



DRAFT MINUTES

**Regional License and Permit Program  
Oversight Group Quarterly Meeting  
June 6, 2017**

**Washoe County, NV – Caucus Room,  
2nd Floor Building A  
Washoe County Administrative  
Complex  
1001 E. Ninth St, Reno**

**Oversight Group**

Reno City Manager - Sabra Newby  
Sparks City Manager - Steve Driscoll  
Washoe County Manager– John Slaughter  
District Health Officer - Kevin Dick

- A. Roll Call:** Reno City Manager - Sabra Newby  
Sparks City Manager - Steve Driscoll  
Washoe County Proxy - Christine Vuletich,  
Assistant County Manager  
District Health Officer - Kevin Dick

Need listing somewhere in here about who was present from staff (per OML).

- B. Public Comment:** None.

**C. Approval of the Agenda: June 6, 2017 (For Possible Action)**

A motion was proposed to amend the order of agenda items to move up item H “Presentation, discussion and possible direction to staff regarding performance report, etc.” ahead

**Proposed Motion:** Approve moving agenda item H between E and before item F and remaining items will remain as otherwise agendized.

**Discussion:** Mr. Dick stated that he believed it would be beneficial to hear first about the performance and credit memo as it relates to item F regarding the unused portion.

**Mover:** Kevin Dick  
**Second:** Sabra Newby  
**Ayes:** [Unanimous]

**D. Approval of Minutes: March 7, 2016 (Special Meeting) (For Possible Action)**

**Proposed Motion:** Move to approve the minutes as presented.

**Mover:** Steve Driscoll  
**Second:** Sabra Smith Newby  
**Ayes:** [Unanimous]

**E. Presentation, discussion, and possible direction to staff** regarding Oversight Group authority, and staff and legal counsel involvement, as pertaining to actions and decisions of the Fiscal Manager pursuant to the Interlocal Cooperative Agreement dated June 17, 2014 **(For Possible Action)**.

Kim Jolly, ARC member for City of Reno, formally asked that in all matters which change the jurisdictions obligations, whether financial or not, an opportunity for legal review be provided to all jurisdictions, not simply Washoe County's.

Discussion followed.

Steve Driscoll suggested discussing with staff operating teams what is considered an operational vs. policy decision, and agreed that policy decisions should remain with the Oversight Group. Mr. Driscoll added that at any time, working within the allowance of the rules open meeting laws, the Oversight Group can be brought together to discuss matters..

Joined the meeting: Audrey Zuro & Chris Alderson, Accela

**Proposed Motion:** Staff from involved jurisdictions are consulted on any changes to the operations of this Accela Project and that policy decisions then be brought back before this board.

**Mover:** Sabra Newby  
**Second:** Steve Driscoll  
**Request for discussion:**

Steve Driscoll clarified his understanding is that the Oversight Group is responsible for overall policy of the entire system, and to the extent that there are minor operational changes that the individual teams can work with, those teams should be very cognizant of where policy starts to get involved requiring oversight at this level.

The Oversight Group is available on an as-needed basis rather than held to quarterly meetings. Mr. Driscoll asked if this clarification was the intent of the motion.

Kevin Dick asked if this would create any change to the existing Interlocal Agreement.

Kim Jolly reiterated that the City of Reno and Sparks' legal teams should be review all contracts and change orders even if a change order results in no additional financial obligation.

Steve Driscoll cited the interlocal agreement, page 5 of 23, Article 4 - Administration, Section 4.1.; and opined that it is important for staff to understand which decisions should come to the Oversight Group and the high level managers assigned to the ARC and ARA teams should understand.

Mr. Dick agreed with Mr. Driscoll's clarification of the interlocal agreement and Christine Vuletich stated her opinion that the clarifications are reasonable.

Sabra Newby, Reno City Manager asked what the proper course of action should be if there is confusion or disagreement amongst ARC members on whether an item is policy and should go to Oversight.

Mr. Dick suggested that the ARC member should notify their Manager that they believe it is policy and for the member to call a Special Oversight Meeting

Sabra Newby agreed with the clarification.

**Ayes:** [Unanimous]

Breaking from the original agenda order as previously moved.

**(item was taken earlier after item E) H. Presentation, discussion and possible direction to staff** regarding 1) Follow-up from the March 7, 2017 Oversight agenda item of requested Monthly Performance Report per Accela Regional Permits and License Contract dated June 17, 2014 and 2) Presentation of Credit memo process and Credit memo(s) issued by Accela for performance shortcomings **(For Possible Action)**.

