Police departments rely on Records Management Systems (RMS) to securely document their work, comply with federal crime reporting requirements, and increase efficiency.⁵ The Integrated Justice Information Systems Institute and the International Association of Chiefs of Police describe a Records Management System as

“an agency-wide system that provides for the storage, retrieval, retention, manipulation, archival, and viewing of information, records,

² “Crime Dashboard – Annual Totals,” Crime Dashboard-Main, New Orleans City Council, <https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiaWJhMjVlYzUtYTI0ZS00MmQxLW13MDgtM2JkNTQ4NjZiZGM2liwidCI6IjFkYzNlZmNmLTVMlMTQtNGRkNS1iMjE3LWE3NTBjNWlxMzlyZCIsImMiOjN9.>

³ Ibid.

⁴ New Orleans Office of Inspector General, *Public Letter on NOPD Staffing, Recruitment, and Retention* (New Orleans, 2023), 1, <https://nolaog.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/NOPD-Recruitment-and-Retention-Public-Release.pdf>.

⁵ RMS Standards Task Force, *Standard Functional Specifications for Law Enforcement Records Management Systems, Version III* (Integrated Justice Information Systems Institute and International Association of Chiefs of Police, 2021), 11-12, <https://www.theiacp.org/resources/standard-functional-specifications-for-record-management-systems>.

documents, or files pertaining to law enforcement operations. It serves as the agency system of record for most policing activities.”⁶

In 2019, the NOPD paid a consultant \$45,937 to draft a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a new RMS. The new RMS was to take the place of the system of individual programs the department had been using to manage law enforcement information, including applications developed in-house for documenting incidents and field interviews. The RFP also included specifications for a Jail Management System (JMS) for the Orleans Parish Sheriff’s Office (OPSO). The proposal for a new RMS and JMS was aimed at leveraging technology to “improve departmental performance and efficiency.”⁷

The NOPD never released the proposal, though. Instead, the Orleans Parish Communication District (OPCD), a state entity that administers New Orleans’ 9-1-1 system, became involved with the RMS initiative and procured Hexagon OnCall Records (Hexagon). At the time, the OPCD’s executive director said his organization had taken the RFP’s requirements and “ensured that this particular system would meet those needs.”⁸ He predicted that the project would “revolutionize how our law enforcement agencies share information back and forth.”⁹

Two and a half years after the Hexagon contract was signed, Hexagon had not gone live and the NOPD still lacked a comprehensive RMS. The City’s Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) sent a memorandum to the City Council identifying “acute challenges” in implementation, including an inability to provide necessary analytics, failure to comply with state and federal crime reporting requirements, and the potential to increase rather than decrease the time needed to file a police report. Soon afterward, the OPCD canceled the Hexagon contract after a significant investment of public funds.

⁶ Ibid., 4.

⁷ New Orleans Police Department, *Request for Proposals, RMS/JMS RFP, Attachment A* (New Orleans, LA, 2019), 2.

⁸ “Special Board Meeting,” January 11, 2021, video of public meeting, 25:30, <https://www.facebook.com/opcd911/videos/opcd-special-board-meeting/111301834138702/>.

⁹ Ibid., 15:50.

III. PROCUREMENT

The OPCD is a political subdivision of the State of Louisiana created in 1982 by the State Legislature.¹⁰ As a political subdivision of the state, the OPCD is a “public entity” subject to the State Public Bid Law. Prior to 2022 this body of law required public entities to advertise and award contracts to the lowest responsible bidder for all purchases of materials and supplies above \$30,000.¹¹

For procurement of professional services, however, political subdivisions were not required by state law to use a public bid or a formal RFP. In its guidance on the state Public Bid Law, the Louisiana Legislative Auditor (LLA) stated “political subdivisions are not required to advertise, receive bids or engage in competitive negotiations for contracts for professional services.”¹² Yet, the LLA did provide guidance to political subdivisions, stating:

“Nevertheless, sound practice dictates seeking the best price available for the service sought to be performed. Sound practices include seeking quotes, using an RFP process, or simply following the Public Bid Law.”¹³

In addition to the statutory provisions, the OPCD was governed by its own Standard Operating Procedure (SOP 1.3.6.) for procurement.¹⁴ At the time the Hexagon contract was signed in 2020, SOP 1.3.6. required the OPCD’s executive director to approve all purchases over \$1,000 in the requisition system before the goods or services were ordered.¹⁵ SOP 1.3.6. further required the OPCD to make

¹⁰ Act No. 155, 1982 La. Acts.

¹¹ La. R.S. 38:2211(A)(12); La. R.S. 38:2212.1(A)(1)(a). At the time Hexagon’s RMS was purchased, the public bid threshold was \$30,000. In 2022, La. R.S. 38:2212(A)(1)(a) was revised to raise the threshold from \$30,000 to \$60,000. See Act No. 204, 2022 La. Acts.

¹² Louisiana Legislative Auditor, *Public Bid Law* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana Legislative Auditor, 2023), [https://app.lla.state.la.us/llala.nsf/87BD5C74CB17E03686257AB8006F37DE/\\$FILE/Public%20Bid%20Law%20FAQ.pdf](https://app.lla.state.la.us/llala.nsf/87BD5C74CB17E03686257AB8006F37DE/$FILE/Public%20Bid%20Law%20FAQ.pdf).

¹³ Louisiana Legislative Auditor, *Public Bid Law*, 42.

¹⁴ Orleans Parish Communication District Standard Operating Procedure Number: 1.3.6., “Purchasing,” revised September 10, 2019.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 2.

documented attempts to get at least three bids, upload quotes, and attach them to a requisition prior to approval for all purchases above \$10,000.¹⁶

Finding 1: The OPCD used a non-transparent process that violated its own internal purchasing policy when obligating more than six million dollars in the Hexagon contract.

The OPCD entered into a contract to purchase Hexagon OnCall Records on December 31, 2020.¹⁷ The Hexagon contract, as originally signed, provided for service and fee payments of at least \$6M over five years. That number included approximately \$4.8M for cloud subscriptions and \$1.3M for implementation services. The contract was issued as a professional services agreement, which meant that it was not subject to any Public Bid or RFP requirements under state law.

