page 2 – Consulting Services Agreement, Non-Public Work City of Redmond, standard form

THIS AGREEMENT is entered into on ______, 20__ between the City of Redmond, Washington, hereinafter called "the CITY", and the above person, firm or organization, hereinafter called "the CONSULTANT".

WHEREAS, the CITY desires to accomplish the above-referenced project; and

WHEREAS, the CITY does not have sufficient staff or expertise to meet the required commitment and therefore deems it advisable and desirable to engage the assistance of a CONSULTANT to provide the necessary services for the project; and

WHEREAS, the CONSULTANT has represented to the CITY that the CONSULTANT is in compliance with the professional registration statutes of the State of Washington, if applicable, and has signified a willingness to furnish consulting services to the CITY, now, therefore,

IN CONSIDERATION OF the terms and conditions set forth below, or attached and incorporated and made a part hereof, the parties agree as follows:

1. <u>Retention of Consultant - Scope of Work</u>. The CITY hereby retains the CONSULTANT to provide professional services as defined in this agreement and as necessary to accomplish the scope of work attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by this reference as if set forth in full. The CONSULTANT shall furnish all services, labor and related equipment necessary to conduct and complete the work, except as specifically noted otherwise in this agreement.

2. <u>Completion of Work</u>. The CONSULTANT shall not begin any work under the terms of this agreement until authorized in writing by the CITY. The CONSULTANT shall complete all work required by this agreement according to the schedule attached as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by this reference as if set forth in full. A failure to complete the work according to the attached schedule, except where such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of the CONSULTANT, shall be deemed a breach of this agreement. The established completion time shall not be extended because of any delays attributable to the CONSULTANT, but may be extended by the CITY, in the event of a delay attributable to the CITY, or because of unavoidable delays caused by circumstances beyond the control of the CONSULTANT. All such extensions shall be in writing and shall be executed by both parties.

3. <u>Payment</u>. The CONSULTANT shall be paid by the CITY for satisfactorily completed work and services satisfactorily rendered under this agreement as provided in Exhibit C, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as if set forth in full. Such payment shall be full compensation for work performed or services rendered and for all labor, materials, supplies, equipment, and incidentals necessary to complete the work specified in the Scope of Work attached. The CONSULTANT shall be entitled to invoice

page 3 – Consulting Services Agreement, Non-Public Work City of Redmond, standard form

the CITY no more frequently than once per month during the course of the completion of work and services by the CONSULTANT. Invoices shall detail the work performed or services rendered, the time involved (if compensation is based on an hourly rate) and the amount to be paid. The CITY shall pay all such invoices within 30 days of submittal, unless the CITY gives notice that the invoice is in dispute. In no event shall the total of all invoices paid exceed the maximum amount payable set forth above, if any, and the CONSULTANT agrees to perform all services contemplated by this agreement for no more than said maximum amount.

4. <u>Changes in Work</u>. The CONSULTANT shall make such changes and revisions in the complete work provided by this agreement as may be necessary to correct errors made by the CONSULTANT and appearing therein when required to do so by the CITY. The CONSULTANT shall make such corrective changes and revisions without additional compensation from the CITY. Should the CITY find it desirable for its own purposes to have previously satisfactorily completed work or parts thereof changed or revised, the CONSULTANT shall make such revisions as directed by the CITY. This work shall be considered as Extra Work and will be paid for as provided in Section 5.

5. <u>Extra Work</u>.

A. The CITY may, at any time, by written order, make changes within the general scope of the agreement in the services to be performed. If any such change causes an increase or decrease in the estimated cost of, or the time required for, performance of any part of the work or services under this agreement, whether or not changed by the order, or otherwise affects any other terms or conditions of the agreement, the CITY shall make an equitable adjustment in the (1) maximum amount payable; (2) delivery or completion schedule or both; and (3) other affected terms, and shall modify the agreement accordingly.

B. The CONSULTANT must submit any "proposal for adjustment" under this clause within 30 days from the date of receipt of the written order to make changes. However, if the CITY decides that the facts justify it, the CITY may receive and act upon a proposal submitted before final payment of the agreement.

C. Failure to agree to any adjustment shall be a dispute under the Disputes clause of this agreement, as provided in Section 13. Notwithstanding any such dispute, the CONSULTANT shall proceed with the agreement as changed.

D. Notwithstanding any other provision in this section, the maximum amount payable for this agreement shall not be increased or considered to be increased except by specific written amendment of this agreement.

page 4 – Consulting Services Agreement, Non-Public Work City of Redmond, standard form

6. <u>Ownership of Work Product</u>. Any and all documents, drawings, reports, and other work product produced by the CONSULTANT under this agreement shall become the property of the CITY upon payment of the CONSULTANT'S fees and charges therefore. The CITY shall have the complete right to use and re-use such work product in any manner deemed appropriate by the CITY, provided, that use on any project other than that for which the work product is prepared shall be at the CITY'S risk unless such use is agreed to by the CONSULTANT.

7. <u>Independent Contractor</u>. The CONSULTANT is an independent contractor for the performance of services under this agreement. The CITY shall not be liable for, nor obligated to pay to the CONSULTANT, or any employee of the CONSULTANT, sick leave, vacation pay, overtime or any other benefit applicable to employees of the CITY, nor to pay or deduct any social security, income tax, or other tax from the payments made to the CONSULTANT which may arise as an incident of the CONSULTANT performing services for the CITY. The CITY shall not be obligated to pay industrial insurance for the services rendered by the CONSULTANT.

8. <u>Indemnity</u>. The CONSULTANT agrees to hold harmless, indemnify and defend the CITY, its officers, agents, and employees, from and against any and all claims, losses, or liability, for injuries, sickness or death of persons, including employees of the CONSULTANT, or damage to property, arising out of any willful misconduct or negligent act, error, or omission of the CONSULTANT, its officers, agents, subconsultants or employees, in connection with the services required by this agreement, provided, however, that:

A. The CONSULTANT's obligations to indemnify, defend and hold harmless shall not extend to injuries, sickness, death or damage caused by or resulting from the sole willful misconduct or sole negligence of the CITY, its officers, agents or employees; and

B. The CONSULTANT's obligations to indemnify, defend and hold harmless for injuries, sickness, death or damage caused by or resulting from the concurrent negligence or willful misconduct of the CONSULTANT and the CITY, or of the CONSULTANT and a third party other than an officer, agent, subconsultant or employee of the CONSULTANT, shall apply only to the extent of the negligence or willful misconduct of the CONSULTANT.

9. <u>Insurance</u>. The CONSULTANT shall provide the following minimum insurance coverages:

A. Worker's compensation and employer's liability insurance as required by the State of Washington;

page 5 – Consulting Services Agreement, Non-Public Work City of Redmond, standard form

B. General public liability and property damage insurance in an amount not less than a combined single limit of two million dollars (\$2,000,000) for bodily injury, including death, and property damage per occurrence.

C. Professional liability insurance, if commercially available in CONSULTANT's field of expertise, in the amount of two million dollars (\$2,000,000) or more against claims arising out of work provided for in this agreement.

The amounts listed above are the minimum deemed necessary by the CITY to protect the CITY'S interests in this matter. The CITY has made no recommendation to the CONSULTANT as to the insurance necessary to protect the CONSULTANT'S interests and any decision by the CONSULTANT to carry or not carry insurance amounts in excess of the above is solely that of the CONSULTANT.

All insurance shall be obtained from an insurance company authorized to do business in the State of Washington. Excepting the professional liability insurance, the CITY will be named on all insurance as an additional insured. The CONSULTANT shall submit a certificate of insurance to the CITY evidencing the coverages specified above, together with an additional insured endorsement naming the CITY, within fifteen (15) days of the execution of this agreement. The additional insured endorsement shall provide that to the extent of the CONSULTANT's negligence, the CONSULTANT's insurance shall be primary and non-contributing as to the City, and any other insurance maintained by the CITY shall be excess and not contributing insurance with respect to the CONSULTANT's insurance. The certificates of insurance shall cover the work specified in or performed under this agreement. No cancellation, reduction or modification of the foregoing policies shall be effective without thirty (30) days prior written notice to the CITY.

10. <u>Records</u>. The CONSULTANT shall keep all records related to this agreement for a period of three years following completion of the work for which the CONSULTANT is retained. The CONSULTANT shall permit any authorized representative of the CITY, and any person authorized by the CITY for audit purposes, to inspect such records at all reasonable times during regular business hours of the CONSULTANT. Upon request, the CONSULTANT will provide the CITY with reproducible copies of any such records. The copies will be provided without cost if required to substantiate any billing of the CONSULTANT, but the CONSULTANT may charge the CITY for copies requested for any other purpose.

11. <u>Notices</u>. All notices required to be given by either party to the other under this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be given in person or by mail to the addresses set forth in the box for the same appearing at the outset of this Agreement. Notice by mail shall be deemed given as of the date the same is deposited in the United States mail, postage prepaid, addressed as provided in this paragraph. page 6 – Consulting Services Agreement, Non-Public Work City of Redmond, standard form

12. <u>Project Administrator</u>. The Project Administrator shall be responsible for coordinating the work of the CONSULTANT, for providing any necessary information for and direction of the CONSULTANT's work in order to ensure that it meets the requirements of this Agreement, and for reviewing, monitoring and approving the quality and quantity of such work. The CONSULTANT shall report to and take any necessary direction from the Project Administrator.

13. <u>Disputes</u>. Any dispute concerning questions of fact in connection with the work not disposed of by agreement between the CONSULTANT and the CITY shall be referred for resolution to a mutually acceptable mediator. The parties shall each be responsible for one-half of the mediator's fees and costs.

14. <u>Termination</u>. The CITY reserves the right to terminate this agreement at any time upon ten (10) days written notice to the CONSULTANT. Any such notice shall be given to the address specified above. In the event that this agreement is terminated by the City other than for fault on the part of the CONSULTANT, a final payment shall be made to the CONSULTANT for all services performed. No payment shall be made for any work completed after ten (10) days following receipt by the CONSULTANT of the notice to terminate. In the event that services of the CONSULTANT are terminated by the CITY for fault on part of the CONSULTANT, the amount to be paid shall be determined by the CITY with consideration given to the actual cost incurred by the CONSULTANT in performing the work to the date of termination, the amount of work originally required which would satisfactorily complete it to date of termination, whether that work is in a form or type which is usable to the CITY at the time of termination, the cost of the CITY of employing another firm to complete the work required, and the time which may be required to do so.

15. <u>Non-Discrimination</u>. The CONSULTANT agrees not to discriminate against any customer, employee or applicant for employment, subcontractor, supplier or materialman, because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, religion, honorable discharged veteran or military status, familial status, sexual orientation, age, or the presence of any sensory, mental, or physical disability or the use of a trained dog or service animal by a person with a disability, except for a bona fide occupational qualification. The CONSULTANT understands that if it violates this provision, this Agreement may be terminated by the CITY and that the CONSULTANT may be barred from performing any services for the CITY now or in the future.

16. <u>Compliance and Governing Law</u>. The CONSULTANT shall at all times comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, rules, ordinances, and regulations. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Washington.

page 7 – Consulting Services Agreement, Non-Public Work City of Redmond, standard form

17. <u>Subcontracting or Assignment</u>. The CONSULTANT may not assign or subcontract any portion of the services to be provided under this agreement without the express written consent of the CITY. Any sub-consultants approved by the CITY at the outset of this agreement are named on separate Exhibit attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as if set forth in full.

18. <u>Non-Waiver</u>. Payment for any part of the work or services by the CITY shall not constitute a waiver by the CITY of any remedies of any type it may have against the CONSULTANT for any breach of the agreement by the CONSULTANT, or for failure of the CONSULTANT to perform work required of it under the agreement by the CITY. Waiver of any right or entitlement under this agreement by the CITY shall not constitute waiver of any other right or entitlement.

19. <u>Litigation</u>. In the event that either party deems it necessary to institute legal action or proceedings to enforce any right or obligation under this agreement, the parties agree that such actions shall be initiated in the Superior Court of the State of Washington, in and for King County. The parties agree that all questions shall be resolved by application of Washington law and that parties to such actions shall have the right of appeal from such decisions of the Superior Court in accordance with the law of the State of Washington. The CONSULTANT hereby consents to the personal jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of Washington, in and for King County of the state of Washington, in and for King County. The prevailing party in any such litigation shall be entitled to recover its costs, including reasonable attorney's fees, in addition to any other award.

20. <u>Taxes</u>. The CONSULTANT will be solely responsible for the payment of any and all applicable taxes related to the services provided under this agreement and if such taxes are required to be passed through to the CITY by law, the same shall be duly itemized on any billings submitted to the CITY by the CONSULTANT.

21. <u>City Business License</u>. The CONSULTANT has obtained, or agrees to obtain, a business license from the CITY prior to commencing to perform any services under this agreement. The CONSULTANT will maintain the business license in good standing throughout the term of this Agreement.

22. <u>Entire Agreement</u>. This agreement represents the entire integrated agreement between the CITY and the CONSULTANT, superseding all prior negotiations, representations or agreements, written or oral. This agreement may be modified, amended, or added to, only by written instrument properly signed by both parties hereto. These standard terms and conditions set forth above supersede any conflicting terms and conditions on any attached and incorporate exhibit. Where conflicting language exists, the CITY'S terms and conditions shall govern.

page 8 – Consulting Services Agreement, Non-Public Work City of Redmond, standard form

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this agreement as of the day and year first above written.

CONSULTANT:

CITY OF REDMOND:

| By: | | |
|--------|--|--|
| Title: | | |

Angela Birney, Mayor DATED:____

ATTEST/AUTHENTICATED:

City Clerk, City of Redmond

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Office of the City Attorney

City of Redmond Building Security Strategic Plan November 15, 2023

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY & OVERALL APPROACH



Claris Strategy is pleased to submit our proposal for RFP 10800-23 Request for Proposals for a Building Security Strategic Plan. Claris Strategy, a California S Corp established in 2012, is a unique management consultancy that focuses on helping communities better prepare for security incidents and disasters. We are partnered with KPJ Consulting, a highlyexperienced cost estimator. Our team has worked on multiple projects together over the past decade, synthesizing our areas of expertise and strong project management to deliver quality projects that are on time and on budget.

We understand the criticality for developing a comprehensive building security strategic plan for the City. For this project, we have brought together an exceptional team of experts in advanced security systems, physical security deterrents, counterterrorism, facilities, water/wastewater operations, and criminal behavior. We have a strong operational knowledge of law enforcement agencies and their technology systems and a comprehensive understanding of the security threats and issues facing our communities today.

Collectively, our team members have over 250 years experience working in security and have prepared over 350 security and all-hazards risk assessments. Lance Ferrell, our security systems task lead, has worked for the Department of Homeland Security and a major security systems integrator and has delivered multimillion dollar security projects for highsecurity military sites, government facilities, state court houses and major airports. Tom LaFreniere, our physical security task lead, is a former Supervisory FBI Special Agent, NCIS investigator and U.S. Marine Combat Engineer and has conducted over 65 security assessments on government buildings, transportation systems, water/wastewater facilities, cities, factories, schools and office buildings.