Lori Piccinini, Washoe County, illustrated pages 7-8 of the distributed PowerPoint presentation and stated agencies are still seeing unplanned down times and Accela issued a credit in the amount of \$3,524.56 to be applied toward the annual subscription per contract.

Chris Alderson and Audrey Zuro, Accela, stated that Accela's Cloud Operations Director is taking action to analyze all of the time frames noted and has not yet

identified any non-standard performance but is looking into any opportunities for optimization. Ms. Zuro indicated that research provided thus far by jurisdictional technical teams continues to be very helpful, and requests continuing specifics that will assist them in discovering and remediating downtimes.

Christine Vuletich asked for the average uptime percentage to which Lori Piccinini replied approximately 99.81% in December.

A discussion followed regarding setting a policy for current and future performance rebates and a motion was made to set policy.

**Motion:** Based on the report that Accela has provided to us that they are investigating (mobile) functionality with no answer to that and we relied on functionality as shown in the demonstrated environment, but it did not work in test or production, that part of the invoice should be set aside until the research is finished by Accela and our team has a chance to double-check what we believe the contract said of our reliance in the demo environment for that print capability that the Health Department needed for legislative dictated purposes.

**Mover:** Steve Driscoll  
**Seconded:** Christine Vuletich  
**Ayes:** [Unanimous]

- F. F. Presentation, discussion, and possible direction to staff** of 1) Financial Report, to include the remaining Accela contractual items; 2) Approval of FY17-18 Accela Automation, Mobile and Citizen Access Annual Subscription fees and jurisdiction costs totaling \$354,670.32 apportioned costs per agency Washoe \$100,147.42, Reno \$127,193.24, Sparks \$73,766.52, Health \$49,799.94 and Mobile license unused accounts \$3,763.20; and, 3) Review the Amendment to the Accela Contract revising the monthly subscription process (**For Possible Action**).

**(1) Financial Report, to include the remaining Accela contractual items**

Regarding the Credit Memo process request from Steve Driscoll, City of Sparks: There was discussion amongst the Oversight members and Lori Piccinini regarding the credit memo and current and future rebates based on performance. It was moved that all current and future rebates from the vendor due to performance of Accela be put into the total as a whole, and used by the total as a whole for the good of operations and maintenance. All in favor.

Financial Report illustrated by Crystal Varnum, Washoe County, who asked about the credit and whether it would apply to future Capital costs or Operation Subscription Fees.

Steve Driscoll clarified the motion for item H as Operational funds to fund ongoing Operations.

Chair Kevin Dick asked for any discussion needed on this item or disagreement with the clarification as stated.

Christine Vuletich agreed and added that if sometime in the future, the amount built up and there was a need to move those funds to capital, the Oversight Group could always make a decision to allocate a special use to capital. Ms. Varnum will add the total of rebated funds to future financial reports.

**Motion:** Approve the financial report as presented by the Washoe County Comptroller's Office regarding the four entities.

**Mover:** Steve Driscoll

**Second:** Sabra Newby

**Ayes:** [Unanimous]

**F. (2) Approval of FY17-18 Accela Automation, Mobile and Citizen Access Annual Subscription fees and jurisdiction costs totaling \$354,670.32**  
apportioned costs per agency Washoe \$100,147.42, Reno \$127,193.24, Sparks \$73,766.52, Health \$49,799.94 and Mobile license unused accounts \$3,763.20

Lori Piccinini brought attention to PowerPoint page 4, Attachment B, "Approval of the FY17-18 Annual Subscriptions Year 4". Ms. Piccinini stated the increase of \$72,705.60 is due to increase in user licenses and back office licenses and the \$3,763.20 called out in the report as "additional" is a bound cost for the mobile licenses. Ms. Piccinini requested action on payment to Accela in the amount of \$351,145.76 with the information provided.

Kevin Dick reported that Accela originally demonstrated compatibility and charged for the ability of the system to work as a mobile application. The Health Department originally paid for mobile subscriptions for several years and purchased tablet computers, however in the live environment the product does not work and/or print in the field. As a condition of the contract we are considered responsible for payment however, Mr. Dick stated his opinion that \$3,763.20 should be withheld from payment because Accela has not delivered the product.

