

NEVADA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES (NACO)

Board of Directors' Meeting

March 24, 2017, 9:30 a.m.

NACO Office

304 S. Minnesota Street

Carson City, NV 89703

AGENDA

Some NACO Board members may attend via video link or phone from other locations. Items on the agenda may be taken out of order. The NACO Board may combine two or more agenda items for consideration. The NACO Board may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

Call to Order and Roll Call

1. Public Comment. Please Limit Comments to 3 Minutes.
2. Approval of Agenda. **For Possible Action.**
3. NACO President's Report.
4. NACO Executive Director's Report.
5. Approval of Minutes of the February 17, 2017 NACO Board of Directors Meeting. **For Possible Action.**
6. Presentation on the Benefits of Partnering with SilverFlume Nevada's Business Portal.
7. Update and Possible Action regarding the Phase-out of Advanced Data Systems used by Nevada's Counties. **For Possible Action.**
8. Presentation on Nevada Division of Environmental Protection - County Coordination in 2017.
9. Update on the Governor's Task Force for the Regulation and Taxation of Marijuana Act.
10. Update and Possible Action regarding Proposed Legislative Measures, Budget Requests and NACO Priorities for the 2017 Legislative Session. **For Possible Action.**

Note: The NACO Board of Directors May Interrupt the Open Meeting and Exclude the Public from the Meeting for the Limited Purpose of Receiving the Information and for Deliberation Relative to Agenda Item #11(d) below:

11. Update and Possible Action Regarding Public Lands and Natural Resources Issues Including:
 - a) BLM's Proposed Sagebrush Focal Area Withdrawal Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
 - b) Update on Pending Public Lands Legislation.
 - c) The U.S. Department of the Navy's *Fallon Range Training Complex Modernization: Expansion of Land Ranges, Airspace Modifications, and Public Land Withdrawal Renewal Environmental Impact Statement*, and the U.S. Air Force's *Notice of Intent to Prepare a Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for the Nevada Test and Training Range Military Land Withdrawal at Nellis Air Force Base.*

d) Litigation

- NACO's Efforts Seeking to Compel the U.S. Bureau of Land Management to Comply with the Provisions of the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act.
- The Center for Biological Diversity's Lawsuit against the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Seeking to Vacate their Decision not to List the Bi-State Sage Grouse as an Endangered Species and NACO's Motion to Intervene on behalf of the F&WS.
- The BLM's and U.S. Forest Service's Greater Sage-Grouse Resource Management Plans including the Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief Filed by the State of Nevada and Seven Nevada Counties, and Recent Implementation Training. **For Possible Action.**

12. NACO Committee of the Emeritus Update.

13. National Association of Counties and Western Interstate Region Board Member Updates.

14. NACO Board Member Updates.

15. Public Comment - Please Limit Comments to 3 Minutes

Adjournment.

Members of the public who are disabled and require special accommodations or assistance at the meeting are requested to notify NACO in writing at 304 S. Minnesota Street, Carson City, NV 89703, or by calling (775) 883-7863 at least three working days prior to the meeting.

Members of the public can request copies of the supporting material for the meeting by contacting Amanda Evans at (775) 883-7863. Supporting material will be available at the NACO office and on the NACO website at: www.nvnaco.org

This agenda was posted at the following locations:

NACO Office 304 S. Minnesota Street, Carson City, NV 89703

Washoe County Admin. Building 1001 E. Ninth Street, Reno, NV 89520

Clark County Admin. Building 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89155

POOL/PACT 201 S. Roop Street, Carson City, NV 89701

The following links and/or pages are support for agenda
Item 5

NEVADA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES (NACO)

Board of Directors' Meeting

February 17, 2017, 9:30 a.m.

This meeting will be conducted via video and teleconference

Members of the public can participate in the meeting at the

NACO Office

304 S. Minnesota Street

Carson City, NV 89703

UNADOPTED MINUTES

Attendance: Elko County Commissioner Dahl, Washoe County Commissioner Herman, Esmeralda County Commissioner Bates, Douglas County Commissioner Thaler and Nevada Assessors Association, Dave Dawley. (NACO Staff: Jeff Fontaine, Dagny Stapleton and Amanda Evans)

Remote Attendance: President Elect Weekly, Nye County Commissioner Wichman, Vice President Waits, Lyon County Commissioner Alt, Mineral County Commissioner Tipton, Pershing County Commissioner Shank, Storey County Commissioner McGuffey, Churchill County Commissioner Olsen, Nevada Treasurers Association, Tammi Davis and Nevada Association of Clerks and Election Officials, Nancy Parent.