A review of internal OPCD emails showed that the department did seek proposals from three vendors, consistent with the OPCD's internal SOP 1.3.6.¹⁸ However, the SOP also required the organization to upload those bids in their requisition system before submitting the documents to the executive director for approval.¹⁹ Upon reviewing the OPCD's files, OIG evaluators noted that the OPCD did not attach any quotes or proposals to the Hexagon requisition file, even though internal OPCD emails showed the OPCD received a project proposal from at least one additional company. Further, the former executive director did not approve the requisition for the Hexagon contract in the OPCD's requisition system until May 2021, more than four months after the contract was signed. This was a violation of SOP 1.3.6., which required prior approval for all purchases over \$1,000.²⁰

When asked, current OPCD administrators stated they were unaware of any written procedures for processing requisitions at the time the Hexagon contract

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ The OPCD's former executive director signed the contract and returned it to Hexagon on December 30, 2020, but Hexagon's representative did not sign the document until December 31.

¹⁸ OPCD SOP No. 1.3.6., 2.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

was signed. Despite the lack of written procedures, OPCD representatives stated that the organization had unwritten approval procedures and that staff had a “very clear” understanding of the expected procedure. However, multiple representatives of the organization stated that, while they noticed the irregularity, they did not raise questions about the failure to use the proper approval process with the Hexagon contract. At least one staff member reported that they did not report the policy violation for fear of losing their job.

Although it did not offer the structure of an RFP or Public Bid process, the OPCD’s policy requiring documentation of proposals was designed to increase transparency in the procurement process. Because there was no documentation of additional proposals in the requisitions file for the Hexagon contract, the OPCD could not provide evidence that the other proposals mentioned in internal emails were actually considered by the organization when purchasing Hexagon. Further, the lack of internal controls to safeguard the process allowed the former executive director to obligate more than six million dollars of public money without any formal procurement process.

Recommendation 1: The OPCD should revise its procurement policies to include internal controls for documentation and the approval process.

Political subdivisions were not required by state law to use any particular method to procure professional services like those obtained in the Hexagon contract.²¹ In the absence of such regulations, some jurisdictions have struggled to prevent fraudulent contracting practices. The indictment and conviction of former New Orleans Mayor C. Ray Nagin on charges that he took advantage of lax regulations to divert professional services contracts for personal gain is one high-profile example of problems that can arise when procurement rules are either unclear or unenforced.²² Nagin's successor subsequently issued an executive order, which required the City publish an RFP or Request for Qualifications (RFQ), obtain at least three proposals from qualified contractors, and document the process of

²¹ Louisiana Legislative Auditor, *Public Bid Law*, 42.

²² United States v. Nagin, 810 F.3d 348 (5th Cir. 2016).

evaluating proposals for each professional services procurement.²³ The Executive Order also provided that vendors could contest the award of contracts.²⁴ It is crucial for the OPCD to similarly adopt and enforce strong policies that ensure large purchases are made through a competitive and transparent process.

To this end, the OIG recommends the OPCD review procurement procedures from other governmental entities. For example, the City of New Orleans' *Bureau of Purchasing Procurement Procedures* stated professional services acquisitions of more than \$15,000 must be procured through an RFQ and/or RFP that included a "clear description of the services to be performed and the criteria for evaluation, and the scoring weight attached to each item."²⁵ The procedures further required the City to obtain at least three proposals from qualified contractors in response to an RFP.²⁶ It should be noted that the City of New Orleans required an RFP process for professional services over \$15,000 even when the service sought was "unique."²⁷ Adopting similar requirements of a competitive process for purchases over a clearly stated threshold would improve transparency and accountability for professional services agreements at the OPCD.

The OIG further recommends the OPCD develop internal controls to ensure the procurement process is followed as intended. This may include checklists, a multi-step approval process, or even backstops in the requisitions system that require the user to follow certain steps before the contract can move forward. The OPCD should review the United States Government Accountability Office's *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government* for information about the types of internal controls that can be incorporated in their procurement process.²⁸

²³ Executive Order MJL 10-05, issued June 3, 2010, 1, 6, 8.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 9.

²⁵ City of New Orleans Bureau of Purchasing, *City of New Orleans Bureau of Purchasing Federal Grant Procurement Procedures*, Version 10, updated March 26, 2024, sec. 1.4.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, sec. 2.3(7).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, sec. 1.5.

²⁸ United States Government Accountability Office, *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government*, (Washington, DC: United States Government Accountability Office, 2014), <https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-14-704g.pdf>.

Finally, the OIG recommends the OPCD educate and inform employees of their rights under the State’s whistleblower protection statutes.²⁹ Staff should feel empowered to report all instances of fraud, waste, and abuse to the appropriate entities without fear of reprisal.

²⁹ La. R.S. 42:1169.

IV. EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

The U. S. General Services Administration’s Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) outlined requirements for evaluating proposals and selecting vendors for federal contracts.³⁰ Though not binding on local governments, FAR required agency heads to designate a “source selection” authority.³¹ Under the guidelines this person had the authority to establish an evaluation team composed of persons knowledgeable in the appropriate fields, and to evaluate proposals to assess the product’s characteristics as compared to the solicitation document.³² FAR also required “[t]he relative strengths, *deficiencies*, significant *weaknesses*, and risks supporting proposal evaluation *shall* be documented in the contract file [emphasis original].”³³

The National Association of State Procurement Officials (NASPO) addressed selection procedures in the *Evaluation and Award* issue of its *Procurement Toolbox* series.³⁴ The NASPO guidelines stated “[t]he evaluation plan for administering the evaluation must be determined in writing, and in place prior to the due date for bids or proposals,” and “analysis of the bids or proposals must be documented in writing.”³⁵ Similarly, the LLA recommended that “[o]nce a vendor is selected, the criteria for selecting the vendor should be documented in the contract file.”³⁶

Though the organization did not use an RFP process in soliciting proposals for the RMS/JMS project, the OPCD’s former executive director stated the organization used an unreleased RFP created by a consultant for the NOPD in 2019 to evaluate

³⁰ F.A.R. §15.3.

