Board members present: Chairman Gary Berndt; Vice-Chairman Obie O’Brien & Paul Jewell Commissioner.

Others: Mandy Buchholz, Deputy Clerk of the Board; Jim Goeben, IT Director; Marsha Weyand Assessor; Andrew Drain, Application Developer; Jason Eklund, GIS Coordinator; Mike Flory, Plans Examiner; Kelly Bacon, Engineer Tech.I; Erin Moore, Permit Tech.; Robin Read, Public Health Administrator; Brenda Larsen, Fire Marshal; Doc Hansen, Planning Official; Holly Myers, Environmental Health Supervisor; Shelley McCallie, Data Processor; Jeff Watson, Planner; Steph Mifflin, Senior Permit Tech.; Jeremy Reddick, Web Developer.

SPECIAL MEETING PERMIT SOFTWARE PROPOSAL COMMISSIONERS

At 2:00 p.m. Chairman Berndt opened a Special Meeting to consider the Permit Software Team’s recommendation on replacement software.

Jim Goeben, IT Director presented the Board with the Kittitas County Tracking Software Project Plan. He explained that the Board of County Commissioners previously held a meeting in August of 2014 and received a proposal and recommendation from the Permit Software Team (PST). He explained that the PST was tasked with investigating options for replacing Eden, which is the County’s current Permitting software. He explained that the team was formed with representatives from CDS, DPW, PH, FM, ASSR, and IT. He explained that at the last meeting the BoCC directed them to publish an RFP for permit tracking software. Nine vendors responded to the RFP and the team rated each response and invited the vendors with the top three scores to make in-person presentations. He stated that the PST did not find one that would meet 100% of the needs, in all the areas. However they could likely make one work for the majority of the County’s requirements. He stated that at that time the PST asked IT to present a plan to build a permit tracking software in-house. The IT Applications Division completed the RFP questionnaire and provided it to the team along with a project plan, a Gantt chart showing the project timeline, and resource requirements. He stated that after completing a pros-and-cons list to compare purchasing with developing in-house, and considering the related costs and resource requirements, the team unified in its recommendations to the BoCC that building in-house will satisfy all of the County’s requirements, while saving the County money. He reviewed the advantages of building in-house and stated that the PST is...
requesting the BoCC approve its recommendation to have IT build a permit tracking software and to hire an additional developer in a temporary position. Mr. Goeben gave a summary of findings, highlighting the in-house solution as well as the cost comparison.

There was discussion on when the in-house application would roll out (current proposed name Sasquatch), the impact with the Laserfiche implementation and how it would work with the in-house application and other CAMAS modules. There was discussion on who would be held accountable if it failed.

The Board stressed the importance of the level of commitment from all parties involved. They requested answers to the following:
1. Who is accountable for settling disputes that might arise over design, content, and functionality of the application?
2. Provide a plan B in case the development of the application cannot be completed or cannot meet the needs of the users.
3. Come up with 3 alternative names to “Sasquatch”.
4. There is a statement that hiring the web developer will save 60 calendar days of development, is that accurate and if so does hiring the web developer provide additional benefit to justify the $138,000.00?
5. Are there alternatives to hiring a web developer, and if so, what are they and what is the cost?
6. Who in the departments will be assigned to work with IT in designing the application and how will we ensure it is part of their job duties?

The Board gave approval to proceed, but required acceptable answers to the questions outlined above.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.