Other Attendees: Nye County Commissioner Schinhoffen, Lyon County Commissioner Gray, John Slaughter, Washoe County Manager; Nick Marano, Carson City Manager and Lee Bonner, NDOT.

The meeting was called to order at 9:33A by President Elect Weekly.

1. **Public Comment.** None was given
2. **Approval of Agenda.** The agenda was approved on a motion by Commissioner Thaler with second by Commissioner Bates.
3. **NACO President's Report.** President Phillips was unable to attend the meeting, none was given.
4. **NACO Executive Director's Report.** In the interest of time none was given.
5. **Approval of Minutes of the January 27, 2017 NACO Board of Directors Meeting.** The minutes were approved on a motion by Commissioner Bates with Second by Commissioner Dahl. Commissioner Tipton abstained because she was unable to attend the January meeting.
6. **Approval of NACO's 2017 Associate Members.** Jeff reviewed the portion of the By-Laws that requires the approval of Associate Members by the Board and referred to the list included in the agenda packet which included previous and new firms interested in participating in the program. Vice President Waits inquired as to if the list should be read into the record and it was suggested by President Elect Weekly that the list be included as an addendum to the minutes which was concurred with by Commissioner McGuffey. The 2017 NACO Associate Members were approved on a motion by Commissioner Dahl with second by Commissioner Herman.
7. **Approval of a List of Persons from which the Governor will Appoint NACO's Representative to the Nevada Commission on Off-Highway Vehicles (NRS 490.067).** Jeff reviewed the Commission's duties related to the oversight of registration and licensing of OHV's including the report provided to the Legislature included in the agenda packet. Jeff noted that NACO's current representative to the Commission is Sue Baker (Clark County Commissioner Brown's Liaison) and that she also serves as Vice Chair of the Commission and has requested to be considered for reappointment. Jeff informed the Board that he has not received any other requests for appointment and recommended her reappointment. Commissioner McGuffey inquired as to if Ms. Baker rides ATV's and Jeff said that he can't answer that but noted that there is a representative of the ATV Riders Association on the Commission and Commissioner Alt inquired as to if there was representative of the ranching

Community on the Commission. Dagny informed the Board that the Commission is comprised of 11 members, made up of representatives for: OHV dealers, sportsmen, ranchers, law enforcement, DCNR, NACO, OHV users association and four OHV enthusiasts. Commissioner McGuffey noted that while he is an advocate of the registration for the building and maintenance of trails he expressed frustration with the registration process through the DMV. Jeff said that he believes the program is out of the DMV to the Department of Conservation and Natural resources and that the Commission is working on those issues and that he would pass along the concerns. Ms. Baker was reappointed on a motion by Commissioner Wichman with second by Commissioner McGuffey.