We understand that the City is seeking the services of a qualified consultant to conduct a security risk assessment and make recommendations to direct security upgrades for a comprehensive approach and unified system.

The Claris Strategy approach is unique to projects of this type. Starting with a strong foundational knowledge of security operations and security systems, our team of experts offers a holistic approach to the project by bringing together multiple perspectives and experiences to inform and develop the building security strategic plan.

Claris' holistic approach combines both rational and intuitive thinking viewed through the lenses of people, process, technology and site and facilities.



We do so because we have consistently found that solutions are more successful when these four elements are in alignment and as integrated as possible.

We have developed a detailed work plan that follows a proven process for similar security assessment projects of this type. The key steps are as follows:

- Project startup
- Evaluation which includes a site and facility walk, stakeholder interviews, document review and research on criminal statistics and best practices
- Findings which includes a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) analysis for each facility and identification locations where physical deterrents may be constructed or added
- A risk assessment of each facility using Department of Homeland Security/ FEMA methodology quantifying threats, vulnerabilities and consequences. The results help prioritize the highest risk to each facility and lead to recommendations for mitigation.
- Recommendations for physical deterrents and security system upgrades
- A rough-order-of-magnitude short and longterm cost analysis for the recommendations
- An implementation plan for the agreed upon recommendations
- An analysis and recommendations for a new, integrated Technology and Information System (TIS)
- Schematic designs for physical deterrents and security system upgrades
- A final Security Assessment Report

We have included a preliminary project schedule and fee proposal.

Our contact information is: Claris Strategy c/o William Lim 1111 Drake Rd., Arcadia, CA 91007 (626) 437-4365 Wlim@clarisstrategy.com

City of Redmond Building Security Strategic Plan

November 15, 2023



RELEVANT PROJECT EXPERIENCE

Claris Strategy Team

Prime Consultant Claris Strategy Arcadia, California

Subconsultants KPJ Consulting Los Angeles, California

INTRODUCTION

Claris Strategy has assembled a highly-qualified team of experts to assist the City of Redmond conduct a security assessment of the City's important facilities and to develop a building security strategic plan. Our team has decades of experience working with government organizations, non-profits and private corporations in physical security assessments, risk assessments, security system design and security strategic plans. Our team members include former FBI special agents, former Department of Homeland Security security system experts, an internationallyrecognized bomb blast mitigation technician, former law enforcement officers and former Department of Defense analysts. We have worked on multi-million dollar security system projects for high-security military bases, public safety facilities, major international airports, critical infrastructure and the California court system.

Claris Strategy, as the prime consultant, is partnered with KPJ Consulting, a highly experienced cost estimator. Claris Strategy and KPJ have worked on multiple projects together for over a decade, synthesizing our expertise and strong project management to deliver quality projects that are on time and on budget.

We are certified with designations in Certified Protection Professional (CPP), Crime Protection Through Environmental Design (CPTED), International Association of Bomb Technicians & Investigators (IABTI), Axis Communications Network Video Certified Professional, IPVM video management/video surveillance as a service, IPVM video analytics, Genetec Security Center designation (pending) and American Water Works Association Risk and Resilience Certification. Our team members are long-time leaders and members of ASIS International.



Claris Strategy

Claris Strategy (Claris), founded in 2012, has dedicated our work to enhancing the safety and security of the nation's critical infrastructure and the communities served. Our clients include the nation's largest cities, counties, transportation agencies, airports, power utilities, water utilities, gas utilities, cities, and federal agencies. We have worked with government agencies including law enforcement, first responders, emergency operations staff and facilities managers across a wide-range of organizations to help them better prepare, mitigate, respond and recover from incidents and disasters. Our associates have responded to or been activated for many of major disasters locally, nationally and globally including the San Bernardino shootings, 9/11, Hurricane Katrina, the Indonesian tsunami and the Pakistan earthquakes.

KPJ Consulting MBE, WBE, DBE, SBE

Founded in 2014, KPJ Consulting, an S Corporation is SBE/DBE/MBE/WBE certified. KPJ Consulting is especially skilled in providing accurate budgets at the early programming and conceptual phases of a project when that accuracy is critical to a project's ultimate success. KPJ Consulting achieves this with early advice during the design phase by creating functional solutions to meet budget expectations. KPJ has firsthand experience to analyze and understand the design solutions researched by design teams and user groups. KPJ can forecast the "unforeseen" cost implications for each design solution. KPJ finally appraises the solutions are measured, evaluated, and presented in easy to comprehend format. KPJ understands the critical current market conditions in the project location is an essential factor in providing an accurate estimate. At the early design phase, KPJ obtains key quotes from vendors for uniquely specified items. When a current event impacts the construction industry, KPJ will research the dynamics of that impact to determine the cost considerations for your project.

Claris Strategy | a certified sbe and dbe firm

VISION

Claris Strategy is a unique type of consultancy that is focused on helping organizations better plan and prepare for security incidents and emergencies. Our approach in putting together solutions for our clients is changing how organizations plan for incidents and disaster preparedness.

We believe that a clear path to success lies in engaging stakeholders both within and outside the organization in the planning and preparation. This **incident management ecosystem** provides an organization with the greatest level of resilience in case of a disaster.

Our goal is to provide world-class service to our clients by clearly identifying the challenges they face and opportunities they have, use the most innovative methods to help them develop a comprehensive plan, and develop the simplest, most efficient way possible to implement the plan.

OUR PROCESS

Organizations are social ecosystems. At their best, organizations and all who participate work toward a common goal. Through a highly collaborative process, our process examines each organization's structure and culture, operating procedures, technology, and workplace environment to gain insight.

Using both quantitative and qualitative tools, we identify the opportunities and challenges that are present. By reductive and inductive analysis, we develop a vision for the future, a Concept of Operations, that combines these multiple perspectives into a cohesive solution. Our goal in our process is to ensure that all organizational needs are addressed so that the solution has the best chance for success.

COMPANY INFORMATION

YEAR ESTABLISHED 2012

CORPORATION TYPE S CORP

COMPANY ADDRESS 1111 Drake Road, Arcadia, California 91007

CONTACT PERSON

William Lim, Project Manager E: wlim@clarisstrategy.com T: (626) 898-4462 M: (626) 437-4365

FEDERAL ID 45-3647046

CERTIFIED MBE, DBE & SBE FIRM

OUR SERVICES

- Project management
- Strategic planning
- Security assessments
- Risk assessments
- Cybersecurity/technology assessments
- Facility assessments
- Emergency planning and disaster preparedness
- Continuity of Operations planning
- Concept of operations (CONOPS)
 development
- Organizational assessments
- Training and exercise development
- Design strategy

WHAT MAKES US UNIQUE

- **Innovative**. We not only bring in best practices, we often arrive at original ideas from analyzing the information we collect.
- **Inclusive**. We choose to work closely with our clients. We believe that by including as many perspectives as possible, a solution gets stronger.
- **Holistic.** Our brains work both on the left side and the right side. We look at an issue in multiple ways to arrive at a solution.
- **Experienced.** We are top-notch professionals with deep and broad experiences in multiple industries and environments.

KPJ Consulting

KPJ Consulting

Service Provided

Cost Estimating

Firm Profile

Founded in 2014, KPJ Consulting, an S Corporation is SBE/MBE/WBE certified. KPJ Consulting is especially skilled in providing accurate budgets at the early programming and conceptual phases of a project when that accuracy is critical to a project's ultimate success. KPJ Consulting achieves this with early advice during the design phase by creating functional solutions to meet budget expectations.

KPJ has firsthand experience to analyze and understand the design solutions researched by design teams and user groups. KPJ can forecast the "unforeseen" cost implications for each design solution. KPJ finally appraises the solutions that are measured, evaluated, and presented in easy to comprehend format. KPJ understands the critical current market conditions in the project location is an essential factor in providing an accurate estimate. At the early design phase, KPJ obtains key quotes from vendors for uniquely specified items. When a current event impacts the construction industry, KPJ will often research the dynamics of that impact to determine the cost considerations for your project.

10 | Claris Strategy |

EXCEPTIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

The Claris team brings a breadth and depth of experience in the area of security assessments that is exceptional. This team has a deep knowledge of the threats facing this nation especially since 9/11; physical security experts in security systems, terrorism, and criminal activity; strong operational knowledge of law enforcement agencies and their technology systems; and a unique understanding of the security issues facing our communities today.

We are holistic thinkers. We have assembled a team comprised of former law enforcement officers, security system planners, architects, engineers, water/wastewater experts, crime analysts, and cost estimators to provide multiple perspectives to assess the security threats that the City faces. With this holistic approach, we are able to develop a comprehensive solution, viewing through the lenses of organizational structure and culture, policy and procedures, technology and facilities.

We've successfully delivered multiple projects

before as a team. Claris Strategy and our partner, KPJ Consulting, have worked together on multiple projects, synthesizing our areas of expertise and, led by strong project management, delivered successful projects that are on time and on budget. We have completed security risk assessment projects for the City of Los Angeles, City of Burbank, Santa Barbara County, Ventura County, LA Metro, Orange County Transportation Authority, Southern California Edison, Los Angeles World Airports and over twenty water/wastewater agencies.

We have excellent knowledge of current security systems and are aware of the benefits and

disadvantages of new technologies. Our team members have collectively over 30 years experience working with advanced security systems. Lance Ferrell, during his time at the Department of Homeland Security, managed the installation of security systems at high security sites, was a project manager at a major security system integrator, and currently is providing consulting services on advanced security systems at major international airports and the California court system. Jacqueline Hickey, a former Los Angeles Police Department lead bomb technician, also is an expert on security systems, having directed the design and installation of security systems at Los Angles Police Department facilities, FBI offices and Los Angeles International Airport terminal modernizations. A UNIQUE BLEND OF PHYSICAL SECURITY/ SECURITY SYSTEM EXPERTISE, RISK ASSESSMENT KNOW-HOW, AND WATER/ WASTEWATER EXPERIENCE

We are experts in our fields. Claris team members have prepared over 350 risk assessments and developed over 250 emergency plans, annexes and business continuity plans. Many of our team have worked in government agencies as law enforcement officers, security staff, emergency planners and responders for government agencies, and first responders to major disasters coordinating on behalf of cities and counties. Most notably, Tom LaFreniere, a former FBI special agent and NCIS investigator has conducted over 65 security assessments for cities, government agencies, transportation systems, seaports, water agencies, factories, schools and office buildings.

We care deeply about the safety and security of

our communities. Through our experience, we have developed an ingrained understanding of the safety and security challenges facing our communities, having helped our clients prepare for, respond to and recover from terrorist acts, criminal activity, active shooter attacks, wildfires, wind storms, floods, earthquakes and climate change. Most of our team members have dedicated our careers serving our country and communities as law enforcement officers, military personnel or first responders. Of note, William Lim, the project manager, is a native of the Pacific Northwest and a graduate of the University of Washington. We bring this dedication, care and experience to this project.

City of Redmond Building Security Strategic Plan

PROJECT PROFILES

LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY VARIOUS SECURITY PROJECTS

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

We have provided project profiles that describe our team's most relevant and successful current and past experience with regard to the City's Building Security Strategic Plan.

These projects are:

- 1. Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority Various Security Projects
- 2. Los Angeles World Airports Security System Upgrade
- Public Water Agencies Group Risk and Resiliency Assessments
- 4. Public Safety Building Projects

Please note that work samples cannot be provided due to the sensitivity of the information. We have provided an example of a findings summary and a typical table of contents for the security assessment report in the Project Understanding section. Claris Strategy has been working with LA Metro System Security and Law Enforcement (SSLE) for the past seven years on a series of security projects that include the design of its state-of-the-art, high security emergency security operations center, a physical security assessment of nineteen of its bus and rail division back-of-house facilities, and physical security

guidelines for new LA Metro rail station designs.

In a recently completed project, Claris Strategy led a team of 15 consultants assessing the threats and vulnerabilities of the iconic Union Station and Metro's Gateway headquarters building. Union Station, one of the most important transportation hubs in the nation, is a major target for human-caused threats and, specifically, terrorist attack. Since 9/11, the hazards and threats to Union Station have grown in complexity and frequency. The team conducted a site assessment identifying vulnerabilities in security; assessed the threats, including multiple types of terrorist attack, criminal behavior and homeless issues; assessed its video surveillance system and access control systems; developed a risk profile; made recommendations based on best practice experience in a final report; and developed an overall security plan.

Currently, we are working on developing a security emergency action plan for Union Station and a physical security design for one of LA Metro's major transportation hubs, the 7th and Metro Center Station.

Professional Reference

Susan Walker, Metro Security Director for Union Station E: WalkerSu@metro.net T: (213) 922-7464

2 LOS ANGELES WORLD AIRPORTS LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT SECURITY SYSTEM UPGRADE

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA



Claris team member, Lance Ferrell is actively working with Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) as the client representative and subject matter expert for an access control project. The airport's access control and alarm monitoring system is a complex security system in a highly regulated environment with numerous third party integrations.

Lance managed the project team that designed, planned, and delivered the replacement of an end-of-life access control system with one featuring current technology and increased functionality. The access control system has over 370 controllers, over 4,000 readers, over 55,000 cardholders and will include biometric access control readers. The access control system required full integration with numerous other third-party security software applications including a new identity management system (IDMS), a physical security information management system (PSIM), and a video management system (VMS); 2019 - Present.

Professional Reference for Lance Ferrell

Alka Kaur, Information Systems Manager E: akaur@lawa.org T: (310) 877-0894

PUBLIC WATER AGENCIES GROUP AMERICA'S WATER INFRASTRUCTURE ACT RISK AND RESILIENCE ASSESSMENTS AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLANS

NINE WATER AGENCIES IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY



Claris Strategy was selected by the Public Water Agencies Group (PWAG), a consortium of nineteen water agencies in Los Angeles County to assist with compliance with America's Water Infrastructure Act. The water agencies located in the north and eastern part of Los Angeles County include Three Valleys Municipal Water District, Palmdale Water District, Rowland Water District, Walnut Valley Water District, Valley County Water District, Valencia Heights Water Company, San Gabriel County Water District, Bellflower-Somerset Mutual Water Company and Pico Water District.

Nine of the PWAG agencies contracted with our team to perform a compliance crosswalk, a risk and resilience assessment and an emergency response plan update. We used the American Water Works Association J100 process to complete the risk and resilience assessments (RRAs). Our team conducted site walks of all critical facilities including treatment facilities, pump stations, reservoirs and the security systems. We developed a facility risk assessment which prioritized the risk to the facilities based on the threats, vulnerabilities and consequences. As a result, we developed mitigation road maps for each of the nine utilities which included physical security and security system upgrades.

The risk and resiliency assessments and emergency response plans were completed in 2021 to meet the America's Water Infrastructure Act compliance deadlines.

