



Regional Business License and Permits Program Oversight Group

****Draft Meeting Minutes****

**Friday, February 10, 2023, 11:00 a.m.
Reno, Nevada**

This meeting was held via teleconference.

Oversight Group Members

City of Reno – Jackie Bryant
City of Sparks – Alyson McCormick
Washoe County – Chad Giesinger
District Health – Kevin Dick
Douglas County – Tom Dallaire

Committee website: [Regional Business License and Permits Program Oversight Group \(Accela\) \(washoecounty.gov\)](https://www.washoecounty.gov/technology/board_committees/regional_license/index.php)
https://www.washoecounty.gov/technology/board_committees/regional_license/index.php

AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Determination of a Quorum [Non-action Item]

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m.

Present

- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|
| • City of Reno | Daniela Monteiro |
| • City of Sparks | Lisa Hunderman |
| • Douglas County | Tom Dallaire |
| • Washoe County | Chad Giesinger |
| • Washoe County Health District | Erin Dixon |

Washoe County Deputy District Attorney Brandon Price was present.

2. 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. However, action may not be taken on any matter raised during this comment period until the matter is specifically listed on an agenda as an action item. Each person addressing the Oversight Group shall give their first and last name. Comments are to be made to the Oversight Group as a whole.

There was no response to the call for public comment; none was submitted prior to the meeting.



QUALITY
PUBLIC SERVICE



INTEGRITY



EFFECTIVE
COMMUNICATION

3. Approval of February 10, 2023, Agenda [For Possible Action]

Tom Dallaire, Douglas County, moved to approve the February 10, 2023, agenda. Daniela Monteiro, City of Reno, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee discussion or public comment. Upon a call for a vote, the motion carried unanimously.

4. Approval of the September 13, 2022, Minutes [For Possible Action] – Committee members may identify any additions or corrections to the draft minutes as transcribed.

Lisa Hunderman, City of Sparks, moved to approve the September 13, 2022, minutes as written. Tom Dallaire, Douglas County, provided the second. There was no response to the call for Committee discussion or public comment. Upon a call for a vote, the motion carried unanimously.

5. NCR Payment Processor Contract Update [For Possible Action] – A review and discussion of current transaction fees of 2% plus \$.0.25 for debit/credit card processing and eCheck processing for Accela online business, and NCR's proposed rate changes of 2.75%. Possible direction to staff may include direction to accept rate increases proposed by NCR; to move forward with a Request for Quote or Request for Proposal process for alternate vendors for either a combined agency or individual agency solution; and/or to identify possible vendors and expected implementation costs to move to another vendor.

Sharmin Kamal, Washoe County Technology Services, reviewed the [presentation](#) for this item (slide two) providing the proposed rate increases, noting the contract was up for renewal in October 2023.

Daniela Monteiro, City of Reno, shared the City of Reno has started looking at pricing for other vendors and spoke in favor of each jurisdiction negotiating with vendors separately. It was clarified that while the interface can support multiple vendors, a change to one other than NCR will result in implementation fees for Gray Quarter to incorporate the new vendors. There was discussion around recommending each agency negotiate separately.

Daniela Monteiro, City of Reno, moved that each individual agency negotiate and separately enter into an agreement with the payment vendor of their choice. Lisa Hunderman, City of Sparks, provided the second. There was no response to the call for public comment or further committee discussion. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

6. Regional Technology Fee [For Possible Action] - A review and discussion of continuing collection of the Regional Technology Fee and if so and the length of time such fees would be collected. Possible direction to staff may include direction to continue collecting Regional Technology Fee at \$4 for annual business licenses, \$2 for quarterly business licenses, and 4% of the total permit cost for all other permits (air quality, building, engineering, environmental health, planning and utility); to reduce collection rates; and/or to discontinue collection of Regional Technology Fee.

Sharmin Kamal, Washoe County Technology Services, reviewed the [presentation](#) for this item (slide three) providing the recommended five-year review of the technology fee originally implemented to recover the capital overlay costs for the project and now used to pay the annual subscription amounts and provide for additional program support. The original go-live was in October 2016 so the original five-year term would have concluded in October 2021.

Daniela Monteiro, City of Reno, spoke in favor of discontinuing the regional fee and rather incorporating application support and improvements into the regular fee schedule which would allow each partner to review and adjust annually as part of the budget process.

Lisa Hunderman, City of Sparks, asked if this Committee was the appropriate one to consider this item considering the original technology fee would have been implemented by each agency's governing body. There was discussion of discontinuing the regional fee and recommending each agency review and pursue a method for fee implementation; there was note that the current regional fee hasn't and may not be adequate for full recovery of expenses every year.

Daniela Monteiro, City of Reno, moved to recommend each agency make a determination if want to continue or discontinue Regional Technology Fee and provide that recommendation to each respective governing body. Chad Giesinger, Washoe County, seconded the motion. There was no response to the call for public comment or further committee discussion. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

- 7. Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Budget** [For Possible Action] – Presentation, discussion and possible action to recommend that the FY23-24 Budget for Accela Automation, Mobile and Citizen Access Annual Subscription fees, licenses, Enhanced Reporting Database (Washoe County, Washoe County Assessor's Office, Health District, City of Sparks, City of Reno), and Gray Quarter (Washoe County, Health District) be apportioned per participating agency as follows:
- a.) Douglas County not to exceed amount of \$72,000;
 - b.) Health District not to exceed the amount of \$100,000;
 - c.) City of Reno not to exceed amount of \$250,000;
 - d.) City of Sparks not to exceed amount of \$115,000; and
 - e.) Washoe County not to exceed the amount of \$140,000.

Sharmin Kamal, Washoe County Technology Services, reviewed the [presentation](#) for this item (slide four) providing an overview of the proposed FY24

Chad Giesinger, Washoe County, shared the Accela Regional Coordinating Team (ARC) had met to review the proposed budget prior to December to ensure agencies had a number to submit as part of the budget process for FY24. He moved to recommend the FY24 Budget for Accela Automation, Mobile and Citizen Access Annual Subscription fees, licenses, Enhanced Reporting Database (Washoe County, Washoe County Assessor's Office, Health District, City of Sparks, City of Reno), and Gray Quarter (Washoe County, Health District) be apportioned per participating agency as recommended by staff. Tom Dallaire, Douglas County, seconded the motion. There was no response to the call for public comment or further committee discussion. Upon a call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

7. **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. However, action may not be taken on any matter raised during this comment period until the matter is specifically listed on an agenda as an action item. Each person addressing the Oversight Group shall give their first and last names. Comments are to be made to the Oversight Group as a whole.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

8. **Adjournment** [Non-action Item]

The meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m.

Draft