DRAFT MINUTES

Regional License and Permit Program
Oversight Group Meeting
Tuesday, March 1, 2016

City of Sparks Training Room
431 E. Prater Way
Sparks, NV 89431

Oversight Committee
Reno City Manager – Andrew Clinger
Sparks city Manager – Steve Driscoll
Washoe County Manager – John Slaughter
District Health Officer – Kevin Dick

Steve Driscoll, Sparks City Manager, chaired the meeting with a call to order.

A. Roll Call

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
~~Andrew Clinger~~ (Bill Thomas, Proxy)	Reno City Manager	Present	
Kevin Dick	District Health Officer	Present	
Steve Driscoll	Sparks City Manager	Present	
John Slaughter	Washoe County Manager	Present	

B. Public Comment

No action was taken on this item.

C. Approval of the Agenda – March 1, 2016

Proposed Motion: Approval so moved.

Mover:

Seconder:

Result: Approved [Unanimous]

AYES: [Unanimous]

D. Approval of the Minutes from the January 21, 2016 meeting

Proposed Motion: Kevin Dick requested a modification and moved to accept the minutes with to modification on the second to the last paragraph on Page 2 where it references "if the project falls more than 5% behind on either side…" to be changed to "if the project falls more than 5 days behind of Critical Paths ".

> **Proposed Motion:** Approval so moved.
> **Mover**: Steve Driscoll
> **Seconder**: John Slaughter
> **Result**: Approved [Unanimous]
> **AYES**: [Unanimous]

E. **Review of Critical Path Items in the revised Project plan**

Christine Herb, Accela VP reported that from the January 21st Special Meeting, the Oversight Group requested a review of the Critical Path items. Also, the status of the Critical Path items in a revised Project Plan dated February 22, 2015. The following table identifies the status of the deliverables associated with a go-live date of August 22, 2016. Christine Herb reviewed this document (see attached) by Line Item. She reviewed Previously Completed through Progress Payment #6. Update on Progress Payment #7 "Train the Trainer" will be when they will be looking at finishing up the end user training, create end user materials, and have Accela give guidance on these.

Mr. Driscoll asked why Train the Trainer is not listed as a Critical Path. He explained Train the Trainer in this configuration is critical to the on-going success of this program and asked why would it not be on its own as a Critical Path element. Peri Halliwell explained the scheduling is being worked on currently to make sure it is done appropriately based on the User Acceptance Testing report prior to all the testing having to take place. It is not Critical Path because it is being scheduled in a way that doesn't impact the end date. It's not that it is not a Critical Path, it is a Critical Task, but it does not impact Critical Path for the implementation date at the end of the project. Ms. Halliwell continued to explain they anticipate scheduling the Train the Trainer sessions approximately in late April or May 2016.

Mr. Driscoll is concerned Train the Trainer should be labeled as a Critical Path and not a Critical Task. He opened this up for discussion. Bill Thomas wanted clarification as far as if Train the Trainer is not completed by three weeks before the go-live date, then it is considered a Critical Path. Ms. Halliwell concurred. She further stated Train the Trainer has multiple purposes and objectives. People will need to be trained before the User Acceptance Testing. There will be multiple sessions, all the documentation will need to be in place and everything else is pulled in together.

Mr. Driscoll doesn't disagree with the assessment and the timeframe. He is concerned that Train the Trainer is on the Critical Path.

Kevin Dick agrees with Mr. Driscoll and Mr. Thomas in that this should fall in line as a Critical Path. His concern is if the schedule reflects people will be trained as trainers by end of July will there now be enough time to train the end users before the go-live date. Ms. Halliwell noted that currently Train the Trainer is scheduled for the first week of June 2016. She also stated that in addition to

that specific task there are also tasks with the Regional Coordination Team to make sure the training plan across the agencies are also in place.

Mr. Driscoll ended the discussion with Trainer the Trainer should be considered a Critical Task and where ever it lands on the schedule it should be focused on by all parties of the project. Ms. Halliwell also suggested she and Lori Piccinini will flag it as well.

Ms. Peri Halliwell updated the Group on Progress Payment #8 by saying the User Acceptance Testing is scheduled for August which should be completed in May 2016. They anticipate several rounds which labels it a Critical Path item.

Also noted as a definite Critical Path is moving Reno to the Cloud because that item needs to stay on track for everything else to fall in place. It was noted that moving Reno to the Cloud has stopped as of February 1st when the issue was reported to Accela and they have been unable to fix this issue. It was suggested this be a warning item for now. The Oversight Committee wanted to clarify that the teams should understand this is not a "yellow" item but most definitely a "red" item. The Committee views this as a problem.