Professional Reference

Alix Stayton, PWAG Emergency Coordinator E: astayton@pwagroup.org T: (626) 598-1627

City of Redmond Building Security Strategic Plan

PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING PROJECTS

VARIOUS LOCATIONS



The Claris Strategy team has extensive experience working with public safety buildings. One of our team members, Jacqueline Hickey, while employed by the Los Angeles Police Department as a Task Force Officer Bomb Technician, worked at the West Los Angeles FBI Field Office and Los Angeles Police Bomb Squad Facility. Based on her analysis, she identified risks and made recommendations that included technology improvements regarding the facilities' physical security systems. These public safety buildings continually experience daily threats via various digital and physical intrusions. These threats were mitigated by using unobtrusive video surveillance, physical contacts, advanced x-ray technology and isolation. An example of an area of high risk was the multiple vendor delivery areas where packages were delivered to the FBI and Bomb Squad facilities. Security systems were installed that allowed remote access and real-time notification of deliverable items. This was accomplished with the use of key cards, biometric technology and video surveillance. Items and vendors may need additional screening and clearance.

Additionally, Claris Strategy helped lead the design of facilities for Orange County Transportation Authority's Transit Security and Operations Center which housed the law enforcement officers from Orange County Sheriff's Department. These facilities included an armory, evidence rooms, officer work rooms, briefing rooms, K-9 kennels and offices. Other public safety buildings we have evaluated or assessed include the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department South Region Headquarters, LAPD's Real-Time Analysis and Critical Response (RACR) Division facilities, LA County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's transit security facilities and Security Operations Center, and Los Angeles World Airport's Police Department facilities.

SELECTED CLIENTS

City of Los Angeles City of Burbank City of San Francisco City of Hesperia City of Santa Maria City of Solvang County of Los Angeles County of Orange County of Ventura County of Sonoma County of Alameda Department of Homeland Security Judicial Council of California Ventura County Sheriff's Office of Emergency Services Burbank Water and Power Palmdale Water District San Gabriel County Water District El Toro Water District Irvine Ranch Water District Orange County Water District South Coast Water District Palmdale Water District Public Water Agencies Group Water Emergency Response Organization of Orange County San Diego Gas & Electric Southern California Edison SoCalGas Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority **Orange County Transportation Authority** Metrolink Ventura County Transportation Commission U.S. Department of Transportation Los Angeles World Airports San Francisco International Airport San Diego International Airport Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport **Denver International Airport** Miami International Airport Guam International Airport Federal Aviation Authority

City of Redmond Building Security Strategic Plan November 15, 2023

QUALIFICATIONS

INTRODUCTION

In this section is the proposed staffing for the Claris team to successfully complete the City's Building Security Strategic Plan. Claris Strategy and our partner KPJ Consulting believe that our team members provide the best possible combination of expertise and handson experience for this project.

Collectively, our team members have over 250 years experience working in the area of risk assessments and have prepared over 350 security and all-hazards risk assessments. Our team members have successfully completed numerous risk assessments and security planning projects for clients including cities and counties, water/wastewater agencies, airports, seaports, transportation agencies, the Department of Homeland Security and the U.S. Congress.

Our team members have best-of-class expertise in:

- **Physical Security**
- Security Systems •
- **Criminal Statistics** •
- Improvised Explosive Device Blast Analysis •
- Human-Caused Threats ٠
- Security Mitigation Measures .
- **Public Safety Buildings**
- Water/Wastewater Security
- Cost Estimation



CLARIS TEAM ORGANIZATION CHART



OUR TEAM MEMBERS

Our team members have over 250 years experience working in the area of security and risk assessments, security systems and mitigation measures. We bring a deep knowledge of hard-earned, on-the-ground security response experience that informs best practices and lessons learned.

| KEY PERSONNEL | | ROLE | EXPERIENCE |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | William Lim Claris Strategy | Project Principal and Project Manager | William has managed and coordinated risk assessment projects for over thirty years. He has successfully delivered security assessment, security planning, and risk mitigation projects across a number of industries including government agencies, public safety organizations, transit agencies, airports, power and gas utilities and water/wastewater utilities with budgets ranging from \$20,000 to \$20 million and has been part of the leadership team for projects up to \$1 billion. He has led projects that has provided best practices for security, resilience and strategic planning projects. As well, William is a native of the Pacific Northwest and a proud graduate of the University of Washington. |
| | Lance Ferrell Claris Strategy | Security Systems Task Lead | Lance will serve as the security systems task lead for the building security strategic plan. While working for the Department of Homeland Security and a national systems integrator, Lance has delivered multimillion dollar security projects across several domains and has led such projects for airport and seaport operators, the federal government, government-affiliated contractors, and private companies. Lance is particularly experienced with access control, video surveillance, intrusion detection, and identity management systems. Lance is expert on the current security technology trends such as the use of artificial intelligence in video surveillance systems. |
| | Tom LaFreniere Claris Strategy | Physical Security Assessment Task Lead | Tom will be the task lead for the physical security assessment. Tom has over 45 years experience including as a Combat Engineer for the United States Marine Corps, an investigator for Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS), a Supervisory Special Agent for the FBI for the San Francisco office and the interim director for the San Francisco Department of Emergency Management. This experience ideally positions him to identify vulnerabilities and threats to the City's facilities. For the past 15 years, Tom has conducted over 65 physical security assessments across a wide range of industries including government buildings, transportation systems, special districts, water agencies, cities, factories, schools and office buildings. |

| KEY PERSONNEL | | ROLE | EXPERIENCE |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Jacqueline (Jackie) Hickey Claris Strategy | Blast Mitigation and Security Technology Subject-Matter Expert | Jackie will provide expertise on blast mitigation and provide support for the physical security and the security systems assessments. As part of the Los Angeles Police Department's Bomb Squad Unit, she has participated in over 2,500 bomb calls with more than 900 of which she was the lead investigative technician. Jackie is a national and international instructor in counter terrorism analysis and assessment, risk and blast mitigation, weapons of mass destruction, and explosives and munitions. During her tenure at LAPD, Jackie helped lead the physical security design of four major airport terminal modernizations at LAX. In 2018, Jackie was awarded LAPD's coveted Police Star Award for her leadership and bravery during the San Bernardino terrorist shooting. |
| | Lisa Garcia Claris Strategy | Crime Statistics Analyst | Lisa will lead the effort in analyzing crime statistics in the identified City facilities. Additionally, she will lead the quality assurance/quality certification effort in developing the report. Lisa has more than 45 years experience as a security analyst conducting over 300 assignments with the FBI, Department of Justice, DEA and in the private sector. Lisa brings her skills as a highly experienced analyst capable of processing, researching and handling complex security information. |
| | Philip Mathur KPJ Consulting | Cost Estimator | Philip will provide cost estimating services in support of the project. Philip is a Senior Construction Consultant for KPJ Consulting with over 34 years of experience in the construction industry. His experience includes both public and private sector clients, nationally and internationally. He has provided expertise to a variety of projects and building types in sectors ranging from city buildings, transportation, infrastructure, hospitality and commercial to federal, sports and healthcare. |

Claris Strategy



EDUCATION Master of Business Administration, Dean's List, Anderson School of Business, UCLA

Bachelor of Applied Science (Civil Engineering), University of British Columbia

Master of Architecture, University of Washington

CERTIFICATIONS

American Water Works Association Utility Risk and Resilience Certification

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

Certification of Business Continuity Planning, DRII (CBCP)

Incident Command System, ICS 100, 200, 700, 701, 702, 703, 775

City of Los Angeles EOC Training 101, 201, 301

William Lim, CPTED, CBCP Project Manager

As the founder of Claris Strategy, William, who is trained as an architect, civil engineer and risk assessment expert, brings a unique blend of talents and experience as a project manager, security consultant and facilities expert. Prior to forming Claris Strategy in 2012, William's eighteen-year career at Gensler, an international design firm, garnered him a broad and deep experience in areas including facility security design, advanced technologies and strategic planning.

William has successfully managed and delivered projects of similar scope and complexity for government organizations. William has dedicated the majority of his 30 year career to helping government organizations. His most recent work includes projects for the City of Los Angeles, City of Burbank, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Orange County Transportation Authority, Los Angeles World Airports, Denver International Airport, the Transportation Research Board, Federal Aviation Administration, Southern California Edison, San Diego Gas and Electric, SoCalGas, and twenty water/wastewater agencies. He has managed projects with budgets up to \$20 million and was a key member of the leadership team with project budgets of \$1 billion.

William is a charter member of the Southern California Critical Lifelines working group, a consortium of over 40 public and private organizations working to increase communication and coordination during major security incidents and disasters. He also currently serves on the Board of Directors for the Los Angeles Emergency Preparedness Foundation, assisting the City of Los Angeles' Emergency Management Department to integrate businesses, non-profits, faith-based organizations, and NGOs into the process of preparing for disasters.

BENEFIT TO THE PROJECT

- Proven track record of successfully managing and delivering similarlysized multidisciplinary security assessments on behalf of cities, counties, and federal agencies
- Conducted over twenty security risk assessment projects in the past three years which include cities, counties, government agencies, critical infrastructure and water/wastewater agencies
- Certified in Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and the American Water Works Association's Utility Risk and Resilience Certification

Claris Strategy

William Lim Project Manager

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE -

LA Metro Physical Security Assessments, Los Angeles, CA | Project Manager

William recently led two threat and vulnerability assessment projects for LA Metro. On one project, the team conducted vulnerability assessments on eighteen bus and rail operating divisions over a six month period. The team performed a site assessment identifying vulnerabilities in security; assessed the threats, including multiple types of terrorist attack, criminal behavior and the homeless issue; reviewed relevant Bus and Rail business continuity plans; interviewed over 80 stakeholders; developed a risk profile; and made recommendations in a final report. A second project, the team completed a threat and vulnerability assessment of the iconic Union Station, the rail yards, the Metro Rail stations and the Metro 25-story headquarters building. Both projects were delivered on time and on budget and to the complete satisfaction of the Metro client. The total fee for the projects was \$900,000. He is currently working on two security-related projects for LA Metro.

Water Agency Risk and Resilience Assessments and Emergency Response Plans, California | Project Manager

William led a team of more than twenty consultants from 2019 to 2022 in conducting risk and resilience assessments and updating emergency response plans for fifteen water agencies in California. We used an updated Department of Homeland Security methodology, J100 (based on RAMCAP), for security risk assessments that measured risk using a threat, vulnerability and consequence equation. The relative risk of each critical asset was measured using a threat-asset pair and mitigation measures with a cost/benefit analysis was provided as part of the assessment.

Orange County Transportation Authority Cybersecurity Risk Assessment and Road Map, Orange, CA | SME.

William, as a subconsultant to a larger team, was selected by Orange County Transportation Authority to perform a cuttingedge study to assess the cybersecurity of its industrial control systems which included its security systems. We identified, documented and assessed the vulnerabilities of cyberattack on its security equipment (CCTV, access control, intrusion detection), facilities, and communications systems. As a result of this assessment, we made recommendations on mitigation measures, improvements to OCTA's response plans, and provided a roadmap for managing and maintaining equipment, systems, and vendors to minimize cyberattack risk.

Risk Assessments for Cities

- City of Los Angeles
- City of Burbank
- City of Santa Maria
- City of Solvang

• City of Hesperia Los Angeles County Transportation Authority

- Threat and Vulnerability
 Assessment for Union
 Station and the Gateway
 Building
- Physical Security
 Assessment for Metro
 Operating Divisions
- BOC/ROC Risk Assessment & Future Implementation Strategy
- Integrated Station Design Solutions - Physical Security Guidelines
- Emergency Security
 Operations Center Design
 and Construction
- Security Emergency Action
 Plan for Union Station

Orange County Transportation Authority

- Cybersecurity Risk
 Assessment
- Transportation Security and
 Operations Center Design
- Fifteen Water/Wastewater Agencies

 Risk and Resilience
 Assessments
- Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties
 - Transportation Emergency Preparedness Plan with Risk Assessment

SoCalGas

- Gas Control Center and Emergency Operations Center Physical Security Design
- San Diego Gas & Electric
 - Distribution Control Center NERC/CIP Physical Security Design

20 | Claris Strategy |

Claris Strategy



EDUCATION B.S. Wildlife Ecology Texas A&M University USMC Infantry Officer USMC Armor Officer USMC Light Armored Reconnaissance Officer USMC Civil Affairs Officer

CERTIFICATIONS

DOD Secret Clearance 1995-Present

Operations and Tactics Instructor, USMC

DOD Top Secret Clearance 2012-2014, 2016

Axis Communications Network Video Certified Professional

IPVM video management/ video surveillance as a service

IPVM video analytics

Genetec Security Center designation (pending)

Lance Ferrell Security Systems Task Lead

Lance Ferrell is an experienced security consultant who has delivered multi-million dollar security projects across several domains. He has led such projects for airport and seaport operators, the federal government, government affiliated contractors, and private companies. Lance is particularly experienced with Access Control, Video Surveillance, Intrusion Detection, and Identity Management systems. Lance is familiar with not only the frontend complexities of installing security systems, but also the technical systems behind them. Lance is focused on helping clients complete technology upgrades and realize innovations through technology.

Lance is a contributing member of the RTCA Special Committee 224 which develops standards for Airport Access Control Systems. Lance rewrote the technology integration section for the latest version of DO-230. The integration section is focused on best practices and considerations for integrating elements of airport physical security systems.

Lance is currently a Colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve with multiple tours to Iraq. During his time with the Marine Corps, Lance gained extensive life experience leading units of various sizes in combat and garrison, maintaining coordination amongst various non-governmental organizations, and providing regular briefings and guidance to senior military and government officials. Lance has commanded the largest Light Armored Reconnaissance Battalion in the Marine Corps (over 1,200 personnel) consisting of seven smaller divisions geographically spread throughout the United States. He served as second in command for a Reserve Tank Battalion, and has deployed to combat as a Tank Platoon Commander, a Tank Company Commander, and as the Deputy Director for Civil Military Operations for the Combined Joint Task Force-Operation Inherent Resolve (3-Star Command fighting ISIS in Iraq and Syria).

BENEFIT TO THE PROJECT

- Subject matter expert in designing and implementing electronic physical security countermeasures. Designed security countermeasures in over 30 US Government facilities and managed the installation of another 70+ projects.
- Experienced in digital transformation and helping clients incorporate new technologies into their security plans. Skilled in the identification of requirements and evaluating different solutions to best meet those needs.
- Experience in counter-terrorism preparedness. Performed threat and vulnerability assessments for the federal government.
- Experience in developing interagency partnerships and collaboration between different government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and international organizations in challenging environments.

Lance Ferrell Security Systems Task Lead

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

As a Marine Corps Officer, Lance has conducted numerous realworld anti-terrorism operations. He is well equipped and practiced at identifying potential threats and mitigating security vulnerabilities in both a garrison environment and during combat operations.

His formal physical security training begin while working for the Department of Homeland Security where he designed the security systems for new field offices and wrote physical security requirements for local integrators to carry out. His designs included access control, video surveillance, intrusion detection, facility lock and key plans, and identification of contract guard requirements. Later, Lance joined an integrator where he spent years managing the installation of many high level physical security installs. From there Lance became a security consultant providing management consulting services to Airport clients performing technology upgrades in access control, biometrics, video surveillance, and identity management solutions.