8. **Update on the 2017 Legislative Session and Possible Action regarding NACO Priorities, including Budget Requests, Bill Draft Requests, Bills and other Measures.** Jeff noted the second week of the Session is wrapping up and that there had been a lot of action in the first two weeks. He noted that the Governor's recommended budget is being heard and pointed out the county cost assessments from the Department of Health & Human Services specifically regarding child welfare and staffing increases; and increases in Medicaid Match program assessments. He also noted that he has a meeting scheduled with the Director of the Health and Human Services Department and he will be bringing county representatives with him to that meeting. Jeff also mentioned that there is great concern with increases in the assessments for pre-sentence investigation reports and noted that there had been a hearing on SB8 and during that hearing statistics had been presented to the Committee that the proposed increase to the parole and probation cost assessment was roughly 72% and that the total county allocation had increased 118% from the 2012/2013 Biennium when the counties first began paying the assessments. All of these increases occurred' while the counties revenue growth is only 6.4% and the States revenue growth is 17.4%. Jeff noted that the assessments were put in place to help the State balance the budget during difficult times and that now the counties will be charged more money with no control of the reports. The message that NACO is sending to the Legislature is that county revenues are not keeping up with the growth of the State's revenue and that assessments need to be addressed. Dagny updated the Board on AB43 regarding property taxes and that there had been a lot of discussion within the Legislature as well as in the media. Since the beginning of Session that there were a number of presentations given by counties and cities on property taxes and how their ability to provide services are being affected. She noted that AB16 (Cooperative Extension) should have a hearing soon and that an amendment will be requested to clarify the match requested by the State is to be the one cent provided by the counties. Dagny next provided the Board a review of previous discussions regarding AB40, the White Pine County Courthouse Bill. She mentioned that previously, information was given about the service the Courthouse provides to the State's maximum security prison and noted the inclusion of the breakdown of the prisoner population by county of origin was included in the current agenda materials. President Elect Weekly inquired as to the Board's feelings on the issue and indicated that he felt it important for NACO to take a position on the issue because it has come up for a number of Legislative Sessions. Commissioner Shank noted that if the bill is passed, Pershing County would look at their needs as they host a state facility as well. Commissioner Waits noted that it hasn't come before Lander County's Board but she understands the needs and supports the measure especially since the major issue is the location of the current courthouse. Commissioner Dahl inquired as to the total cost of the courthouse, White Pine's contribution and where the remaining funds would come from. Jeff clarified that the preliminary construction estimate is \$16M with White Pine contributing \$9M and that the funding requested in the bill is a state appropriation that would not come from the individual counties. He also noted that the bill is being put forth by the Supreme Court and that, as he understood it, a state appropriation was requested due to the fact that the issue is of state-wide interest. Commissioner Thaler noted that Douglas County would not be opposed and that he had used the same concept and argument for successfully obtaining funds for the China Springs Youth Camp. Commissioner Wichman noted that Nye County would also be in support of the important issue. Vice President Waits agreed that NACO needs to take a position but would like to take the issue back to her Board for discussion. President Elect Weekly concurred that it is important to have individual Board discussions and inquired as to how that would work for time. Jeff noted that the next meeting of the Board would not be until the end of March, and that if the bill is heard prior to that there might be the need to convene a special meeting if the bill is heard prior to the next meeting or the official position could be deferred to the Legislative Committee. Commissioner Thaler noted that Board members are elected by the individual Commissions to speak on their behalf. Commissioner Tipton concurred with the statements of Commissioner Thaler. Commissioners Schinhoffen and Gray also agreed that the arguments for the

bill are sound, there is no pass down, and that the Board should take a stance one way or the other and then the individual Commissions could take the item up if they so choose. Commissioner McGuffey agreed as well. Staff was requested to provide a draft letter of support for the counties to use individually. Jeff was asked for a roll call vote and the Board unanimously approved support of AB40 and direction to prepare a draft letter of support for individual county use on a motion by Commissioner Alt.

The Board was next asked to consider Senator Ford's body worn camera bill, SB176. Dagny reviewed the issue and reminded the Board that during the 2015 session the Board didn't oppose the policy issue (wearing the cameras) but opposed the 2015 bill because it was an unfunded mandate. She noted that work had been done with Senator Ford and that with the mandate for the cameras he has included a funding mechanism in the bill. The funding mechanism is an expansion of the use of 911 surcharges on phone bills and enables the counties to enact an increase to those charges. She noted that Senator Ford is not open to amendments on the policy but is open to discussion on the 911 portion of the bill and that he wanted it to be heard the following week. Jeff noted that there are concerns over the funding needs of the counties for communications and that discussion would be held regarding a potential delay of the implementation date from January 2018 to July 2018 to give the counties time for budget planning. He also noted that the increase in the 911 surcharge could be a significant revenue source and inquired as to the Board's appetite to potentially use the funds to assist with the replacement of the ADS system. Commissioner Herman asked if storage costs would come from the surcharge and Jeff noted that all costs associated with body cameras would be included in the funding mechanism and he will make sure that is clarified on the record. Commissioner Thaler noted that it will no doubt pass and not be vetoed and that it is good that the bill is enabling and would provide the appropriate funds necessary. Commissioner Thaler also inquired about the possibility of working ADS into the bill. Jeff noted that emergency management and communication systems are critically integrated in data systems. Nick Marano informed the Board that Carson City would generate roughly \$250K in additional revenue and policy and technology implementations will drive ongoing costs. Mr. Marano also noted that the existing surcharge does not cover the County's costs and that the language may need to be broader regarding the uses of the funds. Jeff noted that it would be a fine line because from a policy standpoint there would need to be a clear nexus to the 911 system. Commissioner Alt noted that there would need to be reserves and it was clarified that the bill includes a reserve requirement and limit by size of county. Commissioner McGuffey noted that not all counties have enacted the fees and Jeff noted that the fee is a surcharge on each phone bill and not based upon actual 911 calls - the phone companies collect the fees and then send the funds to the counties. Dagny reiterated that the funds going to the counties could be significant if they are raised and Jeff noted that the current fee of \$.25 is far below what other states charge. Staff was directed to work toward broader language for the uses of funds and was directed to formally support the bill by consensus. Jeff informed the Board that AB153 was introduced by Assemblyman Daly and includes cosponsors from the Washoe County delegation. The bill would require counties where large development is taking place to compensate neighboring counties for proposed/expected impacts. Commissioner Wichman asked if the language is may or must regarding the impact statements and fees and Jeff and Dagny clarified that the language is mandatory. Commissioner McGuffey stated that Storey County is highly opposed and noted that while the development in the USA Parkway corridor may be employed in the county, workers live in Washoe County and that that county is benefiting from sales, property and other taxes where Storey County will not receive benefit from sales and use taxes for years due to abatements used and to bring industry in. He also noted that the costs of the impact studies required will be significant. Commissioner Thaler agreed with Commissioner McGuffey's statement and noted that it would pit counties against each other. Commissioner Shank also agreed noting that it will impede growth. Staff was instructed to oppose the bill by consensus of the Board. Jeff also informed the Board that there is discussion regarding possible enabling legislation that would allow individual BOCC's to adopt by ordinance an index on diesel fuel of up to five cents and inquired as to the Board's appetite to continue the discussions. Commissioner Tipton said Mineral County would like to see it happen. Vice President Waits inquired as to the Bill Draft and Jeff clarified that it is currently only a discussion. Staff was instructed to continue to participate in the discussion and President Elect Weekly requested that the discussion include provisions in the language to require that Nevada companies and workers be considered first for road work projects. Jeff concluded the item by informing the Board that the final draft language of the Indigent Defense bill along with a summary of what the advantages and disadvantages may be to the counties will be distributed to the Board and