³¹ F.A.R. §15.303(a).

³² F.A.R. §15.303(b)(1) and §15.305(a).

³³ F.A.R. §15.305(a).

³⁴ National Association of State Procurement Officials, *Procurement Toolbox: Evaluation and Award* (Lexington, KY: National Association of State Procurement Officials, 2020), https://cms.naspo.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/2020_ToolBox_Issue_5E.pdf.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 2.

³⁶ Louisiana Legislative Auditor, *Best Practices – Contracting* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana Legislative Auditor, 2019), 2, <https://cms.la.gov/assets/documents/Contracting.pdf>.

the proposals.³⁷ The draft RFP contained a list of mandatory requirements for vendors, including that “[t]he respondent has successfully performed similar work to support law enforcement and corrections requirements in at least three (3) other local government jurisdictions of at least comparable size and characteristics to NOLA.”³⁸ The RFP went on to state, “[i]f the selection committee concludes, after its initial review of a submitted proposal, that one or more of the mandatory requirements above are not met, the proposal will be considered non-responsive and will not be evaluated further.”³⁹ The RFP required the respondent to have completely launched their product in three similarly sized jurisdictions at the time the proposal was submitted and that all software proposed for the project must have been operational in a live environment for at least one year.⁴⁰

The RFP included a list of mandatory functional and technical specifications for the RMS/JMS product as well. In all, it identified 237 requirements shared by the RMS and the JMS. There were an additional 513 requirements for the RMS and 776 requirements for the JMS separately, resulting in a total of 1526 mandatory requirements. The requirements covered a broad spectrum of functionality, including the need to share data with other systems, facilitate reports based on database queries, and support federal and state crime reporting requirements.

Finding 2: The OPCD purchased an RMS product that did not meet the needs identified by the organization.

EVALUATION PROCESS

The OPCD’s procurement policy did not outline any procedures for evaluating bids, documenting evaluations, or selecting a vendor, which would have been consistent with the best practice guidelines issued by both FAR and NASPO.⁴¹ Nevertheless, staff stated it was customary to take contemporaneous notes about the evaluation of proposals for large purchases. Further, in some cases a selection

³⁷ OPCD, “Special Board Meeting,” January 11, 2021, video of public meeting, 25:00.

³⁸ *RMS/JMS RFP* (2019), Attachment A, 1.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 2, 5.

⁴¹ F.A.R. §15.3; National Association of State Procurement Officials, *Procurement Toolbox: Evaluation and Award* (2020); OPCD SOP No. 1.3.6.

committee was established. In purchasing Hexagon, however, OIG evaluators found that the organization did not follow this practice.

A review of internal email communications revealed that OPCD discussed the potential for an RMS/JMS contract with three companies: Hexagon, Mark43, and Motorola. Hexagon and Mark43 ultimately submitted proposals, but the OIG did not find evidence that the OPCD received a formal proposal from Motorola. The requisition file for the Hexagon contract did not include quotes from other vendors, evaluation criteria, scorecards, or any other documentation that an evaluation was conducted. The file included only a payment schedule and list of deliverables for Hexagon. OPCD representatives further reported that the organization's files and facilities had been "exhaustively searched" for documentary evidence that an evaluation of the proposals had taken place and no such evidence was found. In addition, the OPCD did not establish a team of subject matter experts to assess the technical capabilities of proposed products.

As such, although more than one proposal was submitted for the RMS/JMS project, the OPCD was unable to establish that any other proposal was considered and evaluated prior to the selection of Hexagon. Further, the organization could not demonstrate that the merits of the product selected were evaluated against the RFP that the former executive director stated was used as a requirements document.

PRODUCT REQUIREMENTS

OIG evaluators found that neither Hexagon as a company nor its OnCall Records product met the mandatory minimum requirements described in the draft RFP. Specifically, while the draft RFP stated the vendor must have successfully performed similar work in three government jurisdictions of comparable size and characteristic as the City of New Orleans, all of the RMS client references Hexagon provided to the OPCD were for police departments that were significantly smaller than the NOPD.⁴² The largest was a little over half the size of the NOPD. Further, the referenced departments served communities with significantly different characteristics from New Orleans. For instance, according to the FBI's Uniform

⁴² *RMS/JMS RFP (2019)*, Attachment A, 1.

Crime Statistics, in 2019 New Orleans saw three times the violent crimes and almost two and half times the property crimes of any police department listed as a Hexagon customer reference.⁴³ Additionally, Hexagon would not respond to the OIG’s questions regarding the length of time their OnCall Records product had been in use by the customers referenced. This information was important because the RFP required the system to have been used in a live environment for at least one year.

The JMS portion of the RFP included the same minimum requirements for having performed similar work in least three comparable jurisdictions, with the product operating live for at least one year.⁴⁴ Hexagon only provided two references for the JMS portion of the project, neither of which had gone live at the time the references were provided. Additionally, Hexagon’s OnCall Records Product Sheet stated the software’s jail management module managed workflows for small- or medium-sized facilities.⁴⁵ At the time the OPCD was exploring JMS options, the OPSO managed a jail with approximately 1,100 inmates.⁴⁶ This put New Orleans’ facility in roughly the top four percent of U.S. jails by average daily population, indicating it could not be accurately described as “small- or medium-sized.”⁴⁷

In November 2021, nearly a year after the Hexagon contract had been signed, NOPD Information Technology (IT) staff assessed Hexagon’s ability to meet the technical requirements listed in the RFP. The staff, which included the NOPD’s Chief Technology Officer and the department’s Director of Information Technology and Analytics, evaluated 707 of the RFP’s requirements for the NOPD’s RMS. Of these, 92 of the identified requirements were not met either in whole or

⁴³ Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Table 8: Offenses Known to Law Enforcement, by State by City, 2019*. <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2019/crime-in-the-u.s.-2019/topic-pages/offenses-known-to-law-enforcement> (March 25, 2024).

⁴⁴ *RMS/JMS RFP* (2019), Attachment A, 2.

⁴⁵ Hexagon, *HxGN OnCall Records: Product Sheet* (Madison, AL: Hexagon, 2019), 2, <https://hexagon.com/products/hxgn-oncall-records>.

