



## Regional Business License and Permits Program

**\*\*Draft Minutes\*\***

### Regional Business License and Permits Program Oversight Group

**Thursday, December 10, 2020, 3:00 p.m.**

**Washoe County, NV**

**Meeting held via Teleconference**

#### Oversight Group Members

##### Oversight Group

City of Reno – Doug Thornley

City of Sparks – Alyson McCormick

Washoe County – Christine Vuletich

District Health – Kevin Dick

Douglas County – Tom Dallaire

### Agenda Items

**A. Call to Order, Roll Call and Introductions of Accela Regional Coordinating and Administrator teams (Non-action item)**

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m.

#### Present

- |                                 |                    |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| ● City of Reno                  | Arlo Stockham      |
| ● City of Sparks                | Alyson McCormick   |
| ● Washoe County                 | Christine Vuletich |
| ● Washoe County District Health | Kevin Dick         |
| ● Douglas County                | Ann Damian         |

Washoe County Deputy District Attorney Lindsay Liddell was also present.

**B. Public Comment (Non-action item) – 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).**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**C. Approval of December 10, 2020 Agenda** (For Possible Action)

Alyson McCormick, City of Sparks, moved to approve the agenda as written. Arlo Stockham, City of Reno, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

**D. Approval of the June 1, 2020 Minutes** (For Possible Action) – Committee members may identify any additions or corrections to the draft minutes as transcribed.

Kevin Dick, District Health, moved to approve the minutes as written. Arlo Stockham, City of Reno, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

**E. Introduction of New Oversight Members** (For Discussion Only)

Each of the Committee members introduced him/herself.

**F. Presentation, discussion and possible action to approve the Washoe County Comptrollers Financial Report dated December 10, 2020.** (For Possible Action)

Crystal Varnum, Washoe County Comptroller's Office, reviewed her report. She noted the FY21 subscription fees had been added and the City of Reno payment was expected soon.

Kevin Dick, District Health, moved to accept the report; Alyson McCormick, City of Sparks, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

**G. Presentation, discussion, and possible recommendation on the FY21-22 Budget for Accela Automation, Mobile and Citizen Access Annual Subscription fees not to exceed a total of \$530,000, that matches the 2019 budget request, apportioned per participating entity as follows:** (For Possible Action)

- 1.) Douglas County not to exceed amount of \$56,533.33;
- 2.) Health District not to exceed the amount of \$69,488.88;
- 3.) City of Reno not to exceed amount of \$179,022.22;
- 4.) City of Sparks not to exceed amount of \$100,111.11;
- 5.) Washoe County not to exceed the amount of \$124,844.46.

Lori Piccinini, Washoe County Technology Services, reviewed slides four and five of her presentation. The total subscription amount is expected to be no greater than budgeted for FY21. It is expected that due to downtime credits, the total amount invoiced will be less. Additional licenses have been requested for Health for response to COVID-19, the cost of which is not included in these amounts.

Alyson McCormick, City of Sparks, moved to approve the FY21-22 Budget for Accela Automation, Mobile and Citizen Access Annual Subscription fees not to exceed a total of \$530,000, apportioned per participating entity as follows:

- 1.) Douglas County not to exceed amount of \$56,533.33;
- 2.) Health District not to exceed the amount of \$69,488.88;
- 3.) City of Reno not to exceed amount of \$179,022.22;
- 4.) City of Sparks not to exceed amount of \$100,111.11;
- 5.) Washoe County not to exceed the amount of \$124,844.46.

Kevin Dick, District Health, seconded the motion. There was no response to the call for Committee or public comment. Upon a call for a vote, the motion carried unanimously.

**H. Presentation, discussion and possible action to approve the legal joinder of Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) to the Interlocal Cooperative Agreement Establishing the Regional Business License and Permits Program, pursuant to Article 13 of that agreement. Upon its joinder, TMFPD will have all rights, obligations, and liabilities as other entity members, including membership to the Oversight Group. TMFPD may use Accela for its own FIRE permits outside of the existing Washoe County Memorandum of Understanding and Building Permit process, per BCC and Fire board approval of their fee schedules. (For Possible Action)**

Lori Piccinini, Washoe County Technology Services, reviewed slides six and seven of her presentation. Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) has held five Accela back office licenses and four AMO licenses since go live and has been using Accela primarily for the Building permit review. In January 2021, they are planning to begin taking Fire Permit fees using the Fire Module of Accela which will lead to the addition of one to two new licenses over the course of the next few years. This proposed addition would not have a net impact on the fees or costs for any agencies and the licenses will continue to be paid out of the Washoe technology fee funds. This action is requested as TMFPD is a separate legal entity from Washoe County and is similar to how Douglas County was added to the regional platform.