Mr. Driscoll recalled part of original contract included the ability to use the field licenses and print in the field however Accela was never able to successfully implement the product in production therefore, in his opinion, Accela should agree to write off the charge since the product no longer exists through no fault of the Health Department.

Audrey Zuro, Accela, spoke with the product manager Mark Albrecht after he was on site this winter and reported that their ongoing investigation of the Health Department's mobile license function remains inconclusive. Mr. Albrecht indicated to Ms. Zuro that with 2 updates coming out in the next 6-10 weeks, Accela is hoping the updates will correct the mobile application product and Accela hopes to provide the services the Health Department requests. Accela is

currently reviewing the contract to determine the obligation to pay for licenses/functionality not provided.

Mr. Driscoll asked Ms. Zuro if Accela acknowledges that the mobile application worked in the test environment but does not work in live, to which she replied that she was not on the project during that time and did not have an answer.

Kevin Dick clarified his original statement to indicate that the mobile application was showcased in the original product demonstration, not the test environment and then asked Ms. Zuro if the system owners will to be held responsible for disappearing functionality.

Ms. Zuro opined that Accela will address disappearing functions individually and make refund decisions based upon the criteria: product customization vs original product, in an effort to provide the best possible product.

Sabra Smith Newby indicated that during her tenure with Clark County she experienced several credits issued to Clark County during their \$12 million dollar Accela project implementation and she remains hopeful that Accela will credit Washoe County also.

**Motion:** Based on the report that Accela has provided to us that they are investigating (mobile) functionality with no answer to that and we relied on functionality as shown in the demonstrated environment, but it did not work in test or production, that part of the invoice should be set aside until the research is finished by Accela and our team has a chance to double-check what we believe the contract said of our reliance in the demo environment for that print capability that the Health Department needed for legislative dictated purposes.

**Mover:** Steve Driscoll

**Secunder:** Sabra Newby

**Ayes:** [Unanimous]

### **F. (3) Review the Amendment to the Accela Contract revising the monthly subscription process**

Lori Piccinini illustrated PowerPoint page 5 and indicated that the Board of Washoe County Commissioners Chair approved the amendment.

Sabra Newby stated that the action by the BCC before coming to Oversight Group underscores the previous point made that policy decisions, such as this, contracts, must come first to the Oversight Group for legal review and approval per the interlocal agreement policy.

Kevin Dick mentioned that he was briefed by the ARC team and concurred. It is important for to make sure our ARC team is briefing back to the oversight group with these issues.

Mr. Driscoll indicated appreciation for the comments made, and stated that he objects to the amendment as written adding that it is estimated costs will continue to increase and he would prefer amendments to indicate February 1 as the true-up deadline for all future periods in order to receive the dollar amounts by March 1, with invoice in June to be paid within the first 15 days of July. Mr. Driscoll requested that the amendment be changed to February 1 annual true-up for all future periods.

Discussion followed and Mr. Driscoll again requested initial rough costs in December with final true-up by February 1 to allow for the City Council to approve any increase during the budget process.

Mr. Dick agreed with Mr. Driscoll.

**Motion:** Move to finalize negotiation on this amendment with Accela with a change in the date in paragraph, changing May 1, to February 1, and allowing the rest of the amendment to stay in place as currently negotiated.

**Mover:** Steve Driscoll

**Second:** Sabra Newby

**Ayes:** [Unanimous]

Mr. Driscoll clarified that this new true-up date procedure would start February 1, 2018.

**Agreed by consensus.**

Lori Piccinini will work with Audrey Zuro, Accela, to prepare an amendment to the amendment.

**G. Presentation, discussion, and possible approval of the request by Douglas County, NV to join the Regional Project** per the Interlocal Cooperative Agreement dated June 17, 2014 including review of financial obligations by Douglas County; impacts and cost savings for the project as a whole; and potential cost savings and impacts to individual participating agencies (**For Possible Action**).

Dave Lundergreen and Sherri McGee from Douglas County were introduced by Lori Piccinini.

Mr. Lundergreen stated that Douglas County is seriously interested in joining the interlocal agreement and implementing the Accela product. Douglas County has been looking for several years, entertained several vendors and took their first look at Accela a couple of years ago. Douglas County staff attended a live demonstration in Sparks, watched webinars, and met with TruePoint two weeks ago getting an estimate for transfer of data. They have funding for set up and go

live. Douglas County is looking at 10 licenses and 8 months at best to get up and running, or possibly a little longer and later will need 40 licenses and possibly 10 mobile licenses. Staff is prepared to take it to their board in July to seek approval.