⁴⁶ “Average daily number of inmates in the Orleans Parish Prison,” ResultsNOLA, City of New Orleans, updated through Q3 2019, <https://datadriven.nola.gov/results/measures/current/10-6/>.

⁴⁷ United States Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Average Daily Jail Population, by Size of Jurisdiction, 2021*. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/jail-inmates-2021-statistical-tables> (August 29, 2023).

in part. An additional 82 requirements were at least partially undemonstrated at the time of the NOPD’s review. In all, 171 specifications, or approximately 24 percent of the requirements evaluated by NOPD IT staff, were in some way unmet or undemonstrated. See **Figure 1**.

Figure 1: Unmet or Undemonstrated NOPD Technical Requirements

RMS Requirements	Total	% of Total
With Portions Not Met	92	13%
With Portions Not Demonstrated	82	12%
Total with Portions Either Not Met or Not Demonstrated ⁴⁸	171	24%

Source: Evaluation of Hexagon OnCall Records Conducted by NOPD IT Staff

Some particularly significant concerns, as identified by NOPD IT staff, included that Hexagon required officers to enter some data multiple times, making recordkeeping extremely time consuming. Staff also felt the product made it impossible to clearly document field interviews in certain circumstances. For instance, it was nearly impossible to accurately notate a situation in which officers interacted with all occupants of a vehicle but took only one into custody. Hexagon also lacked the functionality needed to prevent officers from editing reports they had not created. Finally, NOPD’s IT staff felt the product did not have the bulk data extraction capabilities to meet the NOPD’s analytics needs.

NOPD’s IT staff also noted the product did not meet some specifications needed for compliance with the NOPD’s federal consent decree and fulfilment of crime reporting obligations. The NOPD’s consent decree mandated an Early Warning System that assisted in identifying officers who displayed patterns of problematic

⁴⁸ The total number of requirements with at least a portion unmet or undemonstrated is slightly lower than the total number unmet plus the total number undemonstrated. This is because many requirements had multiple sections, which were evaluated separately. In a few instances, portions of a requirement were marked unmet while others were marked undemonstrated, causing the same requirement to appear on both lists.

behavior.⁴⁹ According to data analysts who worked with the NOPD IT department to assess the merits of Hexagon, the Early Warning System required the ability to extract bulk data, which Hexagon could not do. Without the Early Warning System, the NOPD would be in direct violation of their federal consent decree.

Finally, NOPD was required to follow Louisiana Incident Based Crime Reporting System (LIBRS) standards in order to be eligible for federal or state funding through the Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement (LCLE). The RFP and the signed Hexagon contract both identified the need to support LIBRS compliance. Had Hexagon successfully launched on the timeline provided in the early stages of the project, the NOPD would have been fully compliant by January 2022. However, because the project was not completed by this deadline, the NOPD was non-compliant with the LCLE reporting requirements for a period of time.

Recommendation 2: The OPCD should adopt an evaluation process for all competitive procurements that is consistent with best practices to ensure the selection of products that meet the needs of the organization.

The OIG recommends the OPCD develop evaluation provisions in their procurement policy consistent with the guidelines released by FAR and NASPO.⁵⁰ Specifically, the OIG recommends the organization adopt a procedure that incorporates a transparent review of all proposals, uses subject matter experts in the particular field, and weighs the strengths and weakness of each proposal.

In developing the new policy provisions, the OPCD should also review the City's procurement policies. The City's *Bureau of Purchasing Procurement Procedures* required evaluation criteria be established before an RFP was released.⁵¹ The City

⁴⁹ United States v. City of New Orleans, Civil Action No. 12-1924, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Rec. Doc. 565, Amended and Restated Consent Decree Regarding the New Orleans Police Department 80-84.

⁵⁰ F.A.R. §15.303(b)(1); National Association of State Procurement Officials, *Procurement Toolbox: Evaluation and Award* (2020).

⁵¹ City of New Orleans Bureau of Purchasing, *City of New Orleans Bureau of Purchasing Federal Grant Procurement Procedures*, Version 10, sec. 2.3(1)(c).

also required a five-person evaluation committee composed of the manager of the requesting department, the CAO, the proposed contract manager, a subject matter expert from local government, and the City's Chief Financial Officer.⁵²

Finally, the OIG recommends the OPCD update its procurement procedures to require that all scorecards from the evaluation committee and minutes from evaluation committee meetings be preserved in writing. Policies like these are aimed at creating a transparent process for potential vendors while ensuring that the products or services purchased would meet the government's needs.⁵³

⁵² Ibid., sec. 2.3(8).

⁵³ Harvard Kennedy School Government Performance Lab, *Guidebook: Crafting a Results-Driven Request for Proposals (RFP)* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Kennedy School Government Performance Lab, 2020), 53-60, <https://govlab.hks.harvard.edu/guidebook-crafting-results-driven-request-proposals-rfp>.

V. INTERNAL CONTROLS AND BOARD GOVERNANCE

The OPCD was created by Act 155 of the 1982 Louisiana Legislature, which established a Board of Commissioners as the governing authority of the OPCD and authorized the Board to hire employees, experts, and consultants as necessary to carry out its duties. The Act further provided that “unless a quorum is present, the commission shall not take any binding or final action on any item.”⁵⁴

The OPCD’s Board also adopted By-Laws, which governed membership, voting rights, appointment of officers, meetings, and order of business.⁵⁵ The By-Laws echoed Act 155’s provision that no actions may be taken by the Board without a quorum present.⁵⁶ They further provided that the Board’s proceedings were governed by *Robert’s Rules of Order*, which established that amendment of items already adopted by a Board must be seconded, were debatable, and required a majority vote.⁵⁷ A two-thirds vote was needed if notice of the amendment had not been given at the previous board meeting.⁵⁸

Finding 3: The OPCD’s former executive director signed the Hexagon contract without prior approval and altered board documents.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN CONTRACTS

On December 30, 2020, the former executive director of the OPCD signed a contract with Hexagon to purchase their RMS/JMS software. In signing the contract, the former executive director obligated the OPCD to pay \$2.18M in the first year and \$1.02M yearly maintenance in each of four subsequent years.⁵⁹ At

⁵⁴ Act No. 155, 1982 La. Acts sec. 4(C).