Arlo Stockham, City of Reno, voiced support for the addition to licensing but had concern for the addition of TMFPD as a voting Committee member potentially providing Washoe County with the membership to dominate the other member votes. The Interlocal Agreement should be revisited and mirrored to other regional boards which have voting membership based on population or licenses to be the criteria for voting membership. Truckee Meadows Fire may have their own board, but that should not be the criteria for a voting Oversight board member. They are not a representative local government on other regional boards. He suggested either having the existing Washoe County representative be able to represent TMFPD or a possible increase in the membership for the City of Reno to two or more, considering the largest portion of licenses held by the City of Reno.

Mary Kandaras, Washoe County Deputy District Attorney for TMFPD, shared that TMFPD, as a political subdivision separate from Washoe County, would have interests that may not be consistent with Washoe County's. As TMFPD would be assuming the liabilities associated with the agreement, they should have the ability to have a voice in decisions. She noted that changes to the representation would require an amendment to the Interlocal and could be a lengthy process that could disrupt the planned 2021 roll-out. Christine Vuletich, Washoe County, shared concern that she would be able to adequately represent the interests of TMFPD.

Ms. Piccinini shared that Chief Way had expressed openness to have Washoe County represent TMFPD on this Committee.

Kevin Dick, District Health, shared concern that it may be disproportionate membership considering the number of licenses. At the inception of the Interlocal, the intent of the current language was for the addition of larger agencies such as other cities and counties and that it may now be appropriate to consider an amendment to create a threshold of licenses for membership.

Alyson McCormick, City of Sparks, voiced concern with the Committee having an even number of members and suggested additional time may be necessary for staff to review the options available to address the concerns raised.

Ms. McCormick moved to continue the item to a future meeting to allow staff to research and present options. Mr. Stockham provided the second. There was no response to the call for further Committee discussion or the call for public comment. Upon a call for a vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Quinn Korbolic indicated he would research the regional representation on other governing boards and provide information on other regional membership criteria.

**I. Each agency will discuss their roadmap for the Electronic Document Review process, and any software and/or process that any agency would like to implement. (For Discussion Only)**

- 1.) Rishma Khimji, Reno
- 2.) Teresa Parkhurst, Sparks
- 3.) Ann Damian, Douglas County
- 4.) Chad Giesinger, Washoe County
- 5.) Amber English, Health District

**1.) Rishma Khimji, Reno**

Ms. Khimji expressed that the City of Reno was considering the solutions for an Electronic Document Review (EDR) system but had not yet settled on one. The focus was to identify the one best able to provide for the individualized needs of the City of Reno, while taking into consideration the need for an interface for the Health. The Accela-Adobe solution had been in place for many months but was no longer sufficient. While not opposed to having all partners using the same vendor, the hope was that each would have a separate contracts, terms, and scope of work.

**2.) Teresa Parkhurst, Sparks**

Ms. Parkhurst shared the City of Sparks had also been using the Accela-Adobe solution and after going through several demos had decided to move forward with the ePermit Hub Software plug-in solution which will provide a more seamless experience by adding tabs to the Accela screens rather than opening in a new platform. It will eliminate the need for customers to look in multiple locations for comments, allows for plan review comments to be answered in the ACA, has the ability to combine documents that are added separately and recognize issues with signatures and document protections. The product has been

successfully tested for the interface with Health. The item is planned to be considered by the City Council December 14, 2020, with a \$60,000 upfront cost with on-going costs based on the number of plans processed.

Kevin Dick, District Health, voiced concern with impacts and complications created for the Health District staff if multiple platforms were in place.

### **5.) Amber English, Health District**

Ms. English expressed the importance of a regional approach to the Health staff. There was concern with staff having to learn multiple platforms. The Accela-Adobe solution has proved to be laborious requiring staff to duplicate efforts with the need to correspond with the applicant by either email or letter. She noted the options had been reviewed and the ePermit Hub seemed to be the best for the Health staff.

### **3.) Ann Damian, Douglas County**

Ms. Damian shared that due to the lower volume of permits processed by Douglas County, it didn't make sense to pursue an EDR program. Douglas County had been using Digiplan that provided a direct connection to Accela and had a minimal implementation cost due to an existing relationship with Truepoint. Due to the considerable on-going costs, however, they were now considering BlueBeam, a product that contractors were already familiar with. BlueBeam provides three price tiers and will provide for considerable savings.