Lance has implemented numerous electronic security system projects throughout his career to include the following:

Los Angeles International Airport (LAX): Represented the Airport by providing delivery oversight of security integrators. Worked with the project team to design, plan, and deliver the replacement of an end-of-life access control system with one featuring current technology and increased functionality. The system has over 400 controllers, over 4,500 readers, over 53,000 cardholders, and will include biometric readers. The access control system must also fully integrate with numerous other third-party security software applications including a new identity management system, new analytics platform (for insider threat monitoring), new video management system, and a physical security information management system.

Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport

(PHX): Mapped business processes, identified technical requirements, and wrote the scope of work for PHX to replace an aging Identity Management System (IDMS) with a more modern system that better meets their strategic objectives. Assisting the PHX selection panel as a subject matter expert.

Federal Government Contractor: Installed

new surveillance system for a federal government contractor creating a Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF) that included cameras for drone detection (using video analytics), exterior cameras, interior cameras, and new video management system.

Federal Government Defense Contractor: Project Manager

installing new electronic security systems for a federal government contractor consisting of an access control system and intrusion detection system (motion sensors, door contacts, glass break detectors, and tamper devices). Led regular meetings to coordinate efforts with the general contractor and other construction trades, provided solutions for scope and design requirements, and supervised the installation team.

US Citizenship and Immigration Services: Project

Manager replacing an endof-life access control system in a federally owned facility. Engineered head end design and supervised the installation team.

Claris Strategy

Claris Strategy



EDUCATION BS Mechanical Engineering, Michigan Technological University

FBI Academy NCIS Academy

Engineer in Training Program, Army Corps of Engineers Officer Training: USMC

CERTIFICATIONS

AWWA Utility Risk and Resilience Certification

Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmental Information (1972 - 2004)

American Society of Industrial Security

Association of Certified Fraud Examiners

Tom Lafreniere Physical Security Assessment Task Lead

With an educational foundation in engineering and a background in crisis management, criminal investigation and counter-terrorism; Tom has developed expertise in performing security assessments, vulnerability analysis, and security design.

Tom's experience include Combat Engineer in the United States Marine Corps, Project Engineer for the Army Corps of Engineers, Special Agent for the Naval Criminal Investigative Service, Special Agent and Supervisory Special agent for the FBI, along with security consulting in the private sector.

As Special Agent and Supervisory Special Agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Naval Criminal Investigative Service, Tom conducted criminal and counter-terrorism investigations. Tom supervised the FBI San Francisco Joint Terrorism Task Force (JTTF) in the aftermath of the 2001 attack of the World Trade Center. He was, subsequently, designated the Coordinator for the International Terrorism Program for the San Francisco Division of the FBI. He was designated the coordinator for the first FBI violent gangs task force in San Francisco. Tom also served as the Primary Crisis Management Coordinator, overseeing the crisis management team for FBI San Francisco, and as the Senior Team Leader for the FBI SWAT program. Tom wrote the Crisis Response plan for San Francisco FBI and designed both the FBI Emergency Operations Center and the Mobile Command Post.

As the program coordinator for the International Terrorism Program for the FBI in San Francisco, Tom coordinated with the planners for the various critical infrastructure to include water and wastewater systems.

Over the past 13 years, Tom has provided security consulting services to the government, the corporate sector and individuals. He has specialized in threat assessments, vulnerability analysis, and security design. Tom has provided security services for municipalities, school districts, corporate offices, factories, and port facilities. Tom is also provisional auditor for ISO 27000, Supply Chain Security, which encompasses physical security attributes throughout the entire supply chain from factory to conveyances, to distribution centers.

BENEFIT TO THE PROJECT-

- Nearly three decades of analyzing criminal behavior, tendencies, and methodology.
- Experience in counter-terrorism investigations and preparedness.
- Experience with public safety security through the FBI Crisis Management Program and the Office of Emergency Services for the City of San Francisco.
- Certified with the American Water Works Association for Risk and Resilience
- Performed over 60 physical security assessments with cities, counties, office buildings, and water/wastewater agencies
- Technical background in engineering.

Claris Strategy

Tom Lafreniere Physical Security Assessment Task Lead

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE -

As an FBI and NCIS special agent, Tom has become familiar with criminal methodologies and with security vulnerabilities exploited by criminal elements.

His experience in crisis management planning for both the FBI and the City of San Francisco has heightened his familiarity with protecting critical infrastructure from bridges to buildings, to include strategic security planning for facilities and services.

Tom, as a member of American Society of Industrial Security, brings with him the training and the security resources, research, and guidelines available through ASIS. Tom has the training and the certification for supply chain security, which includes conveyances.

Tom's experience as an engineer provides a common foundation from which to communicate with contributors to a renovation or upgrade project. Tom has completed numerous security assessments and designs for various government infrastructure and private or corporate entities, to include the following:

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Los Angeles County, CA

Threat and Vulnerability Assessment of Union Station and the Gateway Building; Physical Security Assessment of 18 Metro Bus and Rail Operating Divisions

Port of Richmond, Richmond, CA

Security assessment and system design for the buildings and perimeter of the multi-acre Port site.

America's Water Infrastructure Act Risk and Resilience Assessments, Various Locations, CA

Conducted twelve risk and resilience assessments for water agencies

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians

Physical security assessment of casino and reservation property

Livermore Water Resources Division, City of Livermore Threat and Vulnerability Assessment

San Joaquin Valley Irrigation District, CA

Security assessment and system design for six facilities and pump stations that support the irrigation district

Patterson Irrigation District, Patterson, CA

Threat and Vulnerability Assessment

Fairfield Water District,

Fairfield, CA. Threat and Vulnerability Assessment

Contra Costa Wastewater District, Concord, CA

Threat and Vulnerability Assessment

Castro Valley School District, Castro Valley, CA

Threat assessment and security design for 19 schools

Other threat and vulnerability assessments include:

- Factories that manufacture security products
- Office buildings
- Wineries
- Country clubs
- Municipal parks

Claris Strategy



EDUCATION 2017- Advanced CHEM/BIO Investigation Course 2016 - Advanced Entry Technics Course

2016 - Tactical Bomb Technician Course with SWAT/DOD

2015 - Explosives Unit Laboratory Training Course

2010 - FBI Improvised Explosives Course

2005 - Adlerhorst International K9 Advanced Explosive Detection K9 Instructor Level Course

2004 - The Instructor Development Course

2003 - Special Entry Breacher Course

2003 - Advanced Canine (K9) Handlers Seminar

2001 - Hazardous Materials Technician Certification

2000 - Basic Hazardous Devices School; FBI Basic Post Blast Course

AFFILIATIONS

Member of the International Association of Bomb Technicians and Investigators (IABTI)

Jacqueline (Jackie) Hickey, IABTI Blast Mitigation and Security Technology Subject-Matter Expert

Jackie recently retired as an Explosives Ordnance Technician for the Los Angeles Police Department's Bomb Squad Unit. Her responsibilities included rendering safe all explosive devices, conducting post-blast investigations and reconstructing improvised explosive devices. She has participated in over 2,500 bomb calls, more than 900 of which she was the lead investigative Technician. She was assigned as the TFO to the Los Angeles CT-7 Squad with the FBI. As a CT-7 Squad member she was a key member in the Los Angeles Stabilization Program and deployment of ECM. She was also the Explosives Detection K-9 Trainer and Handler for the CT-7 Squad and a certified Hazardous Materials Technician. She was the 2018 recipient of the LAPD's coveted Police Star Award for her leadership and bravery during the San Bernardino terrorist massacre.

Jackie is a National and International Instructor in counter terrorism analysis and assessment, risk and blast mitigation, weapons of mass destruction, explosives and munitions. As an Instructor, she has traveled to several overseas locations to train other EOD Units and civilian entities. She is a highly sought-after guest speaker for numerous corporate entities, helping to train and increase threat awareness for high-level security personnel.

Jackie has been the lead security detail organizer over all participating law enforcement personnel for many high-profile events at venues across the City of Los Angeles and LA County. She has also served as a Technical Consultant advising on numerous law-enforcement and security related content in the film and television arena.

As an International Assoc. of Bomb Technicians & Investigators (IABTI) Board Member she was delegated to author & develop a Southern California K9 certification program.

Jackie remains as an instructor in counter terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, explosives and munitions, and K9 deployment procedures for all sworn and civilian participation domestically and internationally.

BENEFIT TO THE PROJECT-

- Nationally/internationally recognized expert on counter terrorism, blast assessment and mitigation, weapons of mass destruction and K-9 training
- As LAPD's lead investigative explosive ordnance technician, led 900 bomb calls and has participated in over 2,500 bomb calls
- Provided blast mitigation expertise and security protection for major government facilities and high-profile events
- Extensive experience with security for public safety buildings
- Awarded LAPD's Police Star Award for the San Bernardino terrorist shooting
- Subject-matter expert on innovative security technology solutions

Jacqueline (Jackie) Hickey Blast Mitigation and Security Technology Subject-Matter Expert

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE –

West Los Angeles FBI Field Office and Los Angeles Police Department Bomb Squad Facilities, Los Angeles, CA | Physical Security SME. Provided expertise for physical security assessment of these facilities and mitigation measures to minimize bomb attack risk.

Los Angeles World Airports, Los Angeles, CA | Physical Security SME. Led physical security and security systems design oversight on behalf of Los Angeles World Airports on the modernization of Terminals 1, 4 and Tom Bradley International Terminal.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Los Angeles, CA | Bomb Blast SME. Threat and Vulnerability Assessment of Union Station and the Gateway Building

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, Highland, CA | Physical Security SME. Physical security assessment to improve situational awareness, mitigate security and safety vulnerabilities regarding the reservation and casino properties

Original Farmers Market & A.F. Gilmore Company, Los Angeles County, CA | Physical Security SME. Security assessment to improve situational awareness, mitigate security and safety vulnerabilities within the immediate environment; improve emergency notifications with local departments, implement weekly security training programs; design initial and finalization of a Security Operations Center build-out with staffing.

Government of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia | Explosives Training and Blast Analyst.

Conducted training in advanced explosives techniques and post blast analysis with the Royal Jakarta National Police, Royal Bomb Squad, Royal Thailand National Police and Royal Navy Seals. **Ritz Carlton Hotel, Jakarta, Indonesia | Security explosives and K-9 SME**. Assessed and developed security explosives protocols & K9 protocol.

U.S. Department of Defense, Various Locations | **Security explosives and K-9 SME**. Conducted field-training exercises.

Federal Bureau of Investigation, Virginia | K-9 Certification Author. Authored the FBI's National K9 Certification program and Standard Operation Procedures (SOPs) in effect from 2007-2014.

Claris Strategy

Claris Strategy



CERTIFICATIONS ISO 9001 Auditor

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

Security Analyst for over 300 security and investigative projects

Project manager, security analyst or investigative researcher for over 100 projects for FBI, DOJ, and DEA

LA Metro Physical Security Assessment for Metro Operating Divisions

LA Metro Threat and Vulnerability Assessment of Union Station and the Gateway Building, Los Angeles County, CA

San Manual Casino Physical Security Assessment

Federal Bureau of Investigation, Asset Forfeiture Department, San Diego, CA Contract Analyst II

Lisa Garcia Crime Statistics Analyst

Lisa has more than 45 years of professional experience with the federal government and in the private sector, in collecting information and providing analysis and conclusions in domestic and international venues. Lisa has participated in over 300 security and investigative engagements worldwide.

Lisa's expertise includes knowledge of sophisticated data gathering techniques to evaluate security risks and vulnerabilities in support of complex investigations, critical infrastructure protection and crisis response. Analysis techniques utilized during her professional career include preparation and manipulation of complex spreadsheets for illustration of evidence and research collected, retrieval of data from various publiclyavailable online resources in support of due diligence screening as well as collating and summary report preparation of all research and information gathered.

Lisa spent more than seven years with the FBI and DEA as a financial data analyst in support of the FBI's Asset Forfeiture Support Program and as an Office Manager and Analyst at DEA's Country Offices located in Paris, France and Cairo, Egypt.

Lisa also has experience in the manufacturing industry, spending nine years as a Quality Control Officer for a nationally recognized corrugated company, where she obtained her certification as an ISO 9001 internal auditor.

Between 1975 and 1991, Lisa held managerial and administrative positions in the banking industry in the domestic U.S. and Hawaii, where she worked in the construction loan department, overseeing large-scale construction projects on the outer islands of Maui and Kauai.

BENEFIT TO THE PROJECT -

- Managed or participated in over 300 security and investigative projects including risk assessments, analysis and research of crime data, review of facility operating procedures, security policies and procedures, and performed due diligence and corporate compliance projects.
- Participated as project manager, investigative researcher and security analyst for over 100 federal investigations for the FBI, Department of Justice and DEA in North and South America, Asia and Africa.
- Highly-skilled analyst capable of processing, researching and handling large volumes of complex security information.

City of Redmond Building Security Strategic Plan

PHILIP MATHUR Senior Cost Estimator

Founded in 2014, KPJ Consulting, an S Corporation is SBE/DBE/MBE/WBE certified. KPJ Consulting is especially skilled in providing accurate budgets at the early programming and conceptual phases of a project when that accuracy is critical to a project's ultimate success. KPJ Consulting achieves this with early advice during the design phase by creating functional solutions to meet budget expectations.

Philip Mathur is a Senior Construction Consultant for KPJ Consulting with over 34 years of experience in the construction industry. Philip's experience includes both public and private sector clients, nationally and internationally. He has provided expertise to a variety of projects and building types in sectors ranging from residential, transportation, infrastructure, hospitality and commercial to federal, sports and healthcare.

Philip is adept at coordinating all facets of cost, managing budgets, and negotiating contracts on large- & small-scale projects. He has extensive experience with construction cost estimating, project budget control from early design concepts through construction, GMP/bid package negotiations, change order management, cash flow projection, pay application processing and risk analysis.

Relevant Project Experience (PM performed estimating on all of the following projects primarily during the feasibility, conceptual or schematic design phases.)

Los Angeles Metro Division Facility Security Upgrade Master Plan, Los Angeles, CA Los Angeles Metro Division Union Station Security Upgrade Master Plan, Los Angeles, CA Los Angeles County Civic Center Master Plan, CA West Valley Detention Center TI, Rancho Cucamonga, CA Los Angeles Parts Distribution Center, Torrance, CA Aerial Tramway, Portland, OR Big Blue Bus, Administration & Maintenance Facilities, Santa Monica, CA Golden Empire Transit, Admin & Maintenance Facilities, Bakersfield, CA Metrolink Midway Yards, Phase II Master Plan, Los Angeles, CA Orange County Transportation Authority, Transit Facility, Newport Beach, CA Port of Long Beach, Administration & Maintenance Facilities, Long Beach, CA Port of Los Angeles, Downtown Waterfront Harbor, San Pedro, CA Port of Los Angeles, Joint-Agency Container Inspection Fac., San Pedro, CA Southern California Edison SONGS Master Plan, San Diego, CA UC San Diego, Central Plant, La Jolla, CA Disaster Data Recovery Center, Los Angeles, CA Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Los Angeles, CA Family Support Center, San Fernando, CA Community Center, Hacienda Heights, CA Sanitation District, Puente Hills Material Recovery Facility, City of Industry, CA Antelope Valley Master Plan, CA



Position in Firm Senior Construction Consultant

Role on Project Senior Cost Estimator

Total Years in Field 34 years

Level of Education

Bachelor of Science, Construction Quantity Surveying, Glasgow Caledonian University

Professional Certifications/ Licenses/Registrations

Member, Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyor (MRICS)

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0A400E6A-8197-44EE-9044-E2ECB646CD14

28 | Claris Strategy

City of Redmond Building Security Strategic Plan November 15, 2023

PROJECT UNDERSTANDING

Our understanding is the City of Redmond is seeking the services of a qualified consultant to conduct a security risk assessment and make recommendations to direct security upgrades for a comprehensive approach and unified system. Our team, comprised of security and risk management experts, is very aware of the increasing security threats, criminal activity, and homeless issues that impact the City of Redmond and other communities around the nation.