⁵⁵ Orleans Parish Communication District, *By-Laws of the Board of Commissioners Orleans Parish Communication District*.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, art. 7(4).

⁵⁷ *OPCD By-Laws*, art. 8(1); Robert, Henry M., *Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised, 12th Edition* (New York NY: PublicAffairs, 2020), 35:2(4) and 35:2(7).

⁵⁸ Robert, Henry M., *Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised, 12th Edition*, 35:2(7).

⁵⁹ Orleans Parish Communication District on behalf of the Police Department & Sheriff’s Office Statement of Work for HxGN OnCall Records Implementation (December 31, 2020), 65.

the time the contract was signed, the OPCD's Board had not approved the expenditure through a separate board resolution.

As stated above, OPCD's operations and contracting procedures were governed by Act 155, OPCD's By-Laws, and its internal procurement policies. In reviewing the Hexagon contract and the OPCD's organizational documents, OIG evaluators found there were insufficient internal controls to guide the oversight by the OPCD's Board of Commissioners. While Act 155 provided that the OPCD's Board shall not take any binding or final action without a quorum, it did not specify whether the executive director or any other individual may bind the OPCD without prior Board approval.⁶⁰ The OPCD's By-Laws and the executive director's employment contract were also silent on the issue.⁶¹ Further, when questioned, executives and legal representatives from OPCD were unable to definitively state whether the former executive director had the official authority to sign contracts without Board approval. However, representatives felt that, while not actually stated, the executive director's authority was "inherent" in state law.

A review of the OPCD's purchasing policy suggested that the executive director had the authority to approve all emergency contracts and those between \$1,000 and \$30,000.⁶² The policy stipulated that all goods valued over \$30,000 would be procured by Request for Bids or RFP. However, the policy did not provide clear guidance about the approval process for professional services contracts. The Hexagon contract was well over the figure the organization's procurement policy specifically identified as the amount the executive director had authority to approve.⁶³

Upon the OIG's request, the OPCD was not able to provide any additional documentation as evidence that the OPCD's Board approved the Hexagon contract, or that the former executive director had formal authority to sign the

⁶⁰ Act No. 155, 1982 La. Acts.

⁶¹ *OPCD By-Laws*; Employment Contract between Tyrell Morris and the Orleans Parish Communication District (August 9, 2018).

⁶² OPCD SOP No. 1.3.6., 2.

⁶³ Orleans Parish Communication District on behalf of the Police Department & Sheriff's Office Statement of Work for HxGN OnCall Records Implementation (December 31, 2020), 65.

contract without prior Board approval. Further, although the Board later signed a resolution related to financing the RMS/JMS project, the resolution did not include authorization to sign the Hexagon contract.⁶⁴

ALTERED BOARD RESOLUTION

Nearly two weeks after signing the Hexagon contract, the former executive director called a Special Board Meeting to discuss Resolution 21-02, which would authorize him to enter into a financing agreement with Government Capital Corporation (GCC) to obtain funding for the RMS/JMS project.⁶⁵ The resolution was originally introduced at the January 2021 board meeting, but a decision on the matter was deferred until the February meeting.⁶⁶ Although both meetings included a discussion on whether the OPCD should purchase Hexagon, the resolution was limited to the executive director's authority to sign the lease agreement with the lending agency. Despite the concerns of individual members, the Board ultimately voted to approve the financial agreement on February 3, 2021.⁶⁷

Subsequently, GCC declined financing the project due to the OPCD's financial status.⁶⁸ The OPCD then reached out to JPMorgan Chase Bank to secure financing, and the former executive director requested the Board Chair sign the original resolution so it could be submitted for this purpose.⁶⁹ However, JPMorgan Chase rejected the resolution and requested it be updated because it explicitly approved financing through GCC. The former executive director then forwarded a revised resolution with JPMorgan Chase listed as the approved financial institution to the Board Chair for signature, stating they "needed to make an adjustment to reflect

⁶⁴ Orleans Parish Communication District, Board Resolution No. 21-02, February 3, 2021.

⁶⁵ Orleans Parish Communication District Board of Commissioners, Special Board Meeting Minutes, January 11, 2021, 2, 10, <https://www.opcdla.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/January-11-2021-Special-Board-Meeting-Minutes.pdf>.

⁶⁶ Orleans Parish Communication District Board of Commissioners, Special Board Meeting Minutes, February 3, 2021, 2, <https://www.opcdla.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/February-3-2021-Special-Board-Meeting-Minutes.pdf>.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Government Capital Corporation, letter to Orleans Parish Communication District, February, 24, 2021.

⁶⁹ Although the Board of Commissioners had approved the resolution, the resolution had not yet been signed.

the correct bank.” The change to the resolution and request for the Board Chair’s signature was made within hours of JPMorgan Chase’s request for an updated document. A review of board minutes and other documents did not provide evidence that the altered resolution was approved by the full Board before the Board Chair signed it. Further, the effective date of the resolution was not changed, and no notations were made to acknowledge that the resolution had been revised.

The finance agreement the former executive director signed with JPMorgan Chase pursuant to the altered Resolution 21-02 included several differences from the agreement that had previously been reviewed and approved by the OPCD’s Board. The JPMorgan Chase agreement required quarterly payments, while the financing outlined in the board packet for the GCC agreement called for annual payments.⁷⁰ Further, the amount borrowed was \$67,114 less than originally proposed and the interest rate was 1.86 percent lower than the interest rate listed in the proposal approved by the Board.⁷¹

According to *Robert’s Rules of Order*, which governed the Board’s parliamentary procedures under the OPCD’s By-Laws, any amendments made to the original resolution should have been opened for debate and voted on by the Board.⁷² This was consistent with the opinion of the OPCD’s general counsel, who stated that the amendment should have been formally approved by the Board, included a new date, and been labeled as revised or amended. In editing the Board’s resolution without Board approval, the former executive director and the Board Chair violated the OPCD’s By-Laws. Although some of the changes were favorable to the OPCD, they were material differences in the contract that should have been brought to the attention of the full Board. Further, the failure to bring GCC’s decision not to finance the project and the proposed change in financing to the Board deprived Board members of the opportunity to discuss the financial status

⁷⁰ Orleans Parish Communication District, *Special Board Meeting Packet* (January 10, 2021), 11.; Master Lease-Purchase Agreement between Orleans Parish Communication District and JPMorgan Chase Bank, Payment Schedule (April 30, 2021).