Mr. Driscoll wanted clarification as it relates to the schedule. He understands from his updates with the Sparks team that March is a month where this project is critical because there is a lot going on and many pivotal points for the entire project which wrap around the things that are contemplated for March; not all of which are listed. He does not see one Critical Path item being satisfied during that period. He has concerns that milestones and Critical Tasks as well as Critical Paths may not be as solid as they should. He stated this document appears to have flexibility and negotiability in it which is unacceptable and did not vote on.

Secondly, as a comment, the Sparks team has expressed to him there will be three runs that are necessary to complete Items #10 and #14. While we have done the first run; there are issues that still aren't resolved in the first week of March. Therefore, the ability to complete runs 1, 2, and 3 on time are highly suspect. He is concerned because those runs of the conversion directly affect Washoe County and the City of Reno.

Mr. Thomas asked if it is possible to work on one entity at a time instead of trying to do all agencies at once. It may run smoother if one agency is worked on solely and completed and then move on to the next agency until completed. He also asked for the status of #16.

Christine Herb reported that scripting is a different piece and involves different staff and multiple different resources. There was a 2-3 week hold and the project line was readjusted.

The go-live date was confirmed to be August 22nd by Ms. Halliwell.

Proposed Motion: Moved to approve and accept the report on Critical Path and to note the two required requested adjustments from the Board being Item #26 for May and Item #28 in the month of July.
Mover: John Slaughter
Seconder: Kevin Dick
Result: Approved [Unanimous]
AYES: [Unanimous]

F. **Updates on Board and Council Dates and any Council Action for Change Order**

1. **2/22/16 City of Sparks Council Date**
    Mr. Driscoll reported that while the elected officials were unanimous in their support, they were also similar in their comments about the criticalness of this project and the need for the community that will use this project, they are as concerned as their Manager is about the fact that this project is very fragile, it is struggling to the point of teeter-tottering on failure and that having to understand that a change order was necessary for all of the reasons we stated, while they accepted it, they made it very clear there will not be another. The go-live date is the Council's expectations and they will not be accepting anything that goes down that date unless Spark's specifically has created the problem. Should that happen, Mr. Driscoll stated he will need to find another funding source.

2. **2/24/16 City of Reno Council Date**
    Bill Thomas reported that the current Council was not the Council that started the regional business license, while they're well in agreement with the concept; they have concerns about whether our regional project is dragging down.

G. **Demonstration and discussion of Shopping Cart functionality from latest 8.0.1 version**
    Ms. Piccinini gave out handouts on the revised Shopping Cart functionality. She explained each of the web pages and how they work. Though Shopping Cart is completed, all of the configurations will not be completed until the end of March.

    Mr. Dick commented that he is pleased with the progress. Ms. Piccinini demonstrated the Road Map which will help in applying for many permits within the system. She stated all the items on the Road Map have been delivered.

    Proposed Motion: Moved to approve the report of the latest Shopping Cart functionality.
    Mover: Bill Thomas
    Seconder: John Slaughter

    There was clarification that the motion reflects only accepting the report.

    Result: Approved [Unanimous]
    AYES: [Unanimous]

H. Contract status for ePayment credit card provider Official Payments Corporation (OPC)

Ms. Piccinini noted the contracts went to the government agencies. Mr. Thomas stated Reno is set for March 23rd.

I. Announcements/Reports/Updates

There were no announcements, reports or updates.

J. Identification of future agenda items

Mr. Dick clarified the next meeting will be in three months which would be in June. There was discussion on scheduling a Special Meeting to get an update sooner. Mr. Thomas suggested having another meeting before the next scheduled meeting. Mr. Driscoll noted that March is a pivotal month for this project.

Proposed Motion: Motion to have the Washoe County Team do an assessment and provide information to the others.

There was discussion on having a Special Meeting in early April.

Mover: John Slaughter
Seconder: Bill Thomas

Discussion: Mr. Thomas suggested seeing Reno going to the Cloud and he would like to see the status of Critical Path items done monthly. Mr. Driscoll suggested having the report given to the Team and not just the Managers.

Result: Approved [Unanimous]
AYES: [Unanimous]

K. Public Comment

There was no Public Comment.

L. Adjournment

Proposed Motion: Motion to adjourn
Mover: Bill Thomas
Seconder: Kevin Dick
Result: Approved [Unanimous]
AYES: [Unanimous]