

Joint Administrative Services Board
December 16, 2013 Regular Meeting 1:00 pm

At a regular meeting of the Joint Administrative Services Board held on Monday, December 16, 2013 at 1:00 pm in Berryville Clarke County Government Center Meeting Room AB, Berryville Clarke County Government Center, 101 Chalmers Court, 2nd Floor; Berryville, Virginia.

Members Present

Sharon Keeler; David Ash; J. Michael Hobert; Michael Murphy; Chip Schutte

Members Absent

None

Staff Present

Tom Judge; Gordon Russell, Ed Shewbridge, Lora Walburn

Others Present

None

1. Call to Order - Determination of Quorum

At 1:00 pm, Chairman Schutte called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of Minutes

Mike Hobert, seconded by David Ash, moved to approve the November 14, 2013 and November 25, 2013 meeting minutes as presented. The motion carried as follows:

David Ash	-	Aye
J. Michael Hobert	-	Aye
Sharon Keeler	-	Aye
Michael Murphy	-	Absent
Charles "Chip" Schutte	-	Aye

3. ERP System Procurement

a. Tyler Presentation

Tyler Technologies, Inc.
Munis Demonstration Agenda
Joint Government Center Conference Rooms
December 19, 2013

<u>Time</u>	<u>Application</u>
9:00 – 9:15	Introductions and Overview
9:15 – 10:30	GL/AP/Budgeting
10:30 – 11:00	Purchasing
11:00 – 12:00	HR/Payroll
12:00 – 1:00	Lunch
1:00 – 2:30	Tax Billing (RE and PP)
2:30 – 3:00	Business Licenses / Animal Licenses
3:00 – 3:30	Utility Billing
3:30 – 4:00	Permits / Code Enforcement
4:00 – 4:30	Cashiering

Mike Murphy, Rick Catlett, and Ed Shewbridge joined the meeting at 1:05 pm.

b. Trip to Staunton: who should go, dates available early in January.

Highlights of review include:

- Suggested tour dates: January 3, 9 or 10.
- Chip Schutte will not be available on those dates.
- IT Directors are encouraged to attend.
- Rick Catlett would prefer to meet with School officials.
- Renee Weir, School Administration Office Manager, will attend.
- David Ash, Sharon Keeler and Mike Hobert would like to attend.
- Sally Sheckels and/or Annette Gilley may attend.

c. Answers to queries

Tom Judge reviewed the following responses provided by Tyler.

Queries

The proposal addresses what we asked for, but some of what we asked for was to be sure we had room to grow, so we may need to prune a few things back in the near term.

1. I understand the difference between TCMSE and TCMEE, and I believe the Board will want the TCMEE, but what is the cost differential for both the SaaS and local server options?

\$11,000. Suggest we start with SE and upgrade to EE if we determine we need it.

2. What is the concurrent user calculation for the SaaS option? The numbers I provided in the RFP may not accurately represent what Tyler would define "concurrent user", and before I do the whole SaaS vs. Local Server Total Cost of Ownership calculation I'd like to be sure of the SaaS number.

32 concurrent users. Next step down is 16 (too little).

3. Is Tyler Forms a mandatory element, or only needed for custom forms? Our goal would be to use only Tyler's standard forms.

Mandatory to have it. They will need to customize certain forms like checks, invoices, etc. but we can minimize. They will only bill for what they actually do.

4. Is Tyler Reporting Services (SSRS?) a mandatory element, or only needed for custom reports? Is it included? Our goal would be to use only Tyler's standard reports.

Mandatory to have it. We can create our own custom reports, or pay them to do it, but they have many standard reports.

5. If we get Munis Permitting now, but want to extend the breadth of our land use applications in the future, would we get backed into EnerGov, and find our Munis Permitting license fee to be a sunk cost?

Tyler will credit any investment in their software toward investment in another type of their software sharing similar function, so no sunk cost.

6. I see that we will only be charged for the conversions we actually make. This is good because it's hard to know at this point. Is the same true of external system interfaces?

Yes.

7. FYI: We are trying to get an estimate of the reduced audit cost if we order your CAFR tool.

Awaiting word from auditor.

8. We currently license Versatrans. Will the Maplink GIS Integration extend to that application as well?

Versatrans will connect with ESRJ ArcInfo, but not through Maplink. Tyler will confirm this.

9. We don't want Performance Based Budgeting right now. Please confirm that it is not included.

Not included.

10. Can you provide an xls template for the TCO calculation between SaaS and local Server? There are a great many issues to consider, primarily in the ongoing costs like server license upgrades, disaster recovery, off-site backup, etc. There are a few templates on the web, but thought you might have something tailored to Tyler Munis.

Tyler is looking for this.

11. I will ask the Board about the Performance Bond requirement.

This is about \$15K. We should evaluate the risks and decide whether we want to insure the project.

12. There are substantial costs for "Software Modification Services" in the Cost section. It is our goal not to modify the software, but we need to understand what the tradeoff is if Tyler sees that our requirements are driving the need for modifications.