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² *Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised, 12th Edition* (2020), 35:2(4), 35:2(7).

of the OPCD and consider the decision to move forward with the Hexagon purchase in light of new information.

LONG-TERM FINANCIAL EFFECTS

The Hexagon contract was ultimately canceled on July 31, 2023, but the agreement between Hexagon and the OPCD had long-term financial effects on the OPCD and the City of New Orleans. Ultimately, more than \$3.75M of public money will be spent on the Hexagon contract.

A significant portion of the money spent on the Hexagon contract came directly from the City's coffers. In January 2023 the City paid \$508,532.62 for annual maintenance of the unlaunched NOPD RMS. In May 2023, the City spent another \$63,081.71 for supplemental consulting services from Hexagon.

A different portion of the City's expenditure on the Hexagon contract was related to the question of whether the OPSO had a financial obligation to the project. Before authorizing the former executive director to obtain financing for the project, OPCD Board members expressed concerns about whether the OPSO was committed to participating in the project. Board members suggested at the time that the OPCD obtain a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement (CEA) with the OPSO, detailing the OPSO's obligations to pay a portion of the maintenance fees.⁷³ However, the OPSO never formally committed to the Hexagon project and did not sign a CEA or other document legally obligating them to pay any of the annual maintenance. As a result, the City paid an additional \$450,000 to reimburse the OPCD for what would have been the OPSO's portion of Hexagon's annual maintenance fees.

For its part, as of September 2024 the OPCD had already spent \$1,495,642.07 toward its lease-purchase agreement with JPMorgan Chase.⁷⁴ The OPCD paid Hexagon an additional \$79,784.69 for change orders signed after the original contract and \$443,816.22 for six months of maintenance costs. Further, the OPCD

⁷³ OPCD, "Special Board Meeting," January 11, 2021, video of public meeting, 20:30-30:00.

⁷⁴ Master Lease-Purchase Agreement between Orleans Parish Communication District and JPMorgan Chase Bank, Payment Schedule (April 30, 2021).

still owed JPMorgan Chase \$805,345.73, which it will pay off at a rate of \$115,049.39 per quarter until June 2026.

The City and the OPCD spent additional money on staff time to implement the project. While OIG evaluators were not able to capture the full cost of time dedicated to the project, at least six City employees contributed substantial time to the implementation of Hexagon. The OPCD also employed a full-time RMS manager for more than two and a half years, whose job was to administer the Hexagon project for the communication district. The total salary expenditure for this employee was \$233,223.41

In all, pursuant to a contract that had no approval or selection process, and for which a board resolution was altered to secure financing, the City spent \$1,021,614.33 on RMS/JMS capabilities that never materialized, while the OPCD spent \$1,956,161.27 and still owed an additional \$805,345.73.

Recommendation 3: The OPCD should clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the Board of Commissioners and the executive director. Further, the OPCD should establish a formal process for entering collaborative partnerships with other governmental entities.

The OIG acknowledges and is encouraged that the OPCD's Board is already working to address some of the issues identified in this finding. Effective emergency services are crucial to the health, safety, and welfare of all New Orleanians. Considering the importance of the OPCD's role in facilitating emergency services, it is important for the organization's Board to develop clear lines of authority and communication that enable resources to be used efficiently and in pursuit of strategic goals. To this end, the OIG recommends the OPCD Board create policies and procedures that clarify responsibilities within the organization.

The United States Government Accountability Office's *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government* (The Green Book) provides best practices for

establishing internal controls within public entities.⁷⁵ Additionally the OIG published *Model Board Manual* and *Model Administrative Procedures* in 2013 to inform the process of updating policies and internal controls.⁷⁶ The OIG recommends that the OPCD review these documents, as they lay out best practices for policies that aid in prevention and detection of fraud, waste, and abuse.

As a governmental oversight body, the OPCD’s Board of Commissioners is responsible for overseeing the organization’s progress toward its strategic goals and “overseeing management’s design, implementation, and operation of an internal control system.”⁷⁷ Based on best practices like those described in the *Model Board Manual* and the Green Book, the OIG recommends the OPCD board establish clear, written guidelines for its role in the organization’s governance. The Board’s role should include responsibilities for ensuring that management institutes and monitors the effectiveness of internal controls. The Board should also establish clearly-defined responsibilities for members, including the creation of standing committees for governance, finance, and audit, which did not exist at the time of this evaluation.

The OIG recommends the OPCD Board explicitly authorize the executive director to sign contracts below an established price threshold and require contracts above that threshold to be approved by the Board. The OIG’s *Model Administrative Procedures* further recommends that

⁷⁵ United States Government Accountability Office, *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government*.

⁷⁶ New Orleans Office of Inspector General, *Model Board Manual* (New Orleans, LA: New Orleans Office of Inspector General, 2013); New Orleans Office of Inspector General, *Model Administrative Procedures* (New Orleans, LA: New Orleans Office of Inspector General, 2013).

⁷⁷ United States Government Accountability Office, *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government*), 11.

“[n]o person should be authorized to obligate the organization without encumbering, in advance, and through the executive director (or designee) sufficient funds to meet the purchase obligation.”⁷⁸

Finally, based on its role as a communications hub between various City and state agencies, the OPCD regularly undertakes collaborative projects with many other governmental bodies. The OIG recommends the OPCD require individually drafted CEAs for these efforts. The LLA provided guidance and a sample cooperative endeavor agreement form that the OPCD may use as a model when drafting future CEAs.⁷⁹ In line with the LLA’s guidance and Art. VII, §14(A) of the Louisiana State Constitution, CEAs should include the public benefit to be gained from the project and how the expenditure falls within the purpose of the partnering agencies. Additionally, the document should explicitly define the financial and administrative obligations of each participating entity. The use of CEAs when expending funds in partnership with other agencies helps to eliminate confusion and reduces the risk of fraud, waste, and abuse.