We will develop a comprehensive security strategic plan that addresses the evolving security environment, combines concepts from Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) with traditional physical security methods, and provides guidance for a more efficient and integrated security system.

We understand that the assessment is comprised of the three following tasks with the understanding that these are minimum requirements:

- 1. General existing conditions
- 2. Recommended changes prioritized by effectiveness and cost
- 3. Cost summary based on recommendations presented as an outcome of item (2) above

To accomplish these tasks, we will use the three-step process outlined in the RFP scope of work:

- Task 1: Evaluation
- Task 2: Operational Consideration
- Task 3: Final Report

In this section of our proposal, we have provided the following:

- 1. Our project approach
- 2. A project roadmap
- 3. A preliminary work plan
- 4. A preliminary project schedule



PROJECT APPROACH

A Changing Safety and Security Environment

In today's increasingly complex safety and security environment, the City is facing threats that were unimaginable only a few short decades ago. With the watershed event of 9/11, recent socio-economic and political impacts such as COVID-19, mass political demonstrations, civil unrest, and the January 6th attack on the U.S. Capitol, the City is expected to find ways to increase the safety and security of its citizens, its employees and its critical assets while balancing operational efficiency, social sensitivity and environmental sustainability.

In today's environment, an effective and efficient safety and security operation is a linchpin to keeping the City's employees and the public safe. We believe that conducting a security risk assessment and using its findings to develop a comprehensive Building Security Strategic Plan is one of the necessary steps in building a more robust safety and security environment for the city.

Holistic Perspective

Our team was formed to take a holistic approach to this project by bringing together multiple perspectives and experiences to inform and develop the building security plan. Our team includes experts in advanced security systems, physical security, blast analysis, counter-terrorism, water/waste water risk assessments, facilities, emergency response, crime analysis, and cost analysis.

Also, our team members are fully invested in helping our communities, many of whom have devoted our careers to defending our nation, serving in law enforcement and assisting others. We bring these collective perspectives to the project.

Claris' holistic approach combines both rational and intuitive thinking viewed through the lenses of people, process, technology and site and facilities as illustrated by the top right diagram.

We use a unique approach – one that examines all of the core elements in developing a plan in parallel: organization, process, facility, and technology. We do so because we have consistently found that solutions are more successful when these four elements are in alignment.



Inclusive Approach

The Claris team believes in a highly-collaborative approach to all of our work not only within our team but also with our clients. Because we work in partnership, the result is a solution that is comprehensive, viable, and defensible.

As appropriate, we encourage the direct involvement and input from City staff, law enforcement, City Fire, other City departments and contractors. Claris Strategy is committed to an inclusive approach that ensures stakeholder participation to maximize plan success.

Following is a proposed project roadmap for developing the Building Security Strategic Plan.

Exhibit A & B - Scope of Work and Project Schedule

BUILDING SECURITY STRATEGIC PLAN ROADMAP





32 | Claris Strategy |

PROJECT WORK PLAN

TASK 0: PROJECT STARTUP

In this task, we will coordinate with City staff to confirm the details of the project and make any necessary adjustments.

0.1 Request for Background Materials

We will request any pertinent background materials and data for our review and use throughout the project. These may include:

- Mission statement, goals and policies
- Regulatory requirements
- Threat and vulnerability assessments
- Safety and security plans
- Security system information:
 - As-built floor plans with layout of rooms, cable paths, architectural features, and security devices
 - System block diagrams illustrating the overall architecture and components of the electronic security systems and interconnections between different devices
 - Wiring diagrams depicting the electrical connections between different components of the security system.
 - Elevation Drawings with a vertical view of specific

areas, such as the exterior walls where security devices are placed

- Integration Design Documents: a comprehensive and detailed blueprint for the integration of disparate systems, applications, or components within a larger software or IT infrastructure. This document outlines the architecture, data flow, interfaces, protocols, and communication mechanisms.
- City Policies regarding:
 - How video can be used in the city
 - Exporting and sharing recorded video
 - Configuration of video cameras (resolution, framerate, codec, compression, etc.)
 - Design standards or design criteria for security systems
 - User accounts and access rights for various security systems
- Standard Operating Procedures
 - Response to access control alarms (e.g. door held open, door forced open) to include alarmed gates and roll-up doors
 - Response to duress alarm
 - Procedures for exporting and sharing recorded


video

- Procedures for viewing live video
- After-Action Reports and Improvement Plans
- Site maps and facility plans of facilities to be assessed
- Staff and customer surveys on safety and security
- Customer and staff data on safety and security issues
- Specific safety and security standard operating procedures (SOPs)
- Organization charts
- Previous related studies and reports

0.2 Project Kickoff Meeting

The Kickoff Meeting will provide an opportunity for our team to meet with City staff assigned to this project.

During this virtual meeting (or in-person if we can schedule to coincide with the site walks), we will:

- Review project goals and assumptions
- Review project scope, schedule, and work plan
- Confirm City staff and Claris team members roles and responsibilities
- Confirm the facilities to be assessed
- Discuss data collection methods
- Discuss a preliminary set of assessment criteria
- Discuss use of risk methodology for risk assessment
- Set up communication channels
- Confirm key project dates
- Confirm deliverables
- Discuss and confirm dates for site walks
- Develop initial list of stakeholders
- Project team discussion

TASK 1: EVALUATION

In this task, our team will perform the actions identified by the City:

- Evaluation of existing conditions, including:
 - Review of physical security systems
 - Areas of greatest intrusion vulnerability (architectural security)
 - Areas of most significant egress vulnerability
 - Locations with the greatest level of risk

This evaluation will be used to inform our risk assessment.

In this task, we intend to develop an understanding of the following:

- The current City safety and security plans including the organizational structure, processes and procedures and technologies
- The historical, current and potential use and operations of the facilities included in the RFP
- The physical security systems used at these facilities
- External and internal factors that may affect safety and security at each of these facilities
- Organizational factors that may impact the safety and security of these facilities
- Best practices, lessons learned and industry trends for all hazard mitigation at bus, paratransit, rail and critical infrastructure operations

Facilities to Assess

We will assess the 49 facilities the City has identified:

- City Hall
- City Hall Parking Garage
- Public Safety Building
- Teen Center
- Community Center
- Redmond Pool
- MOC site with 13 facilities and areas
- 7 Fire Stations
- 22 Water/Wastewater sites

Prior to any site and facility walks, we will discuss with City staff to identify any key security concerns that they would like our team to focus on.

1.1 Site and Facility Walks

Our goal of the site and facility walks is to evaluate potential threats, to document the security measures in place, to assess any vulnerabilities and to identify any opportunities for improvement. Our team will visit the facilities accompanied by City staff. We will document the site and facilities through photographs and notes, focusing on an assessment criteria checklist previously developed. These will include:

- Video surveillance systems (CCTV)
- Access control systems
- Intrusion detection systems
- Communication systems
- Technology infrastructure systems

PROJECT WORK PLAN (CONTINUED)

- Site and facilities physical security including use of entrances and exits for vehicles and persons, lighting, fences, walls, gates, guard rails, bollards, secured doors and locking systems, screening centers and equipment and guard posts
- Intrusion and egress vulnerabilities to the threats such as terrorist attack, active shooter and criminal behavior

We will evaluate the following with respect to the security systems on our site walks:

- **Coverage**: Evaluate the system's coverage and ensure that all critical areas, such as entry and exit points, perimeters of buildings, areas critical to operations, and public spaces are adequately covered by cameras.
- Quality: The quality of the video footage is essential for identifying people and events accurately. Every camera should have a specific objective and purpose (detection, observation, recognition, identification). Some cameras will be used for general observation of a space while other cameras should provide highresolution video that can capture details such as faces, license plates, and other identifying features.
- **Storage**: The system should have sufficient storage capacity to retain video footage for an extended period. Depending on the City's requirements, the storage capacity should be able to retain video footage for a specified amount of time.
- Integration: The video surveillance system could be integrated with other security systems, such as access control and alarm systems. Integration ensures that the video footage can be used in conjunction with other security measures to enhance the overall security of the city. Integrations will be evaluated and considered in the process.
- **Maintenance**: The system should be easy to maintain, and regular maintenance should be performed to ensure optimal performance. Maintenance and support options will be considered with any recommendations.

1.2 Key Stakeholder Interviews

The Claris team will conduct up to eight (8) interviews with key City staff of approximately sixty minutes in length. These interviews will be held virtually or, if possible, on site during the site walks. We will:

- Identify the key stakeholders responsible for security at the facilities to be assessed.
- Meet with the key stakeholders to discuss any security concerns, past incidents, challenges, lessons learned and opportunities.
- Interview Technology and Information Systems (TIS) personnel currently maintaining the electronic security system equipment and City Cybersecurity staff to understand any constraints or regulatory requirements around the use of Software as a Service (SaaS), cloud technologies, or biometric technologies.
- Develop an understanding of the processes and procedures in place to monitor, report, notify and respond to security incidents.
- Meet with law enforcement and security staff to discuss security issues such as criminal activity, incident reports, and community and social concerns which could impact the potential threats and vulnerabilities surrounding the facilities.

1.3 Document Review

We will review the background material received in detail. From a review of this material, the site walks and the interviews, the team will form a picture of the current state of the safety and security of these facilities.

1.4 Research

Threat Analysis Based on Local and National Research

The Claris team will perform research on the following threat areas:

• **Terrorist threat**. Our team members regularly update the threat profile for various types of terrorist threats to transit systems utilizing our sources and contacts at applicable security organizations such as the FBI, DHS, Infragard, FEMA, local law enforcement and ASIS to identify the current best practices to harden high target facilities. This effort will be led by Lisa Garcia, formerly an analyst at the FBI and the Department of Justice who has 45 years of experience conducting over 300 security

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0A400E6A-8197-44EE-9044-E2ECB646CD14

Claris Strategy



assessments.

 Criminal Statistics. Our team, will provide three (3) years of crime statistics for each facility location. Analysis will include current, real-time, and historical data by utilization of the Federal Bureau of Investigation Uniform Crime Report (UCR) systems as well as Automated Regional Justice Information Systems (ARJIS) to target Part 1 violent crimes, Part 1 property crimes, and Part 2 offenses.

Best Practices, Lessons Learned and Trends on Mitigation Measures

We will utilize our experience in assessing security threats and vulnerabilities across multiple environments including highsecurity public buildings, public safety buildings, critical infrastructure sites, public gathering places and water/ wastewater facilities.

Our team will use our knowledge of best practices, lessons learned and industry trends to develop recommendations on mitigation measures, improvements to the security systems and the advantages and disadvantages of future technologies.

TASK 2: OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

In this task, our team will perform the actions identified by the City:

• Identification of locations necessitating the construction, or addition of physical deterrents

2.1 Findings

Our team will summarize the information collected and use a SWOT analysis to frame the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for each facility. An example of the findings summary table that illustrates the threats, strengths and weaknesses for each facility is provided on the following pages.

We will use the findings to begin forming our thoughts for system-wide and site-specific mitigation opportunities.

As part of the opportunities, we will identify locations where physical deterrents may be constructed or added.

2.2 Findings Meeting

We will hold a virtual meeting with City project staff to review the team's findings. In the meeting, we will discuss the SWOT analysis and receive direction from the City on direction of which mitigation strategies to focus on.

SITE SUMMARY FINDINGS EXAMPLE

| Site Location H | Key Facility 1 | Facility 2 | Facility 3 | Facility 4 | Facility 5 | Facility 6 | Facility 7 | Facility 8 | Facility 9 |
|------------------------------------------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Site Characteristics | | | | | | | | | |
| Threats | | | | | | | | | |
| Terrorist - Bomb Attack | | | | | | | | | |
| Terrorist - Active Shooter | | | | | | | | | |
| Terrorist - Vehicular Attack | | | | | | | | | |
| Personal Crime | | | | | | | | | |
| Theft | | | | | | | | | |
| Vandalism | | | | | | | | | |
| Trespassing | | | | | | | | | |
| Internal Threats | | | | | | | | | |
| Issues | | | | | | | | | |
| Homeless Issue | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Security Personnel | - | - | - | | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | |
| Contracted Security | • | • | • | • | | • | | | • |
| Law Enforcement | | | | • | | • | | | |
| Site Attributes | | | | | | | | | |
| Perimeter | | | | | | | | | |
| Fencing (includes Maint.), Gates and Loc | cks | | | | | | | | |
| Lighting | | | | | | | | | |
| Cages | | | | | | | | | |
| Signage | | | | | | | | | |
| Structures | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| Building Envelope (Walls) | | | | | | | | | |
| Building Envelope and Structure (Blast) | | | | | | | | | |
| Exterior Doors and Hardware | | | | | | | | | |
| Exterior Windows | | | | | | | | | <u>,</u> |
| Interior Doors and Hardware | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Key Control | | | | | | | | | |
| , | | | | | | | | | |
| Security Systems | | | | | | · | | | |
| Video Surveillance | | | | | | | | | |
| Analog Cameras | • | • | | | | | | | |
| IP Cameras | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • |
| Access Control | | | | | | | | | |
| Intrusion Detection | | | | | | | | | |
| Emergency Communication | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Security Policy, Process and Procedure | | | | | | | | | |

Claris Strategy

| Facility 10 | Facility 11 | Facility 12 | Facility 13 | Facility 14 | Facility 15 | Facility 16 | Facility 17 | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|--------------------|
| | | | | | | | | THREATS A | AND ISSUES LEGEND |
| | | | | | | | | | High Threat |
| | | | | | | | | | Medium Threat |
| | | | | | | | | | Low Threat |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | OTHER C | ATEGORIES LEGEND |
| • | • | • | | • | • | • | | | Poor Condition |
| | | | | | | | | | Moderate Condition |
| | | | | | | | | | Good Condition |
| | | | | | | | | • | Present |
| | | | | | | | | | Not Applicable |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| • | • | • | | • | • | ٠ | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

PROJECT WORK PLAN (CONTINUED)

TASK 3: FINAL REPORT

In this task, our team will develop a final report that will include strategic recommendations to implement security upgrades for continuous risk mitigation. The report will include:

- Development of recommendations for security improvements
- Identification of short-term and long-term costs
- Prioritization of recommendations and development of an implementation plan
- Preparation of written Security Assessment Report
- Costs associated with constructed improvements

3.1 Risk Assessment

We will use the information collected to develop a risk assessment based on the assets to be protected, relevant threats and vulnerabilities identified. This risk assessment for each facility will help prioritize recommendations across all facilities.