### **4.) Chad Giesinger, Washoe County**

Mr. Giesinger shared that Washoe County Building and CSD had reviewed the option and also liked the ePermit Hub solution. Given the move toward not accepting paper plans it was a high priority to get an enhanced system in place. He noted that his understanding was different workflows wouldn't create issues. Ms English expressed that Health has considered staying with the Accela-Adobe solution for comment relay if complications were to arise from multiple, non-compatible systems.

[Kevin Dick left at 4:00 p.m.]

## **J. Each agency will provide a status update on the Accela move to the new Hosted Azure Platform project September 1, 2020, including any highlights of issues, performance, problems, and successes. (For Discussion Only)**

- 1.) Rishma Khimji, Reno
- 2.) Teresa Parkhurst, Sparks
- 3.) Ann Damian, Douglas County
- 4.) Chad Giesinger, Washoe County
- 5.) Amber English, Health District

### **1.) Rishma Khimji, Reno**

Ms. Khimji shared that the move to the Azure platform had not been as seamless as had been promised. She acknowledged the accommodation to delay the move until the beginning of September but expressed dissatisfaction with the ongoing issues related to accessing documents, business activity interruptions, the ability to take payments, receipt functionality, and reporting. While Accela support was made available and was responsive, it was not the seamless transition that was promised, and the agency was not provided an option not to move to the new platform.

## **2.) Russ Elder, City of Sparks**

Mr. Elder stated agreement with Reno's comments adding issues with payments, and on-going duplicate email and reporting issues. Of considerable impact has been the increased frequency and timing of the maintenance, often multiple times per week occurring between 7 p.m. and midnight.

## **3.) Ann Damian, Douglas County**

Ms. Damian shared the sentiments that the transition had not been seamless. As Douglas County was not using the ACA they did not experience the multitude of issues the other agencies had experienced. There were mapping issues that had still not been resolved.

## **4.) Chad Giesinger, Washoe County**

Mr. Giesinger expressed agreement with the earlier comments. He acknowledged the accommodation to move the go-live date which allowed for more testing. Though not a seamless transition, major issues were avoided due to the increase in testing before go-live.

Ms. Piccinini noted that while anticipated, improved performance had not been an expected result of the change. The concerns had been brought to the vendor's attention, especially with the downtime experienced in the evening hours. The system is contracted to maintain 99.9% uptime with less resulting in downtime credits.

## **5.) Amber English, Health District**

Ms. English agreed with not seeing an improvement in performance and attributed the ability for testing in advance to minimize issues. She expressed issue with the COVID unit needing to be down for three days and with the evening hours being used for downtimes. Approximately 30-50% of tests are scheduled between 5 p.m. and midnight and often staff is entering information after hours.

## **K. Announcements/Reports/Updates (For Discussion Only) - 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.**

Amber English, District Health, provided a brief update on the Accela COVID module. The module went live in early May, with an approximate 60,000 tests scheduled since go-live and now scheduling 750 test per day, 5 days per week. Additional licenses have been added to support the testing activities. The module has helped move from an entirely manual process to one that has been flexible and responsive to the ever-changing and expansive needs of the Health District. Enhancements have included that ability to send emails for notification of positive test results and include results for Influenza A & B, the ability to modify lab slips to increase testing capabilities and streamlining reporting. A future enhancement focuses on the interface with labs.

Christine Vuletich, Washoe County, expressed appreciation for the success and increased

functionality and efficiency especially considering this was not the intended purpose of the module.

Lori Piccinini, Washoe County Technology Services, shared that members of her team had participated in the Accela Virtual Conference in October 2020 which allowed for exposure to the vendors and functionality possible with the Electronics Document Review.

- L. Identification of Oversight Group future agenda items** (For Possible Action) - No discussion among Committee members will take place on this item. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 2, 2021, at 2:30 p.m.; meetings may be scheduled as needed.

There were no objections to Ms. Piccinini' s question about scheduling a Special Meeting, possibly in January, once staff was able to draft potential options for addressing the concerns noted with TMFPD membership. DDA Liddell shared she would work with TMFPD DDA Kandaras to address the concerns.

- M. Public Comment** (Non-action item) – 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).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

- N. Adjournment** (Non-action item)

The meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m.