County Managers within the next week or so and encouraged the Board to review the language closely, as it is important that the bill doesn't become a divisive issue among the Association.

9. **Update and Discussion regarding Meetings and Events during the National Association of Counties Legislative Conference in Washington, D.C. February 25 to March 1, 2017.** Jeff informed the Board that it was expected for 18 to 21 persons attending the conference representing eleven counties and that the schedule of events and Capitol Hill visits would be distributed the following week. Also, meetings were scheduled with all members of the Delegation and also, an informal discussion among the states that have approved recreational marijuana will be held as well. President Elect Weekly inquired as to any events scheduled with former Congressman Porter and Jeff informed the Board that the Congressman is hosting a reception as well as a guided tour of the Capitol. No action was taken

10. **Update and Possible Action Regarding Public Lands and Natural Resources Issues Including:**
 - a) **The Bureau of Land Management's Final 2.0 Planning Regulations.** Jeff informed the Board that on February 7th the House repealed the regulations under the Congressional Review Act and that there is a similar measure in the Senate. This measure has support of NACo and that, while the Western Governors Association has concerns with the regulations, they stopped short of requesting repeal of the regulations. Jeff noted that unless the Board's appetite regarding the issue had changed the Association would continue to support repeal of the measure.
 - b) **Nominations to Fill Future Vacancies on the BLM's Wild Horse and Burro Advisory Board.** Jeff informed the Board that Commissioner French had submitted an application to fill a vacancy on the Board and that a letter had been sent from the Association as well as from the National Association of Counties supporting his appointment to that Board.
 - c) **NACO's Efforts Seeking to Compel the U.S. Bureau of Land Management to Comply with the Provisions of the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act.** Jeff informed the Board that oral argument before the 9th Circuit US Court of Appeals in San Francisco will occur on March 14th at 9:00 AM.
 - d) **The BLM's and U.S. Forest Service's Greater Sage-Grouse Resource Management Plans including the Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief Filed by the State of Nevada and Seven Nevada Counties, and BLM's Sagebrush Focal Areas Withdrawal Environmental Impact Statement.** Jeff thanked the Board and Counties that attended the hearing held in Reno regarding the question of whether the State and Counties had standing and that Judge Du indicated that she would be making a decision on the issue within 4-6 weeks. He also noted that the DEIS has been released for public comment and that the comment period ends on March 30th - there will be public meetings held in Sparks and Elko. Jeff reminded the Board that the Association is a Cooperating Agency and will be submitting comments as well.

11. **NACO Committee of the Emeritus Update.** Commissioner Wichman, Chair of the Committee deferred to Dagny regarding the item and Dagny informed the Board that several Commissioners had been invited to join the Committee by President Phillips and that the first meeting of the Committee would be the following week. She also noted that the Committee had previously worked on the issue of Home Rule and that the report submitted to the Legislature on Home Rule was included in the agenda packet and can be found on the NACO website.