We propose using the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS)/Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) methodology for the risk assessment. This following formula for risk illustrates the approach:

Risk (R) = Threat (T) x Vulnerability (V) x Consequence (C)

3.1.1 Threat Assessment

Based on our team's research, we will identify the relevant threats to each facility. The threats and hazards that will be considered include:

- Terrorist attack
 - Vehicle borne bomb
 - Person borne bomb
 - Vehicle ramming
 - Drone attack
 - Active shooter
 - Sabotage
 - Chemical/Biological/Radiological/Nuclear (CBRN) attack
- Criminal Activity
 - Active shooter
 - Trespassing

- Assault
- Theft or diversion
- Robbery
- Rape
- Arson
- Vandalism
- Insider threat

Each relevant threat for a facility will be rated on a scale of 1 (Very Low) - 10 (Very High).

3.1.2 Vulnerability Assessment

The vulnerability assessment will analyze in depth the facilities' functions, systems, and site characteristics to identify building weaknesses and identify mitigations or corrective actions that can be designed or implemented to reduce the vulnerabilities. We will consider the following components for each facility if relevant:

- Security systems
 - Video surveillance
 - Access control
 - Intrusion detection
 - System monitoring
- Fencing/gates
- Security lighting
- Security signage
- Vehicle bollards
- Door and gate locks
- Blast resistance
- Panic buttons
- Security/emergency communications

From the information we receive through site walk observations, documentation and stakeholder interviews, we will rate each relevant vulnerability to the threat on a scale of 1 (Very Low) - 10 (Very High).

3.1.3 Consequences

Using the DHS/FEMA TVA methodology, we will quantify the potential losses using four categories:

1. <u>Human Impact:</u> Effects on human life and physical wellbeing (e.g. fatalities, injuries)

- 2. <u>Economic Impact</u>: Direct and indirect effects on the economy with respect to the buildings and its functions
- 3. <u>Public Confidence:</u> Effect on the public confidence in the organization to deliver service. This encompasses those changes in perception emerging from a significant incident that affect the public's sense of safety and wellbeing
- 4. <u>Business Functionality</u>: Effect on the business's ability to continue operations to deliver service.

For each facility, we will rate a consequence on a scale of 1 (Very Low) - 10 (Very High).

3.1.4 Risk Analysis

Using the confirmed threat, asset and vulnerability assessments, we will quantify the level of risk for each facility against each primary threat using the proposed risk equation. The risks will be ranked high, medium and low. A possible risk scale is:

| | Low Risk | Medium Risk | High Risk |
|-----------------------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| Risk Factors Total | 1-60 | 61-175 | >175 |

An overall risk rating will be tabulated for each facility.

3.2 Recommendations

From the risk analysis, the team will develop a set of recommendations prioritized by risk for mitigating the vulnerabilities and enhancing the security systems and physical deterrents.

3.3 Short and Long-Term Costs

Philip Mathur, of KPJ Consulting, and Lance Ferrell, of Claris Strategy, will review the prioritized recommendations and develop a rough order of magnitude (ROM) cost estimate divided into short and long-term costs. We will use historic data, current market pricing and in some cases direct vendor estimates in the process of preparing the cost estimates for the physical deterrents and security system improvements. The format of the estimate will follow the client requirements and will be broken down for each facility.

3.4 Risk Assessment Workshop

We will schedule a four-hour virtual workshop to review and

discuss our risk assessment, prioritized recommendations and cost estimates with the project team and key stakeholders.

3.5 Implementation Plan

The Claris team will develop an implementation plan for City staff to review and comment. The implementation plan may be organized as follows:

- A list of prioritized recommendations categorized into short-term, medium-term and long-term time frames
- ROM costs for the each of the time frames

3.6 Security Schematic Design

We will develop a set of schematic design drawings for recommended physical improvements to buildings and surrounding site area facilities. Recommendations may include physical barriers, gates, fencing, guard booths, and visual depictions of recommended hardware to include camera coverage and access control points. An example of a video surveillance camera layout is provided below. We are assuming that the City has a current set as-built drawings for each of the sites.



PROJECT WORK PLAN (CONTINUED)

3.7 New Technology and Information System (TIS) Analysis

We will develop a high level analysis of a new technology and information system. This electronic security systems will explore options for:

- Transitioning existing Genetec Synergis (access control) and Omnicast (video management systems) servers to Genetec Stratocast or another Video Surveillance as a Service (VSaaS) solution
- Identifying the pros and cons of utilizing Access Control as a Service (ACaaS) and VSaaS to more efficiently operate and manage the system
- Identifying potential opportunities for reducing the technical skills and knowledge required of the TIS team to maintain the systems
- Identifying potential opportunities for reducing the number of staff required to maintain the electronic security systems
- Identifying opportunities to make it simpler to remotely operate and manage the electronic security systems
- Identifying potential opportunities for reducing the technical skills and knowledge required of operators to use the systems
- Transitioning card readers to mobile or biometric readers to eliminate the need to issue, maintain, and carry access credentials
- Identify options for managing visitors to city facilities
- Exploring the use of a virtual security operations center or third-party alarm monitoring service to relieve city resources of the responsibility for alarm monitoring
- Standardizing surveillance hardware for simplified management, interoperability, and cost efficiency
- Providing recommendations for contracting a local integrator for maintenance of the electronic security systems

Based on our analysis, we will provide a set of recommendations for the new system for the City to consider.

3.8 Security Assessment Draft Report

We will develop a draft report for City staff for review. Much of the content of this report will be developed during the previous tasks with the final content, recommendations, and appendices finalized in the draft report. The preliminary table of contents for the draft report may include:

- An executive summary
- An introduction with project scope, methodology and assumptions
- A findings summary with SWOT analysis
- A threat analysis
- A vulnerability assessment
- A consequence analysis
- A risk assessment summary
- An evaluation matrix ranking risk based on threat, vulnerability and consequence
- A prioritized set of recommendations with a focus on the security systems
- Rough-Order-of-Magnitude costs for the recommendations
- An implementation plan for short-term, medium-term and long-term improvements
- A schematic design for the physical system improvements
- An analysis and recommendations for a new, integrated Technology and Information System (TIS)
- A summary report of each identified facility which may include:
 - A description of the facility and its key functions
 - A threat analysis
 - A vulnerability assessment of each site
 - A consequence analysis
 - An risk assessment matrix
 - Site-specific recommendations for mitigation
- A set of appendices
 - A glossary
 - Detailed crime statistics

A sample table of contents is provided on the following page.

3.9 Security Assessment Draft Report Meeting

We will present the key elements of the draft report to City staff and other identified stakeholders in a virtual meeting. We will suggest that staff will have two weeks for review.

3.10 Security Assessment Final Report

Our team will incorporate any changes into the report and submit the final report to City staff for approval.

Deliverables

- Security assessment draft report
- Security assessment final report. The final report will be delivered in up to three (3) hard copies and digital format (PDF) on a USB drive

