

**IcMillan, Acquanette (Netta)**

**From:** humaira afzal  
**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2026 3:00 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** public comment on item 19 - Motorola Contract (June 8 City Council meeting)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] [Learn why this is important](#)

[ ! ] **CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

City Council Members,

I have written previously about Motorola Solutions problematic relationship with the Department of Homeland Security. Rather than repeat those concerns, I am focusing on issues raised by the June 8 staff report regarding the proposed contract with Motorola Solutions. Pasadena is one of the thousands of municipalities across the United States that has indefinitely locked itself into a Motorola Solutions based infrastructure for public safety communications. I urge city council members to acknowledge this, address how the City got itself in this situation, commit to avoiding future contractual and interagency arrangements that are based on infrastructure controlled by one or a few companies, and work towards extracting itself (and the ICI) from its dependence on Motorola Solutions products.

The central message of the June 8 Department of Information Technology report on the proposed contract with Motorola Solutions is that the City cannot realistically move away from Motorola because it is part of the Interagency Communications Interoperability (ICI) System, which has a "cumulative investment exceeding \$230 million in Motorola infrastructure." The issue is not that Pasadena is part of an integrated system, but that this shared regional infrastructure is dependent on ONE company.

The high-switching cost is by design. Motorola Solutions has for decades set up emergency radio networks that utilize specialized encryption and proprietary software protocols that force government entities to continue buying Motorola hardware to ensure system compatibility. Motorola has also encouraged cooperative purchasing contracts in order to avoid standard bidding processes. These cooperative contracts may speed up procurement processes, but they have also enabled Motorola to become the single vendor dominating public-safety communications infrastructure and it has facilitated the circumvention of fair-market bidding. The contract under review by City Council today is just another example of that. [With Friends in Government, Motorola Beats a Path to Telecom Supremacy](#), an article from 2014, explains how Motorola was already pursuing industry dominance by questionable means over a decade ago. the situation has only gotten worse.

Government officials – ranging for city councils to federal agencies – have been handing Motorola lucrative, noncompetitive contracts for decades. As a result, cities like Pasadena now find themselves essentially locked into long-term (if not permanent) systems that are dependent on Motorola infrastructure. This has almost certainly been at the cost of the most efficient use of government dollars because contracts tied to a monopoly in an industry are never a good deal. It has also enabled Motorola to continue acquiring more and more companies in order to dominate additional sectors (such as drones for the public safety sector).

I urge City Council to commit to stop feeding the Motorola profit machine. In addition to a history of problematic business practices (such as providing communications equipment to apartheid South Africa police or making bomb fuses for the Israeli military, or providing communication and surveillance equipment to DHS), Motorola has monopoly control over our regional public safety communications equipment (and more). This doesn't have to be permanent, but it will continue unless our City's leaders acknowledge the problem and commit to addressing it. We have a multitude of other community needs that are not being met because of the inefficient

use of city funds in noncompetitive, monopolistic contracts. "Deals" offered by monopolies are only good for the companies like Motorola that exercise control over an industry.

Regards,

Humaira Afzal, PhD

District 7

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.