12. **National Association of Counties and Western Interstate Region Board Member Updates.** None were given.

13. **NACO Board Member Updates.** None were given.

14. **Public Comment.** Jeff informed the Board that nominations for the NACo County Leadership Institute are open and requested anyone is interested in attending to

The meeting was adjourned at 11:25A.

The following links and/or pages are support for agenda
Item 6



NACO Presentation

Benefits of Partnering with SilverFlume Nevada's Business Portal

Nevada Secretary of State Barbara K. Cegavske

Reduce paperwork for business customers



Use the SilverFlume Common Business Registration to eliminate redundant forms and processes.

Common Business Registration (CBR) asks the ***commonly*** required information once and shares that information with multiple governmental agencies instead of re-asking the business customer the same questions.

Information for planning and economic development

Washoe County used the information as input to run an **Economic Impact Model**, including NAICS/industry codes and # of employees at regional businesses.

*- Mojra Hauenstein,
Director of Planning & Development,
Washoe County Community Services
Department*



Requirements to Participate

- ***No cost***
- ***No commitment to participate at any level***
- Sign Inter-Local Agreement to acknowledge understanding of how to handle non-public information and access to reports.
- Easiest way to participate requires ***only*** an Internet web browser and Internet connection.



Contact:

Karen Michael

Administrator, Business Portal Division

775-684-5732 Office

kmichael@sos.nv.gov

The following links and/or pages are support for agenda
Item 7

White Paper courtesy of the Lyon County Comptroller's
Office

ADS Replacement Software Selection Considerations

Do It Right the First Time

With ADS planning on closing their doors in December 2019, their clients will need to select and implement new software for a variety of functions and extract their data from their existing system prior to that date. The counties will most likely have “one-shot” to do this correctly due to the time frames involved. This is why it is important to pick the right vendor and product.

There are numerous examples of software implementations/configurations over the years that have failed or cost significantly more than was originally quoted. Software sales teams have been known to overpromise, underperform, and have cost overruns on a regular basis. That is why this selection process is so important.

Recent Examples of NOT Doing it Right the First Time

- Health care exchanges - cost overruns and/or outright failures
- Nevada school student testing software – Hasn’t worked properly, significant delays
- Marin County, California – financial software implementation failure (cost over \$30M, couldn’t run financial reports for two years, started over again from scratch with a new software company)
- Waste Management - \$100M lawsuit against software vendor for failure to work
- City of San Diego – \$30M project ended up costing \$50M and certain tasks have tripled in time to complete
- The County of Clarion, PA - awarded an assessor CAMA system to the lowest bid vendor, went through full implementation, and the software was not able to perform as promised. They canceled their contract and went to another vendor, effectively having to throw away the purchase price and implementation costs.

Ideal Selection

Ideally one software would be selected across all the ADS clients and for Recorder/Assessor/Treasurer/Finance/Payroll/Permitting/Utility Billing. This would allow for the most cost effective solution for software pricing, future enhancements, and hardware costs. A la carte products for each office are insanely more expensive to purchase and maintain.

It is almost **essential that the Assessor and Treasurer use a single software platform/vendor**, since there is so much information that has to be correctly shared between the assessed value and the tax roll extension and collection. While it is feasible that a custom interface can be created between the two if they were on different software, experience shows that it is problematic.

Washoe County chose to use a separate software for assessor and treasurer and had functionality issues. The software companies did not provide an acceptable solution and Washoe County finally ended up relying on internal IT programmers to complete the interface between the two vendor products to make it work properly. Outside of Washoe and Clark, none of the other

Nevada counties have the ability to do that work internally. Since there is a significant amount of information shared between the Recorder and the Assessor, it would be very beneficial to have them on the same platform as well.

Finance/Payroll/HR/Receipting should also be on the same software platform as each other.

The more software vendors are involved, the more interfaces and more manual processes are necessary. This escalates the cost. The worst case scenario for overall functionality and cost is having each office in a county to be on a different software. This has been one reason that ADS has been so cost effective.

Choosing a single vendor could minimize migration costs with ADS. When ADS closes their doors, being able to access historical data will be an issue in future years, so essential data needs to be migrated to new software(s). The counties should plan to budget to pay ADS for their assistance in extracting data from their program into the new programs. If ADS has to do this with multiple vendors, it becomes a much bigger chore and much more expensive. It is possible that the necessary migration can't be accomplished in the remaining timeframe if there are too many vendors involved.