The requirements that drove the modifications do not appear to be critical. Suggest moving forward without modifications. In many cases Tyler provides another way to accomplish the same purpose. If it is truly necessary, another community will pay for the modification, and it will be rolled into our updates at no charge.

13. What's the difference between UB Interface and Utility Billing CIS? Is there an option to do one and not the other?

UB Interface merely provides for an automatic meter reader capability. Mike Legge is considering this need.

14. Tyler now has 20% of clients on SewS, expect 50% in the next few years. They don't push clients either way. No matter which way customers choose (SewS or Local Server), they will give you credit toward the other solution, if you switch Madison and Prince George Counties (Government and Schools) are currently using SaaS.

d. Reference checks.

Client Reference Localities: City of Staunton and Schools; Isle of Wight County and Schools, VA; Montgomery County and Schools, VA; Norfolk Schools, VA; Portsmouth, VA City and Schools

Additional Localities: Town of Leesburg; Madison County; Orange County; Prince George County; Alexandria.

- Tom Judge will develop a list of five to six questions.
- Tom Judge put forth that he could contact the listed localities or a group approach could be employed.
- Mike Murphy offered to make cold calls to Schools in the user localities.
- Gordon Russell suggested asking jurisdictions that have recently implemented Tyler Munis what lessons they learned, what to look for, and the cost of change order costs. The Board supported the proposed questions.
- Tom Judge will proceed with the client reference localities.
- Board members and IT staff will contact peers in the additional localities.

4. ERP Evaluation Consultant

The cost of the Scope of Work and contractual negotiations consultations is a flat fee \$18K. However, Tyler is accustomed to devising the draft scope of work using its management software and best practice, and as a large corporation, resists changes to its standard terms and conditions. Nevertheless Plante and Moran believes that there is value to their services even with Tyler, considering the likely duration and complexity of the contract. However, Plante and Moran suggests that they are willing to perform the services on a time and materials basis, which would leave Clarke in the position to manage the process to a smaller consultation cost. The goal is to get a draft contract to Plante and Moran by January 1. Should it be lump sum, or T&M?

Tom Judge opined that given the anticipated longevity and project scope it was prudent to employ a consultant.

Following discussion of its options, contracting with a consultant and whether the contract should be for time and material or lump sum, by consensus, the Board agreed to a lump-sum option with Plante and Moran.

5. Technology Governance

Update technology plan. Fiber Optic. Training.

Joint Technology Plan: Tom Judge asked the Board to supply him with any additional initiatives for the proposed update.

Fiber Optic: Gordon Russell provided an update on the fiber optic project. Highlights include:

- Extended existing structure under existing franchise agreement.
- A new 15-year franchise agreement is in process.

- Recommended pursuing a second fiber network with Shentel, who would like to partner with the County to run fiber to the Town of Boyce.
- A second system would enhance the network making it more robust and less prone to failure.
- Has not contacted REC regarding potential use of utility poles.
- Current cost to hang fiber on poles is \$60,000 per mile.

Training: Several training sessions on MicroSoft programs has been conducted at the high school.

6. Hybrid Plan

Reminder to consider revision of leave policies for members of this retirement group (employees brought into the system after 1/1/14).

Tom Judge advised that at 10 am Wednesday, December 18 VACo would be providing training on the new hybrid plan, including suggestions on leave policy revisions.

7. Pay and Classification Studies

A clerical error prevented Springsted from proposing to the School Division. As neither the Government nor the Schools have contracted at this point, but time is very short to dovetail with the FY 15 budget process, the Board should consider whether there is still a way to achieve the goal of establishing a common basis for the calculation of compensation.

Tom Judge asked the Board for direction on how to proceed.

Chip Schutte put forth that the School Board had voted to move forward.

Mike Hobert opined that this was a very unfortunate situation. He said that Constitutional Officers have complained of delays already and change at this point would result in further delay.

Mike Murphy covered the various options available to the Schools opining that the ideal would be using the same organization to evaluate both the County and Schools.

The Board agreed that timing was a major factor.

Tom Judge suggested that Mike Murphy and he review the RFP's; then, they could contact the higher ranking companies and solicit a cost proposal for adding the County to the proposal.

David Ash stated that for the County going with a different vendor would be a new project. He also noted that the Board of Supervisors had not discussed using someone other than the established vendor.

8. January Meeting Date

By consensus, the Board scheduled the January meeting for Monday, January 27, 2014 at 1 pm in Meeting Room AB. It further canceled the meeting scheduled for Thursday, January 23, 2014 in favor of the standard Monday meeting day.

9. Performance Evaluation

Mike Murphy noted various circumstances, including the recent inclement weather, that have impeded his ability to complete the Joint Administrative Services Director's evaluation. He stated that he had been communicating with David Ash and promised that a pdf of the evaluation for review by Mr. Ash, Sharon Keeler and Mike Hobert would be forthcoming.

Next Meeting

The next regular meeting is scheduled for January 27, 2014.

Adjournment

Chairman Schutte adjourned the meeting at 2:47 pm.

Minutes Recorded and Transcribed by Lora B. Walburn