⁷⁸ New Orleans Office of Inspector General, *Model Administrative Procedures*, 2013, II.C.3.

⁷⁹ Louisiana Legislative Auditor, *Legislative Auditor’s Cabela’s Test and Cooperative Endeavor Agreements: Memo and Sample Form* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana Legislative Auditor, 2023), 18-28,

[https://app.la.state.la.us/lla/nsf/9EB337F0C1BA94D886257AB500752B32/\\$FILE/CEA%20Memo%20and%20Sample.pdf](https://app.la.state.la.us/lla/nsf/9EB337F0C1BA94D886257AB500752B32/$FILE/CEA%20Memo%20and%20Sample.pdf).

VI. CONCLUSION

The OPCD entered into a contract for Hexagon OnCall Records in December 2020 with the intention of meeting a complex set of needs that had previously been identified by the NOPD and the OPSO. These needs included functionality required by federal consent decrees under which each organization operated. Two and a half years later Hexagon had not gone live and the OPCD canceled the contract, leaving the city without efficient records management systems at its police department and jail. By September 2024, more than \$2.9 million had been spent on the Hexagon project, and the OPCD still owed more than \$800,000 on a lease-purchase agreement it had taken out to finance the initiative.

In reviewing the process used to procure Hexagon, OIG evaluators found the OPCD did not adhere to its own purchasing policy or best practices for public procurement. OIG evaluators further found that the OPCD's procedures did not require a formal evaluation process before purchasing products and found no evidence that one was used when selecting Hexagon for the RMS project. As a result, the Hexagon product did not meet the needs identified by the NOPD or the OPSO. Finally, evaluators found that, due to a lack of clear lines of authority and internal controls, the former executive director of the OPCD signed the Hexagon contract without seeking prior approval from the OPCD Board of Commissioners and subsequently altered a board resolution to obtain financing for the project.

To address these deficiencies, the OIG recommends the OPCD update its policies to ensure that it makes prudent and efficient use of public resources. First, the OIG recommends the OPCD require a competitive process for large purchases above an identified monetary threshold. Second, the OPCD should identify selection committees and evaluation criteria in writing before soliciting proposals. Further, written evaluation sheets should be preserved and attached to each requisition file. Finally, the OPCD Board should update its By-Laws to outline how the OPCD should partner with outside agencies in the future and to clearly establish the roles, responsibilities, and authority of the executive director and the Board itself.

APPENDIX A. TIMELINE OF KEY DATES⁸⁰

Date	Event
7/17/20	Hexagon provides \$2.18M first year proposal for both an RMS and a JMS.
12/30/20	The OPCD's executive director signs a Hexagon Contract and returns it to the Hexagon salesperson.
1/8/21	The OPCD's executive director gives permission for Hexagon to announce the New Orleans sale to its own board. The OPCD begins working with Hexagon on a press release to announce the project.
1/11/21	OPCD board meets to discuss Resolution 21-02, which would allow the executive director to obtain funding for the Hexagon project. The board defers voting on the resolution.
2/3/21	The OPCD board approves Resolution 21-02, authorizing the executive director to obtain financing for the Hexagon Project from GCC.
2/25/21	GCC declines to finance the project.
4/23/21	OPCD executive director asks board chair to sign Resolution 21-02, which had been approved on 2/3/21, for submittal to JP Morgan Chase Bank.
4/27/21 9:00 am – 1:00 pm	Hexagon Kick-Off Meeting takes place. The Kick-Off Meeting is the first benchmark that triggers a payment in the Hexagon Contract.
4/27/21 12:01 pm	JP Morgan Chase emails the executive director to inform him they cannot accept Resolution 21-02 because it approves financing through GCC.
4/27/21 1:55 pm	Executive director sends an altered version of Resolution 21-01 for the board chair's signature. This version of the document replaces GCC with JP Morgan Chase.
4/27/21 2:20 pm	Executive director submits a signed copy of the altered resolution to JP Morgan Chase.
5/2/21	The Hexagon requisition is created in the OPCD purchasing system.
11/11/21	NOPD and other City IT staff internally circulate a list of unmet and undemonstrated requirements from the NOPD RFP.
3/9/22	The former executive director signs Change Order 4, removing services needed to make the Jail Management System function and replacing them with additional services for the NOPD's RMS.
9/14/22	LCLE informs New Orleans' Mayor that NOPD is not LIBRS compliant, potentially making the City ineligible for federal or state funding through LCLE in 2022.
1/19/23	The City of New Orleans pays the OPCD \$508,000 for the annual subscription to Hexagon's RMS.
2/7/23	The City of New Orleans pays the OPCD \$450,000 for the annual subscription to Hexagon's Jail Management System.
3/28/23	The City of New Orleans pays the OPCD \$63,081.71 as reimbursement for supplemental data conversion services purchased from Hexagon.
7/31/23	The OPCD cancels the Hexagon Contract.

⁸⁰ This timeline does not include all payments made for the Hexagon project, including quarterly payments to satisfy the lease-purchase agreement with JPMorgan Chase.

OFFICIAL COMMENTS FROM THE ORLEANS PARISH COMMUNICATION DISTRICT



(OPCD HEXAGON CONTRACT I&E 23-004)

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE FORM

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS FORM AND RETURN AS SPECIFIED BELOW. SUPPLY YOUR RESPONSES IN THE SHADED BOXES.

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS BY SELECTING A RESPONSE FROM THE DROPDOWN BOX. IF YOU *REJECT* OR *PARTIALLY ACCEPT* THE RECOMMENDATION, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY IN THE SPACE PROVIDED, INCLUDING ANY ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS TO ADDRESS THE FINDING. PLEASE DEVISE A PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OR SOLVING THE PROBLEMS THAT WERE FOUND. DESCRIBE EACH ACTION YOUR AGENCY WILL TAKE TO IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATION, OR FIX THE PROBLEM, ALONG WITH THE NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF THE PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACTION AND THE COMPLETION DATE.