Having multiple vendors also increases hardware costs. It is possible that much fewer physical servers will be needed with a single vendor. If there is a separate software vendor for each office, there may be a dozen servers that would need to be purchased, licensed, and maintained. This increases IT costs as well.

Vendor Selection

A vendor should be evaluated on multiple criteria.

- Able to provide the needed functionality
- Sustainability
 - Avoid small vendors
 - May go out of business, which requires another costly migration to a new software
 - May be purchased by a larger company and become a legacy software program
 - May not have needed expertise or staffing levels/depth
 - May not be able to meet future changes and needs
- Ease of use
- Able to provide entire suites of products across the entire enterprise
 - Demonstrates sustainability
 - Allows seamless integration between offices, avoiding costly and troublesome interfaces
- Customer service availability
- Pricing (usually the last item to be evaluated as pricing is a negotiable item)
- History of implementations being on schedule and within original costs
- Integrity (honest in implementation costs and timeframe)

Pricing

Purchasing software is like shopping in Mexico. Negotiations are expected and significant discounts can and should occur. The software vendor has already built their product and it costs them nothing additional to have you on it, so they have ability to sell it for significant discounts vs list price.

Implementation and conversion costs do cost the vendor time and money. Don't necessarily look for the cheapest vendor on these items as you will most likely end up having to pay significantly more than originally contracted. You want the vendor who is the most realistic about time and costs to implement. Don't hesitate to ask for referrals to speak with both satisfied and dissatisfied customers. Avoid vendors who prohibit dissatisfied customers from sharing their experience.

Legacy Products

Almost all software companies will stop supporting a product and develop an entirely new product. The old product is then termed a legacy product and is phased out in five to ten years. Think of Windows 2000, Windows XP, etc. Carson City and Elko County purchased HTE / Sunguard financial software a few years ago. That product was purchased by Harris Software as a legacy system. At some not-too-distance point, Carson City and Elko County will have to pay to migrate off of their legacy product to a brand new product. That includes an entirely new purchase price, migration cost, etc. For those used to ADS keeping a single product and doing upgrades, this is an entirely new paradigm.

One software company under current consideration charges more each year in maintenance costs, but allows upgrades from one version of the software to the next to be free of charge (the technical term is evergreen). For pricing to be compared between the vendors, the cost of a new software every five to ten years should be added into the other company quotes. This can be a difference in pricing that can range from hundreds of thousands to millions of dollars.

Purchasing Power

Purchase of software platforms crossing offices, i.e. – using the same vendor for Recorder/Assessor/Treasurer, will significantly decrease initial and ongoing costs. If multiple governments collaborate to purchase the same software, purchase discounts increase substantially. Savings of hundreds of thousands of dollars can be realized by choosing a single vendor for all of the offices and all of the counties. This has been one of the significant benefits of using ADS.

If multiple counties use the same vendor, proposed future enhancements can be done either free or at a significant reduction in costs. If a single county chooses a single vendor for a product, enhancements or changes will be paid by that county alone. This can easily add up to tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands of dollars. If a vendor serves multiple counties with the same change requested by all, they can allocate that change across the group, which saves all of

them money. This is especially true anytime the legislature changes a law that affects how the office operates, which could be every other year.

Conclusion

Officials from the Assessors/Clerks/Comptrollers/Recorders/Treasurers, etc. should be encouraged to work together to evaluate a top vendor that meets all of their needs, instead of trying to do a “best of breed” in each office. Heaven forbid that they scatter to the four winds and across counties, as that could be a disaster for almost all involved.

The counties should also be encouraged to select a single vendor between them, as much as that is feasible. This allows for significant savings, faster implementations, fewer migration issues, and better overall functionality. There will be significant purchasing power if the counties choose a single vendor.

If a single vendor is not feasible across all platforms, it is recommended that a single vendor be chosen for the Recorder/Assessor/Treasurer platform and a single vendor be chosen for Accounting/Payroll/HR/Receipting. Other offices may be done “a la carte,” but that will increase overall costs.

The vendor(s) selected should have sufficient expertise and be of sufficient size to ensure future sustainability. Customer support and prior implementation results should be factors in selection.

Pricing, although very important, is very negotiable. Non-evergreen pricing should be evaluated to include multiple purchases of the product and implementation costs over a ten year period. This is important so that product prices are truly being compared “apples to apples.”

If you remember nothing else, remember a single vendor with proven results is preferable!!