



Regional Business License and Permits Program

~~Draft Minutes~~

**Regional License and Permit Program
Oversight Group Special Meeting
May 21, 2019 ~ 9:00 a.m.**

**Washoe County Administrative Complex
1001 E. Ninth Street, Reno
Building C, Central Conference Room
Washoe County, Nevada**

Oversight Group

Reno City Manager – Sabra Newby
Sparks City Manager – Neil Krutz
Douglas County Community Development – Tom Dallaire
Washoe County Manager – John Slaughter
Washoe County District Health Officer – Kevin Dick

A. Roll Call: City of Reno, Bill Thomas
City of Sparks, Lisa Hunderman
Douglas County, Ann Damian (phone)
Washoe County, Craig Betts
Washoe County District Health, Kevin Dick

City of Reno: Michael Chaump, Kim Jolly, Rishma Khimji, Michael Telliano, Julie Towler, Calli Wilsey

City of Sparks: Michelle Harper

Washoe County: Charlene Albee, Paul Burr, Sara DeLozier, Kari Estrada, Stephan Hollandsworth, Lori Piccinini

B. 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).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

C. Approval of the Agenda – May 21, 2019 (For Possible Action)

Proposed Motion: Approve agenda as written; to open and consider Items F, G, and H together)
Motion: Bill Thomas
Second: Craig Betts
Ayes: Unanimous

D. Approval of Minutes – December 4, 2018 (For Possible Action)

Proposed Motion: Approve agenda as written
Motion: Bill Thomas
Second: Craig Betts
Ayes: Unanimous

E. Welcome new Oversight Members and Accela Regional Coordinating Team update on members.

Tom Dallaire for Douglas County, and Neil Krutz for City of Sparks were announced as new members. Lori Piccinini, Washoe County, reviewed the current members of the Accela Regional Coordination (ARC) and Accela Regional Administrator Teams (slide 3 of presentation).

[Items F, G, and H were opened together.]

F. Presentation, discussion, and possible action on Washoe County Purchasing’s RFP-3080-19 E-Payment Vendor for Accela Regional Permits and License Program, including recommending that Washoe County award a contract to Jetpay for e-payment processing. (For Possible Action)

G. Presentation, discussion, and possible action on recommending each Participating Entity to enter a separate contract or joinder with Jetpay for e-payment services based on Washoe County’s contract with Jetpay, and whether the contracts’ terms should be three or five years. (For Possible Action)

H. Presentation, discussion, and possible action regarding recommending rejecting all bids for Washoe County’s RFP 3080-19 E-Payment Vendor for Accela Regional Permits and License Program and issuing an RFP (Request for Proposal) for an e-payment vendor that allows vendors to bid on discrete portions of the work and allows Washoe County to award a contract to multiple bidders. (Possible Action)

Lori Piccinini, Washoe County, began with a review of slides four through ten. She provided an overview of the request for proposal process, timelines and responses. She covered the challenges and issues with the current systems and the anticipated benefits of selecting a new e-payment processor. After reviewing the three bids received, the E-payment Committee was recommending selection of the lowest bidder, Jetpay. Ms. Piccinini reviewed the vendor pricing and potential savings based on past volume. She noted that all responses to the RFP included three- and five-year term options and that Item H provided an option to reject all bids and issue a new RFP.

Bill Thomas, City of Reno, expressed concern that the original mission to better serve customers and realize efficiencies had not been realized with the current configuration requiring considerable staff time to investigate and correct mischarges and mismatched data. The City of Reno would prefer to select a payment provider and integrator separately in order to focus on the translation between the Accela system and the payment processor. City of Reno counsel had advised that the option to reject all bids and issue a new RFP would be the preferred action to accomplish this.

There was discussion about the ability to award the bid to Jetpay and select separately the integrator; it was pointed out that the multiple opinions about what was permissible within the confines of the current RFP were part of the concern in moving forward with the recommended payment processor at this time. Mr. Thomas raised concern with the liability to the other jurisdictions if the current agreement were to hold harmless the master agreement signatory (Washoe County).

Ms. Piccinini indicated the RFP did not allow for award to multiple bidders which would have provided the flexibility to select the processor from one bid and the integrator from another. She had inquired but did not think it was likely the current vendor would agree to a month-to-month agreement; the integration process was expected to take approximately six months. Stephan Hollandsworth, Deputy District Attorney, Washoe County, cautioned that should a one-year contract be entered into with the current vendor, any actions to implement a new payment processor would need to maintain the spirit of the original contract to avoid concerns of good faith and fair dealing.

It was not certain if there was room to negotiate the integrator if Jetpay was selected. In order to maintain the regional platform, each jurisdiction would need to use the same integrator; though, each could have its own payment processor. There was concern that there would be a breach of the RFP if all jurisdictions did not go with the same payment processor.

Anne Damian, Douglas County, shared they were currently without a payment processor and were not interested in entering into a single-year contract with ACI OPC, and would be subject to their new payment structure if they did. ACI OPC had agreed to renew for the existing customers for one year at the existing rates.

Mr. Thomas indicated he would not be able to vote toward selecting a vendor from the current RFP process with the City of Reno preferring to first select the integrator and then the processor and considering the other concerns previously mentioned. If the group were to move forward with a selection, the City of Reno would pursue options for an integrator that would work for them with the potential that the result would merge at a later point with the direction of the other jurisdictions. Reno staff would be willing to revisit to vendor selection if outstanding questions and concerns could be resolved by the June 4, 2019, meeting.

Item F – Craig Betts, Washoe County, moved to recommend moving forward with an award of the RFP to the recommended e-payment processor, Jetpay; Lisa Hunderman, City of Sparks, provided the second. Upon a call for a vote, the motion carried four in favor, Bill Thomas, City of Reno, opposed.

Item G – Ms. Piccinini shared next steps would include negotiations with Jetpay and establishing a plan for an integrator. Washoe County would then take the items forward to the Board of County Commissioners for review and approval. Each of the jurisdictions would then

have the option to either joiner with Washoe County's contract or enter separate ones. All jurisdictions would need to be in alignment on the term of the contract. Ann Damian, Douglas County, moved to select a five-year term; Craig Betts, Washoe County, provided the second. The motion carried four in favor, Bill Thomas, City of Reno, opposed.

Item H – There was no action taken on Item H of this agenda.

I. 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. (For Discussion Only)

J. Identification of future agenda items for the next quarterly meeting of the Oversight Group on June 4, 2019, at 2:30 p.m. or the date of the next meeting. (For Possible Action)

- Subscription true-up update
- Payment processor and integrator
- Updated ARC agreement
- Suggestions to update the interlocal

K. 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).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

L. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 9:51 a.m.