RETURN THIS COMPLETED FORM TO [SARAH LEWIS](mailto:slewis@nolaOIG.gov) AT [SLEWIS@NOLAIG.GOV](mailto:slewis@nolaOIG.gov) BY **NOVEMBER 22, 2024**.

ENTER NAME HERE: KARL FASOLD (KARLF@OPCDLA.GOV)

RECOMMENDATION #1 REQUIRING IMMEDIATE ACTION:	RESPONSIBLE PERSON: (NAME AND CONTACT)	RESPONSE CHOICE (SELECT ONE):
1. THE OPCD SHOULD REVISE ITS PROCUREMENT POLICIES TO INCLUDE INTERNAL CONTROLS FOR DOCUMENTATION AND THE APPROVAL PROCESS.	KARL FASOLD	Accept
IF YOU <i>REJECT</i> OR <i>PARTIALLY ACCEPT</i> RECOMMENDATION #1, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY OR PROPOSE AN ALTERNATE SOLUTION: <div style="background-color: #cccccc; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div>		
DESCRIBE THE ACTIONS YOU WILL TAKE TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATION #1 OR FIX THE PROBLEM:	RESPONSIBLE PERSON:	COMPLETION DATE:
1.1 OPCD'S EXISTING PROCUREMENT PROCESS INCLUDES A REQUIREMENT OF DOCUMENTATION (MULTIPLE SOURCES, BIDS, REP DEPENDING UPON TOTAL COST). THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND FINANCE STAFF WILL ENSURE THAT THIS PROCESS IS FOLLOWED APPROPRIATELY FOR ALL PROCUREMENT GOING FORWARD.	KARL FASOLD FINANCE STAFF	SEPTEMBER 2024
1. THE FINANCE MANAGER SHALL REPORT DIRECTLY TO THE BOARD CHAIR REGARDING ANY CIRCUMVENTION OF THE POLICY OR PROCESS.	BOARD CHAIR	NOVEMBER 2024
1.3 BOARD FINANCE COMMITTEE TO BE ESTABLISHED WITH OVERSIGHT. FINANCE MANAGER TO SERVE AS A MEMBER OF SAID COMMITTEE, AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR WILL NOT BE A MEMBER.	BOARD CHAIR	1Q2025
1.4		

RECOMMENDATION #2 REQUIRING IMMEDIATE ACTION:	RESPONSIBLE PERSON: (NAME AND CONTACT)	RESPONSE CHOICE (SELECT ONE):
2. THE OPCD SHOULD ADOPT AN EVALUATION PROCESS FOR ALL COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENTS THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH BEST PRACTICES TO ENSURE THE SELECTION OF PRODUCTS THAT MEET THE NEEDS OF THE ORGANIZATION.	KARL FASOLD	Accept
IF YOU REJECT OR PARTIALLY ACCEPT RECOMMENDATION #2, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY OR PROPOSE AN ALTERNATE SOLUTION: [REDACTED]		
DESCRIBE THE ACTIONS YOU WILL TAKE TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATION #2 OR FIX THE PROBLEM:	RESPONSIBLE PERSON:	COMPLETION DATE:
2.1 OPCD FOLLOWS STATE PROCUREMENT LAW REGARDING MULTIPLE VENDOR PRICING, BIDS, OR RFP/RFQ PROCESS. POLICY WILL BE UPDATED TO SPECIFICALLY REQUIRE ALL SCORE SHEETS, MEETING MINUTES, AND DOCUMENTATION OF DECISION PROCESS ARE PRESERVED.	DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FINANCE MANAGER	NOVEMBER 2024
2.2 OPCD FOLLOWS STATE LAW REGARDING CONTRACTING FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES. OPCD WILL DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A SPECIFIC PROCESS FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENTS THAT TAKES INTO ACCOUNT BEST PRACTICES FROM SIMILAR AGENCIES.	KARL FASOLD FINANCE COMMITTEE DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	1Q2025
2.3 [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
2.4 [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
2.5 [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

RECOMMENDATION #3 REQUIRING IMMEDIATE ACTION:	RESPONSIBLE PERSON: (NAME AND CONTACT)	RESPONSE CHOICE (SELECT ONE):
3. THE OPCD SHOULD CLEARLY DEFINE THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AND THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR. FURTHER, THE OPCD SHOULD ESTABLISH A FORMAL PROCESS FOR ENTERING COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIPS WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES.	BOARD CHAIR KARL FASOLD	Accept
IF YOU <u>REJECT</u> OR <u>PARTIALLY ACCEPT</u> RECOMMENDATION #3, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY OR PROPOSE AN ALTERNATE SOLUTION: <div style="background-color: #cccccc; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div>		
DESCRIBE THE ACTIONS YOU WILL TAKE TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATION #3 OR FIX THE PROBLEM:	RESPONSIBLE PERSON:	COMPLETION DATE:
3.1 OPCD POLICY WILL BE UPDATED TO REQUIRE CREATION OF A CEA WHENEVER A COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP IS ENTERED WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES TO COMPLETELY AND CLEARLY SPELL OUT THE GOALS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS OF ALL PARTIES	KARL FASOLD DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FINANCE MANAGER	1Q2025
3.2 THE CONTRACT WITH KARL FASOLD FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S POSITION WAS REVISED PRIOR TO EXECUTION TO CLEARLY DEFINE THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	COUNSEL	JUNE 2024
3.3 OPCD POLICY TO BE UPDATED TO CLARIFY REQUIREMENT FOR BOARD APPROVAL FOR CONTRACTS NOT BUDGETED OR PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED BY BOARD ACTION EXCEEDING A DEFINED THRESHOLD	KARL FASOLD FINANCE MANAGER DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	1Q2025
3.4 OPCD WILL DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT BOARD SUBCOMMITTEES AND REVISE THE BYLAWS TO REFLECT THEIR MEMBERSHIP, DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	BOARD CHAIR BOARD MEMBERS	1Q2025
3.5 OPCD BYLAWS WILL BE UPDATED TO BETTER DEFINE THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF BOARD EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND GENERAL MEMBERS	BOARD CHAIR GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE	1Q2025