Responding to capacity questions, Chris Alderson from the AccelaCloud Operations Team added Douglas County will not have additional impact or cause degradation to the system/speed if they joined into our Super-Agency model.

Mr. Driscoll asked, that since GIS is used in the product, has GIS been discussed with Douglas County and Accela?

Craig Betts answered that Douglas County and Washoe County GIS Managers have discussed connectivity and each system will consume data.

Lori Piccinini added that Douglas County could also be separate from our instance of GIS.

Mr. Dick and Mr. Driscoll recalled that this project originally came out of the shared services group and part of the discussion was to establish a web based regional platform consistent with the establishment of an Interlocal Agreement and asked if Douglas County has reviewed the Interlocal Agreement.

Mr. Lundergreen replied that indeed, Douglas County staff and their attorney have reviewed the interlocal agreement.

Kevin Dick asked if discussions have begun to determine allocated cost/contingency fund and any changes to each entity and whether consideration of contingency funding is appropriate. He also asked what path would be taken to include Douglas County.

Paul Burr opined that the contingency funding was strictly related to the Implementation project and that it would not be applicable to Douglas County since they have hired Truepoint for Implementation.

**Motion:** Move approve Douglas County joining July 1, 2017 into the Regional Permits Interlocal Agreement and make appropriate changes to add a new member as this action does not dilute current management oversight and adding Douglas County to this group is welcomed. Help them move along and clean up the details legally.

**Mover:** Steve Driscoll

**Second:** Sabra Newby

**Ayes:** [Unanimous]

- I. **Presentation, discussion, and possible direction to staff** regarding status on Regional Business License and Permit Platform post October 31, 2016



Go-Live; to include outstanding implementation issues which are Accela's responsibility and transition plan (**For Possible Action**).

Lori Piccinini presented PowerPoint page 9 which demonstrated there are only 3 remaining deliverables from the Accela implementation which was an improvement from the March meeting of 5 deliverables. Once these deliverables are signed we will release retention payments. The 3 remaining deliverables are:

- Silverflume Interface – Accela basic connectivity tests; then Internal Staff will complete
- Administrative Enforcement interface
- Move to CRC; no issues for 2 weeks

With 9.1 Release June 1, staff will be testing Silverflume interface again and are hopeful for resolutions and new functionality and Accela is ready to deliver the Administrative Enforcement interface in June.

Mr. Driscoll stated that with the exception of Silver Flume which is out of our control, Accela's intent to finish is clear and he would like to see payment made and no remaining deliverables by the next meeting.

### **Agreed by consensus**

**J. Announcements/Reports/Updates** - Oversight Group member announcements/reports/updates from members concerning the regional business license and permits project. Requests for information and any ideas and suggestions for the project.

Kevin Dick requested that the ARC team look at the possibility of Reno and Sparks collecting the development fees on behalf of Washoe County Health District (WCHD) as these records are created by those entities and WCHD is just a reviewer no different than a building permit. He was requesting Accela be used as much as possible at the regional level and noted Washoe County Planning was already collecting these fees at this time. By improving this process, we will save the citizen and staff time for having to duplicate these processes or have the citizen go to two agencies. He asked for this to be explored by ARC through Health working with Sparks and Reno with an update at the next Oversight Meeting.

– Collection of fees and workflow for plan review through community development Reno and Sparks current process is Accela is being used for fee application but Health District fee is not being collected for Health. One issue was the 4% tech fee and now that figure is rolled into the total fee this year. Sparks collected through Accela

Separate check to Health, need another record type, clunky process now. How to handle fee, automation of workflow. Meetings going on with Martini and Reno, would like a status update.

**K. Identification of future agenda items for the quarterly meeting of the Oversight Group on September 5, 2017 (For Possible Action).**

**L. Public Comment** – Comments heard under this item will be limited to three (3) minutes per person and may pertain to matters both on and off the agenda. Each person addressing the Oversight Group shall give his name and shall limit the time of their presentation to three (3) minutes per NRS 241.020(2)(d)(7).

**None.**

**M. Adjournment (For Possible Action).**

**Mover:** Steve Driscoll  
**Second:** Christine Vuletich  
**Ayes:** [Unanimous]