City of Redmond Building Security Strategic Plan November 15, 2023 | 41

| 3.1Findings Summary Chart383.2Threats413.3SWOT Analysis423.4Research584. RISK ASSESSMENT654.1Risk Tables664.2Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation664.3Cybersecurity Risk Assessment685. RECOMMENDATIONS735.1Physical Security Recommendations745.2Security Systems Recommendations925.3Cybersecurity Recommendations and Roadmap966. COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY1016.1Cost Estimate Assumptions1026.2ROM Cost Estimate102 | | Tab | le of Contents | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 11 Project Scope 10 13 Overall Approach 12 14 Findings 13 15 Recommendations 16 16 Cost Estimate 20 17 Implementation Plan 21 2. INTRODUCTION 24 A Comprehensive Approach 25 2.1 Project Scope 25 2.2 Project Mission, Coals and Objectives 27 2.1 Project Scope 25 2.2 Project Mission, Coals and Objectives 27 2.3 Overall Approach 30 2.4 A Comprehensive Approach to Physical Security 28 3.2 Project Assumptions 31 3.3 Throngs Summary Chart 38 3.4 Research 58 4.1 Rick Tables 66 4.2 Rick Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 72 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations and Roadmap 96 <t< th=""><th>1 FXFCUTIVE SUMMADY</th><th></th><th></th><th>10</th></t<> | 1 FXFCUTIVE SUMMADY | | | 10 |
| 1.2 Project Mission, Goals and Objectives 11 1.4 Findings 13 1.5 Recommendations 16 1.6 Cast Estimate 20 2. Implementation Plan 21 2. Implementation Plan 21 2. Project Scope 25 2. Project Mission, Goals and Objectives 27 2. Project Assumptions 28 2. Project Assumptions 29 2. Project Assumptions 20 2. Project Assumptions 21 2. Project Assumptions 21 2. Project Assumptions 21 2. Threads 41 3. SWOT Analysis 42 3. SWOT Analysis 42 3. SWOT Analysis 42 3. Cybersecurity Recommendations 74 3. Cybersecurity Recommendations 92 5. Project System Recommendations 92 5. Scott Estimate Assumptions 102 6. Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 7. Implementation Plan 103 5. Division 1 113 5. | | 11 | Project Scope | |
| 13 Overall Approach 12 14 Findings 13 15 Recommendations 16 16 Cost Estimate 20 17 Implementation Plan 21 2. INTRODUCTION 24 20 2. INTRODUCTION 24 20 2.1 Project Scope 25 2.2 Project Mission, Goals and Objectives 27 2.3 Overall Approach 28 2.4 A Comprehensive Approach to Physical Security 28 2.7 Project Assumptions 30 2.7 Project Assumptions 30 2.7 Project Assumptions 31 3.3 SWOT Analysis 41 3.4 Research 58 4.1 Risk Assessment 65 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations 74 3.2 Security Systems Recommendations 72 3.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations and Re | | | | |
| 1.5 Recommendations 10 1.6 Cost Stimate 20 1.7 Implementation Plan 21 2. INTRODUCTION 24 25 2.1 Project Xcope 25 2.2 Overall Approach 28 2.4 A Comprehensive Approach to Physical Security 28 2.5 Report Organization 30 2.6 Project Torcess 31 2.7 Project Tracess 32 3.0 27 Project Assumptions 31 3.1 Findings Summary Chart 38 3.2 Treast 41 3.3 SWOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 55 4.1 Risk Tables 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations 74 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6.4 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 Cost Estima | | 1.3 | | 12 |
| 1.6 Cost Estimate 20 1.7 Implementation Plan 21 2. INTRODUCTION 1 Project Ecope 25 2.2 Project Missin, Goals and Objectives 25 2.3 Overall Approach 28 2.4 A Comprehensive Approach to Physical Security 28 2.4 A Comprehensive Approach to Physical Security 30 2.5 Report Organization 30 2.6 Project Assumptions 31 2.1 Findings Summary Chart 38 3.2 Threats 41 3.3 SWOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 56 4.1 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Risk Assessment 50 5. RECOMMENDATIONS 74 5. Cybersecurity Risk Assessment 50 6. Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 7. Implementation Plan | | 1.4 | Findings | 13 |
| 1.7 Implementation Plan 21 2. INTRODUCTION 74 2.1 Project Mission Goals and Objectives 72 2.2 Overall Apprach 72 2.4 A Comprehensive Approach to Physical Security 78 2.5 Report Organization 30 2.6 Project Assumptions 31 2.7 Project Process 32 3.0 Vertal Info@g Summary Chart 78 3.1 Findings Summary Chart 78 3.2 Threats 78 3.4 Research 58 3.5 SWOT Analysis 41 3.6 Cybernecurity Recommendations 74 3.7 Project Status 66 4.1 Rick Tables 66 4.2 Skike Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybernecurity Recommendations 74 3.8 Security Systems Recommendations 72 3.9 Physical Security Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6.0 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6.0 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> | | | | - |
| 2. INTRODUCTION 24 2.1 Project Mission, Gols and Objectives 25 2.2 Overall Agroach 28 2.4 A Comprehensive Agroach to Physical Security 28 2.5 Report Organization 30 2.6 Project Assumptions 31 2.7 Project Assumptions 32 3.0 VERALL FINDINGS 32 3.1 Findings Summary Chart 38 3.2 Threats 41 3.3 SWOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 56 4.1 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.2 Sik Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Risk Assessment 68 5. RECOMMENDATIONS 74 5. Cybersecurity Recommendations 92 5. Cybersecurity Risk Assessment 68 6. Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6. Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 7. | | | | |
| 2.1 Project Scope 25 2.2 Project Mission, Coals and Objectives 27 2.3 Overall Approach 28 2.4 A Comprehensive Approach to Physical Security 28 2.5 Report Organization 30 2.6 Project Assumptions 31 2.7 Project Process 32 3.0 VERALL FINDINGS 37 3.1 Findings Summary Chart 31 3.2 Threats 41 3.3 SWOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 58 4. RISK ASSESSMENT 66 4.1 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations 92 5. Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 7. Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 51 Di | | 1.7 | Implementation Plan | 21 |
| 2.1 Project Scope 25 2.2 Project Mission, Coals and Objectives 27 2.3 Overall Approach 28 2.4 A Comprehensive Approach to Physical Security 28 2.5 Report Organization 30 2.6 Project Assumptions 31 2.7 Project Process 32 3.0 VERALL FINDINGS 37 3.1 Findings Summary Chart 31 3.2 Threats 41 3.3 SWOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 58 4. RISK ASSESSMENT 66 4.1 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations 92 5. Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 7. Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 51 Di | | | | 24 |
| 2.2 Project Mission, Coals and Objectives 27 2.3 Overall Approach to Physical Security 28 2.4 A Comprehensive Approach to Physical Security 28 2.6 Project Assumptions 31 2.7 Project Assumptions 31 2.7 Project Assumptions 32 3.0 Findings Summary Chart 38 3.1 Threats 41 3.2 SWOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 58 4.1 Risk Tables 66 4.2 Research 58 4. RISK ASSESSMENT 66 62 4.1 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.2 Site Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations 74 5.2 Security System Recommendations 74 5.2 Security System Recommendations 92 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 103 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 113 5.2 Division 1 <t< td=""><td></td><td>2.1</td><td>Project Scope</td><td></td></t<> | | 2.1 | Project Scope | |
| 2.4 A Comprehensive Approach to Physical Security 28 2.5 Report Organization 30 2.6 Project Assumptions 31 2.7 Project Process 32 3.0 Comprehensive Approach to Physical Security 38 3.1 Findings Summary Chart 38 3.2 Threats 41 3.3 SWOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 58 4.1 Risk Tables 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Risk Assessment 68 5. RECOMMENDATIONS 74 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 92 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations 92 6. Cost Estimate 102 6. Cost Estimate 102 7. Implementation Plan 108 8. InDivision 4 113 5.1 Division 2 113 5.2 Security Assessment Report 4 7. Mitision 3 113 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>Project Mission, Goals and Objectives</td><td>27</td></t<> | | | Project Mission, Goals and Objectives | 27 |
| 2.5 Report Organization 30 2.6 Project Assumptions 31 2.7 Project Process 32 3.0 VERALL FINDINGS 37 3.1 Findings Summary Chart 38 3.2 Threats 41 3.3 SWOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 38 4.1 Risk Roduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Risk Assessment 68 5. RECOMMENDATIONS 74 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations 92 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations 92 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations 92 5.4 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSENT REPORTS 113 5.1 Division 1 113 5.2 Division 2 113 5.3 Division 3 113 | | | | |
| 2.6 Project Assumptions 31 2.7 Project Process 32 3.0 VERALL FINDINGS 31 Findings Summary Chart 38 3.2 Threats 41 33 3.3 SVOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 58 4.1 Risk Tables 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Recommendations 74 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations 102 6.1 Cost Estimate 102 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.1 Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 51 Division 1 113 52 Division 3 | | | | |
| 2.7 Project Process 32 3.0 VERALL FINDINGS 31 Findings Summary Chart 38 3.1 Findings Summary Chart 38 3.2 Threats 41 3.3 SWOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 58 4. RISK ASSESSMENT 65 4.1 Risk Tables 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 5. RECOMMENDATIONS 73 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations 74 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations 92 5.4 Division 1 5.1 Division 1 | | | | |
| 3. OVERALL FINDINGS 31 Findings Summary Chart 32 3. 2 Threats 41 3.3 SWOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 58 4. RISK ASSESSMENT 65 4.1 Risk Tables 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations 74 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 92 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations 92 5.4 Cost Estimate 800 6. Cost Estimate Summary 96 6. Cost Estimate Summary 96 6. Cost Estimate 99 6. Cost Estimate 99 6. Cost Estimate 99 6. Cost Estimate 99 7. Implementation Plan 90 7. Implementation Plan 90 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 5.4 Division 1 113 5.4 Division 3 113 5.4 Division 4 113 5.5 Division 1 113 5.1 Division 1 113 5.2 Division 3 113 5.4 Division 1 113 5.5 Division 1 113 5.5 Division 1 113 5.6 Division 1 113 5.7 Division 1 113 5.8 Division 1 113 5.9 Division 1 113 5.0 Division 1 113 5.0 Division 1 113 5.1 Division 1 113 5.2 Division 2 113 5.2 Division 2 113 5.3 Division 3 113 5.4 Division 1 113 5.1 Division 1 113 5.2 Division 2 113 5.3 Division 3 113 5.4 Division 1 113 5.1 Division 1 113 5.2 Division 2 113 5.3 Division 3 113 5.4 Division 1 113 5.4 Division 1 113 5.5 Division 1 113 5.7 Division 1 113 5.8 Division 1 113 5.9 Division 1 113 5.9 Division 1 113 5.0 Division 1 113 5.0 Division 1 113 5.0 Division 1 113 5.1 Division 1 113 5.2 Division 2 113 5.3 Division 3 113 5.4 Division 1 113 5.5 Division 1 113 5.6 Division 1 113 5.7 Division 1 113 5.8 Division 1 113 5.9 Division 1 113 5.9 Division 1 113 5.9 Division 1 113 5.9 Division 1 113 5.0 Divis | | | | |
| 3.1 Findings Summary Chart 38 3.2 Threats 41 3.3 SWOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 58 4.1 Risk Rables 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Risk Assessment 68 5. Physical Security Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6. Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 103 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 5.2 Division 1 113 5.3 Division 4 113 5.4 Division 2 113 5.2 Division 3 113 5.4 Division 1 113 5.2 Division 1 113 5.3 Division 2 113 | | 2.1 | riojett riotess | 26 |
| 3.2 Threats 41 3.3 SWOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 58 4. RISK ASSESSMENT 65 4.1 Risk Tables 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Risk Assessment 68 5. RECOMMENDATIONS 73 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 74 5.2 Security System Recommendations 92 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6. Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 51 Division 1 113 52 Division 2 113 53 Division 4 113 54 Division 4 113 510 Division 7 35 52 Division 8 313 53 | 3. OVERALL FINDINGS | | | 37 |
| 3.3 SWOT Analysis 42 3.4 Research 58 4. RISK ASSESSMENT 65 4.1 Risk Tables 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Risk Assessment 68 5. RECOMMENDATIONS 73 73 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6. COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY 101 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 51 Division 1 113 52 Division 3 113 53 Division 4 113 54 Division 3 113 51 Division 4 113 52 Division 7 113 53 Division 1 113 51 Division 1 113 52 Division 1 113 53 Division 2 113 54 Division 1 113 51 Division 1 113< | | | | |
| 3.4 Research 58 4. RISK ASSESSMENT 65 4.1 Risk Tables 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Risk Assessment 68 5. RECOMMENDATIONS 73 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 92 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6. COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY 101 102 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 51 Division 1 113 52 Division 2 113 53 Division 3 113 54 Division 4 113 510 Division 1 113 511 Division 1 113 512 Division 1 113 513 Division 2 113 52 Division 3 113 53 Division 1 113 532 Division 1 113 533 Division 1 113 54 Division 2 116 < | | | | |
| 4. RISK ASSESSMENT 66 4.1 Risk Tables 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Cybersecurity Risk Assessment 68 5. RECOMMENDATIONS 73 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations 92 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations 92 5.4 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.1 Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 S1 Division 1 113 S2 Division 2 113 S3 Division 3 113 S4 Division 1 113 S1 Division 1 113 S1 Division 1 113 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | | | | |
| 4.1 Risk Tables 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6. COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY 101 102 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 S1 Division 1 113 S2 Division 3 113 S2 Division 4 113 S2 Division 3 113 S2 Division 3 113 S3 Division 1 113 S4 Division 1 113 S4 Division 1 113 S4 Division 1 113 S1 Division 1 113 S1 Division 1 113 S1 Division 1 113 S | | 3.4 | Kesearch | 86 |
| 4.1 Risk Tables 66 4.2 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 4.3 Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation 66 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6. COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY 101 102 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 S1 Division 1 113 S2 Division 3 113 S2 Division 4 113 S2 Division 3 113 S2 Division 3 113 S3 Division 1 113 S4 Division 1 113 S4 Division 1 113 S4 Division 1 113 S1 Division 1 113 S1 Division 1 113 S1 Division 1 113 S | 4. RISK ASSESSMENT | | | 65 |
| 4.3 Cybersecurity Risk Assessment 68 5. RECOMMENDATIONS 73 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations 92 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6. COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY 101 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 107 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 5.1 Division 1 113 5.2 Division 2 113 5.4 Division 3 113 5.4 Division 3 113 5.4 Division 3 51 5.5 Division 7 5.7 Division 8 5.8 Division 1 5.1 Division 4 5.4 Division 1 5.5 Division 2 5.5 Division | | 4.1 | Risk Tables | |
| 4.3 Cybersecurity Risk Assessment 68 5. RECOMMENDATIONS 73 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations 92 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6. COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY 101 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 51 Division 1 113 52 Division 2 113 53 Division 3 113 54 Division 4 113 51 Division 3 113 52 Division 1 113 54 Division 1 113 51 Division 3 113 52 Division 13 113 53 Division 13 113 54 Division 13 113 51 Division 13 113 51 Division 13 113 52 Division 13 113 51 Division 13 113 51 Division 13 113 | | | Risk Reduction Through Vulnerability Mitigation | |
| 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations 92 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 S1 Division 1 113 S2 Division 2 113 S3 Division 3 113 S4 Division 3 113 S4 Division 1 113 S1 Division 3 113 S4 Division 1 113 S1 Division 1 113 S4 Division 13 113 S1 Division 1 113 S1 Division 1 113 S1 Division 13 113 S1 Division 10 113 S1 Division 13 113 S1 Division 13 113 </td <td></td> <td>4.3</td> <td></td> <td></td> | | 4.3 | | |
| 5.1 Physical Security Recommendations 74 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations 92 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations and Roadmap 96 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations and Roadmap 96 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations and Roadmap 96 5.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 S1 Division 1 113 S2 Division 2 113 S3 Division 3 113 S4 Division 3 113 S1 Division 4 113 S4 Division 1 113 S1 Division 3 113 S1 Division 1 113 S1 Division 3 113 S4 Division 1 113 S1 Division 1 113 S1 Division 13 113 S1 Division 13 113 S1 | E DECOMMENDATIONS | | | 73 |
| 5.2 Security Systems Recommendations 92 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 S1 Division 1 113 S2 Division 2 113 S2 Division 4 113 S2 Division 3 113 S4 Division 4 113 S10 Division 1 113 S2 Division 3 113 S4 Division 1 113 S10 Division 1 113 S11 Division 1 113 S12 Division 1 113 S13 Division 1 113 S2 Division 1 113 S2 Division 1 113 S2 Division 1 113 S14 Division 1 113 S15 Division 13 11 S16 | D. RECOMMENDATIONS | 51 | Physical Security Performandations | |
| 5.3 Cybersecurity Recommendations and Roadmap 96 6. COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY 101 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 107 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 5.1 Division 1 113 5.2 Division 2 113 5.3 Division 3 113 5.4 Division 4 113 5.4 Division 4 113 5.5 Division 9 5.6 Division 7 5.7 Division 9 5.8 Division 9 5.9 Division 1 5.1 Division 1 5.1 Division 1 5.2 Division 1 5.3 Division 1 5.4 Division 1 5.5 Division 2 5.5 Division 1 5.5 Division 2 5 | | | | - |
| 6. COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 S1 Division 1 113 S2 Division 2 113 S3 Division 3 113 S4 Division 3 113 S4 Division 4 113 S S Execurity Assessment Report 4 S6 Division 7 S7 Division 8 S8 Division 9 S9 Division 1 S10 Division 1 S11 Division 1 S12 Division 2 S1 Division 2 S1 Division 1 S10 Division 1 S10 Division 1 S10 Division 1 S10 Division 2 S1 Division 3 S1 Division 3 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 3 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 3 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 3 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 3 S1 Division 4 S1 Div | | | | |
| 6.1 Cost Estimate Assumptions 102 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 107 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 S1 Division 1 113 S2 Division 2 113 S3 Division 3 113 S4 Division 4 113 S4 Division 4 113 S5 Division 8 S5 Division 9 S9 Division 13 S1 Division 13 S1 Division 13 S2 Division 13 S2 Division 13 S4 Division 4 113 S5 Division 13 S6 Division 13 S1 Division 20 S1 Division 13 S1 Division 20 S1 Division 12 S1 Division 20 S1 Division 13 S1 Division 20 S1 Division 14 S1 Division 20 S1 Division 13 S1 Division 20 S1 Division 14 S1 Division 20 S1 Division 14 S1 Division 20 S1 Division 13 S1 Division 20 S1 Division 14 S1 Division 20 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 20 S1 Division 20 S1 Division 20 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 32 S1 Division 4 S1 Division 6 S1 | | | - | |
| 6.2 ROM Cost Estimate 102 7. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 107 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 S1 Division 1 113 S2 Division 2 113 S3 Division 3 113 S4 Division 4 113 S4 Division 4 113 S5 Division 1 113 S4 Division 1 113 S5 Division 1 113 S6 Division 2 | 6. COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY | <i>C</i> 1 | Cost Estimato Assumptions | |
| Dystantial 107 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 S1 Division 1 113 S2 Division 2 113 S3 Division 3 113 S4 Division 4 113 S6 Division 7 113 S6 Division 7 113 S6 Division 8 113 S8 Division 1 113 S1 Division 4 113 S4 Division 4 113 S6 Division 7 113 S7 Division 8 113 S8 Division 18 113 S1 Division 13 113 S10 Division 13 113 S11 Division 13 113 S12 Division 13 113 S13 Division 13 113 S14 Division 12 113 S15 Division 12 113 S16 Location 60 Rail Operations Center S18 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | | | | |
| 7.1 Implementation Plan 108 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 S1 Division 1 113 S2 Division 2 113 S3 Division 3 113 S4 Division 4 113 Security Assessment Report 4 Security Assessment Report 5 Security Assessment Report 5 Security | | | | |
| 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPERATING DIVISION ASSESSMENT REPORTS 113 S1 Division 1 S2 Division 2 33 Division 3 S4 Division 4 Security Assessment Report 4 S6 Division 7 S7 Division 7 S7 Division 8 S8 Division 9 S9 Division 13 S1D Division 13 S1D Division 15 S12 Division 18 S13 Division 20 S14 Division 22 S16 Location 60 Rail Operations Center S18 Location 61 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9. APPENDICES 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | 7. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN | | | |
| S1 Division 1 113 S2 Division 2 113 S3 Division 3 113 S4 Division 4 113 Security Assessment Report 4 Security Colspan="2">Security Report 5 Site Division 13 Site Division 20 Site Division 20 Site Division 20 Site Division 60 Rail Opera | | 7.1 | Implementation Plan | 108 |
| S1 Division 1 113 S2 Division 2 113 S3 Division 3 113 S4 Division 4 113 Security Assessment Report 4 Security Colspan="2">Security Report 5 Site Division 13 Site Division 20 Site Division 20 Site Division 20 Site Division 60 Rail Opera | 8. INDIVIDUAL METRO OPFRATI | | ON ASSESSMENT REPORTS | 113 |
| S3 Division 3 113 S4 Division 4 113 Security Assessment Report 4 Security Colspan="2">Security Colspan="2">Security Colspan= 2 Security Colspan= 2 Site Assessment Report 515 Division 21 Site Assessment Report 52 Site Assessment Report 52 Site Assessment Report 52 S | | | | |
| S4 Division 4 113 Security Assessment Report 4 Security Report Securit Security Report </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>Division 2</td> <td></td> | | | Division 2 | |
| Security Assessment Report 4 S6 Division 7 57 Division 8 58 Division 9 59 Division 11 510 Division 13 511 Division 15 512 Division 18 513 Division 20 514 Division 21 515 Division 22 516 Location 34 Vernon Yard 517 Location 60 Rail Operations Center 518 Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9. APPENDICES 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | | |
| S6 Division 7 S7 Division 8 S8 Division 9 S9 Division 11 S10 Division 13 S11 Division 15 S12 Division 18 S13 Division 20 S14 Division 21 S15 Division 22 S16 Location 34 Vernon Yard S17 Location 60 Rail Operations Center S18 Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | S4 | Division 4 | 113 |
| S6 Division 7 57 Division 8 58 Division 9 59 Division 11 510 Division 13 511 Division 15 512 Division 18 513 Division 20 514 Division 20 514 Division 21 515 Division 22 516 Location 34 Vernon Yard 517 Location 60 Rail Operations Center 518 Location 60 Rail Operations Center 518 Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | C. | |
| S7 Division 8 S8 Division 9 S9 Division 11 S10 Division 13 S11 Division 15 S12 Division 20 S14 Division 21 S15 Division 22 S16 Location 34 Vernon Yard S17 Location 60 Rail Operations Center S18 Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9. APPENDICES 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | | |
| S8 Division 9 S9 Division 11 S10 Division 13 S11 Division 15 S12 Division 20 S14 Division 21 S15 Division 22 S16 Location 34 Vernon Yard S17 Location 60 Rail Operations Center S18 Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9. APPENDICES 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | | |
| S10 Division 13 S11 Division 15 S12 Division 18 S13 Division 20 S14 Division 21 S15 Division 22 S16 Location 34 Vernon Yard S17 Location 60 Rail Operations Center S18 Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | S8 | Division 9 |
| S11 Division 15 S12 Division 18 S13 Division 20 S14 Division 21 S15 Division 22 S16 Location 34 Vernon Yard S17 Location 60 Rail Operations Center S18 Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9. APPENDICES 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | | |
| S12 Division 18 S13 Division 20 S14 Division 21 S15 Division 22 S16 Location 34 Vernon Yard S17 Location 60 Rail Operations Center S18 Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9. APPENDICES 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | | |
| S13 Division 20 S14 Division 21 S15 Division 22 S16 Location 34 Vernon Yard S17 Location 60 Rail Operations Center S18 Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9. APPENDICES 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | | |
| S14 Division 21 S15 Division 22 S16 Location 34 Vernon Yard S17 Location 60 Rail Operations Center S18 Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9. APPENDICES 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | | |
| S15 Division 22 S16 Location 34 Vernon Yard S17 Location 60 Rail Operations Center S18 Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9. APPENDICES 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | | |
| S16 Location 34 Vernon Yard S17 Location 60 Rail Operations Center S18 Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9. APPENDICES 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | | |
| S17 Location 60 Rail Operations Center S18 Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way 9. APPENDICES 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | | |
| 9. APPENDICES 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | S17 | Location 60 Rail Operations Center |
| 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | S18 | Location 66 Light Rail Maintenance of Way |
| 9.1 Cybersecurity Report 9.2 High-Speed Vehicle Gates Examples 9.3 Cost Estimate Details 9.4 Detailed Research | | | 9. APPENDICES | |
| 9.3Cost Estimate Details9.4Detailed Research | | | 9.1 | |
| 9.4 Detailed Research | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | 9.4 | |

PRELIMINARY PROJECT SCHEDULE

| TASK MC | onths | | | | 1 | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| V | VEEKS | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | | 5 |
| TASK 0: PROJECT STARTUP | | | | | | | | |
| 0.1 REQUEST FOR BACKGROUND MATERIAL | | | | | | | | |
| 0.2 PROJECT KICKOFF MEETING | | | • | | | | | |
| TASK 1: EVALUATION | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 SITE AND FACILITY WALKS | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2 STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS | | | | | | | | |
| 1.3 DOCUMENT REVIEW | | | | | | | | |
| 1.4 RESEARCH | | | | | | | | |
| TASK 2: OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATION | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 FINDINGS (WITH ID OF LOCATIONS REQ. PHYSICAL DETER | RRENTS) | | | | | | | |
| 2.2 FINDINGS MEETING | | | | | | | | |
| TASK 3: FINAL REPORT | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 RISK ASSESSMENT | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 RECOMMENDATIONS | | | | | | | | |
| 3.3 SHORT AND LONG-TERM COSTS | | | | | | | | |
| 3.4 RISK ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP | | | | | | | | |
| 3.5 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN | | | | | | | | |
| 3.6 SECURITY SCHEMATIC DESIGN | | | | | | | | |
| 3.7 NEW TECHNOLOGY AND INFORMATION (TIS) ANALYSIS | | | | | | | | |
| 3.8 SECURITY ASSESSMENT DRAFT REPORT | | | | | | | | |
| 3.9 SECURITY ASSESSMENT DRAFT REPORT MEETING | | | | | | | | |
| CITY STAFF REPORT REVIEW AND COMMENT | | | | | | | | |
| 3.10 SECURITY ASSESSMENT FINAL REPORT | | | | | | | | |



TASK ESTIMATED TIME

SUBTASK ESTIMATED TIME

MEETINGS/PRESENTATIONS

CITY REPORT REVIEW ESTIMATED TIME

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0A400E6A-8197-44EE-9044-E2ECB646CD14

Claris Strategy



DocuSign Envelope ID: 0A400E6A-8197-44EE-9044-E2ECB646CD14

44 | Claris Strategy

City of Redmond Building Security Strategic Plan



Claris Strategy, working with our team, will develop a project management plan that clearly defines the methods for project execution and coordination. This plan will include an operations plan, communications plan and a QA/QC plan and will address the following items:

- An achievable, realistic schedule and a means for proactively addressing potential delays
- A detailed schedule that demonstrates the overall work approach identifying the critical path
- An organization chart that defines the key positions and an effective staffing plan that assigns the right staff to each project task

At the start of the project, the project manager, William Lim of Claris Strategy will refine the project roadmap for the project.

OPERATIONS PLAN

Resource Requirements and Planning

At the outset of the project, we will identify the required resources that match the project scope of services:

- A description of tasks required to develop the agreed upon services and deliverables
- A list of specific contract requirements which could impact the scope of services
- A clarification of services to be completed by the client or subconsultant

Budget

Upon the Notice to Proceed (NTP), Claris will develop a plan to monitor the project budget and schedule. The budget will:

- List project and task numbers
- List number of hours budgeted for each task
- List the budgeted expenses for each task
- Identify any limitations or special requirements relating to travel

A detailed estimate of progress made during each reporting period will be used to prepare status reports. Our team will reassess project progress during bi-weekly meetings to determine if we are within the approved budget and whether the approved schedule is being met. If we find that either one of those indicators is compromised, the Project Manager and Task Leads will take corrective measures and adjust resources as necessary. If there is a change in scope, we will closely communicate any issues with the City's Project Manager and work together to mitigate impacts.

Scheduling

We understand the importance of project schedules and timely delivery. We will use Microsoft Project to develop project resource loaded schedules. This schedule will include the following:

- Notice to proceed
- Request for information
- Project kickoff
- Site walks
- Research
- Intermediate milestones
- General and detailed assessments
- Recommendations
- Implementation plan
- QC reviews and resolution of comments
- Draft and final report deliverables
- City staff reviews

Detailed Work Plan

Our detailed work plan will include task definition, key project milestones and deliverables. We have provided a preliminary work plan in the following section.

Document Production

For the production of deliverables we will meet the quality standards of city documentation and will confirm the compatibility of the City's software requirements. We will:

- Confirm written, presentation and drawing document requirements
- Identify software to be used on the project and validation requirements

Subconsultant Management

Our Project Manager will provide close coordination with our subconsultant and will initiate and execute a document control process.

Project Technical Requirements

The Claris team will perform all services in compliance with any regulatory or policy requirements governing transit operations. We will address the following:

- A project technical approach
- Regulatory and security standards requirements governing the project
- Methodologies and assumptions
- Claris team and industry best practices
- Client directives

Risk Management Plan

Our team will manage risk by verifying that project deliverables and supporting documentation are complete and understandable, conform to applicable and reasonable standards relative to their intended purpose, and meet client and Claris requirements. We will:

- Identify critical risks which may impact successful project delivery
- Risk response strategy (avoid, transfer, mitigate or accept)
- Assign action items and track each risk

COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

We recognize that effective communication is critical to the successful delivery of any project. To that end, William Lim of Claris Strategy will be the primary point-of-contact with City staff. As required, we will hold regular meetings with the client and select staff to discuss project status, potential project constraints and opportunities in addition to agenda items dealing with project schedule, budget status and potential scope creep.

At the beginning of the project, we will:

- Confirm the individual(s) who will coordinate all communication from the client
- Identify the project team members who are authorized to submit requests for data, meetings or other information
- Describe how communication records shall be prepared and maintained
- Identify confidentiality requirements and restrictions

QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Although all team members are cognizant and responsible for the quality of their work, we will ensure that city quality standards are met by assigning a Quality Control manager.

Project Planning Review

The PM will schedule a planning review with the city project leadership to discuss and verify that contractual, business, and management issues have been adequately prepared and planned for prior to beginning project execution.

Risk Assessment

Risk assessments will be performed from the project development stage through the full execution of the project. Mitigation plans are developed and reviewed with senior management for projects with identified elevated risks.

QC Checking

The document originator and document checker will work together to verify the accuracy and completeness of written material, calculations, spreadsheets, and drawings.

QC Reviews

QC reviews are conducted as integral components of project activities as follows:

- 1. Conducted by experienced personnel who are not otherwise involved in producing the documents to provide impartial assessments.
- 2. Originator reviews the comments and makes necessary changes and additions to the original document.
- 3. QC Reviewer reviews the revised document and discusses comment resolutions with the Originator and/or PM.
- 4. PM reviews the QC review comments and revised document.

Project Reviews

Project reviews occur throughout project execution to facilitate communication between the PM and the project team. The status of the project is discussed along with areas where actions are required.

City of Redmond Building Security Strategic Plan November 15, 2023

PROPOSED FEE/COSTS

Exhibit C - Payment Schedule

PROPOSED FEE SUMMARY

| Tasks | Hours | Fee |
|--------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Project Management | 30 \$ | 6,750 |
| 0.0 Project Startup | 72 \$ | 12,600 |
| 1.0 Evaluation | 252 \$ | 43,350 |
| 2.0 Operational Considerations | 184 \$ | 32,700 |
| 3.0 Final Report | 452 \$ | 96,220 |
| Labor Hours an d Costs Total | 990 \$ | 191,620 |
| Other Direct Costs | | |
| Printing | \$ | 1,000 |
| Mileage | \$ | - |
| Car Rental/Transit/Ride Share | \$ | 1,122 |
| Flight | \$ | 1,700 |
| Lodging | \$ | 3,400 |
| Per Diem | \$ | 850 |
| Other Direct Costs Total | \$ | 8,072 |
| Total Fee | \$ | 199,692 |

PROPOSED FEE DETAIL

| Task Description | Project Manager | Security Systems Lee | Blast Mitigation and Technology SME | Physical Security Lead | Crime Statistics Analyst | Total Hours | Claris Strategy Total Fee | | KPJ Consulting | | Project Team Total Fee |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------|----------------|----------|------------------------|
| | William Lim | Lance Ferrell | Jaqueline Hickey | Tom LaFreniere | Lisa Garcia | Toi | Claris Str | | КРJ | | Project] |
| Billing Rates | \$225 | \$180 | \$180 | \$150 | \$150 | | | | | | |
| Project Management | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Management | 30 | | | | | 30 | \$ 6,750 |) \$ | - | \$ | 6,750 |
| SUBTOTAL | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | \$ 6,750 |) \$ | - | \$ | 6,750 |
| 0.0: Project Startup | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.1 -Request for Background Information | 4 | | | | | 4 | | | - | \$ | 900 |
| 0.2 -Project Kickoff Meeting | 6 | | | 2 | | 10 | \$ 2,010 | | - | \$ | 2,010 |
| 0.3 -Site Walk Preparation | 2 | 24 | 4 | 28 | | 58 | \$ 9,690 | | - | \$ | 9,690 |
| SUBTOTAL | 12 | 26 | 4 | 30 | 0 | 72 | \$ 12,600 |) \$ | - | \$ | 12,600 |
| 1.0: Evaluation | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | |
| 1.1 -Site and Facility Walks | 8 | | 47 | 47 | | 152 | \$ 26,310 | | - | \$ | 26,310 |
| 1.2 -Stakeholder Interviews | 16 | 4 | 4 | | | 24 | \$ 5,040 | | - | \$ | 5,040 |
| 1.3 -Document Review | 8 | | | | 00 | 8 | \$ 1,800 | | - | \$ | 1,800 |
| 1.4 -Research | 32 | 54 | F4 | 47 | 68 | 68 | \$ 10,200 \$ 43.350 | | <u>·</u> | \$ \$ | 10,200 |
| SUBTOTAL | 32 | 54 | 51 | 4/ | 68 | 252 | \$ 43,350 | 1 2 | - | 3 | 43,350 |
| 2.0 Operational Considerations 2.1 -Findings with ID of Locations Requiring Construction of Physical Deterrents | 20 | 68 | 38 | 48 | | 174 | \$ 30,780 |) \$ | | \$ | 30,780 |
| 2.1 -Findings with ID of Locations Requiring Construction of Physical Deterrents 2.2 -Findings Meeting | 20 | 2 | 2 | 40 | | 1/4 | \$ 30,780 \$ 1,920 | | - | ֆ \$ | 1,920 |
| 2.2 -Findings meeting SUBTOTAL | 24 | 70 | 40 | | 0 | 184 | \$ 32,700 | | - | ф ф | 32,700 |
| 3.0 Final Report | 24 | 10 | 40 | 50 | | 104 | φ <u>32</u> ,700 | , <u> </u> | | Ψ | 52,700 |
| 3.1 -Risk Assessment | 24 | 8 | 4 | 8 | | 44 | \$ 8,760 |) \$ | | \$ | 8,760 |
| 3.2 -Recommendations | 8 | | 16 | | | 82 | \$ 14,100 | | - | Ψ \$ | 14,100 |
| 3.3 -Short and Long-term Costs | 4 | 24 | 10 | 07 | | 28 | \$ 5,220 | | 10,000 | \$ | 15,220 |
| 3.4 -Risk Assessment Workshop | 8 | 4 | | 4 | | 16 | \$ 3,120 | | 10,000 | \$ | 3,120 |
| 3.5 -Implementation Plan | 16 | . 8 | | 8 | | 32 | \$ 6.240 | | - | \$ | 6.240 |
| 3.6 -Security Schematic Design | 16 | 20 | | | | 36 | \$ 7,200 | | - | \$ | 7,200 |
| 3.7 -New Technology and Information (TIS) Analysis | | 20 | | | | 20 | \$ 3,600 | | - | \$ | 3,600 |
| 3.8 -Security Assessment Draft Report | 80 | 24 | | 54 | | 158 | \$ 30,420 | | - | \$ | 30,420 |
| 3.9 -Security Assessment Draft Report Meeting | 8 | 4 | | | | 12 | \$ 2,520 | | - | \$ | 2,520 |
| 3.10 -Security Assessment Final Report | 16 | 8 | | | | 24 | \$ 5,040 | | - | \$ | 5,040 |
| SUBTOTAL | 180 | 144 | 20 | 108 | 0 | 452 | \$ 86,220 |) \$ | 10,000 | \$ | 96,220 |
| LABOR TOTAL | 278 | 294 | 115 | 235 | 68 | 990 | \$ 181,620 |) \$ | 10,000 | \$ | 191,620 |
| Other Direct Expense Detail | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Printing | \$ 1,000 | | | | | | | | | \$ | 1,000 |
| Car Rental/Transit/Ride Share | \$ 100 | | \$ 330 | | | | | | | \$ | 1,122 |
| Flight | \$ 400 | \$ 400 | \$ 500 | \$ 400 | | | | | | \$ | 1,700 |
| Lodging | \$ 400 | \$ 1,000 | \$ 1,000 | \$ 1,000 | | | | | | \$ | 3,400 |
| Per Diem | \$ 100 | \$ 250 | \$ 250 | \$ 250 | | | | | | \$ | 850 |
| | | | | | | | | | | \$ | - |
| EXPENSES TOTAL | \$ 2,000 | \$ 2,020 | \$ 2,080 | \$ 1,972 | | | Ŧ | - \$ | - | \$ | 8,072 |
| LABOR + EXPENSES TOTAL | \$ 64,550 | \$ 54,940 | \$ 22,780 | \$ 37,222 | \$ 10,200 | \$- | \$ · | - \$ | 10,000 | \$ | 199,692 |