Accela GAP Analysis Phase 1

Clark County, NV

Final V3

© 2014 Accela, Inc.

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Date	Name	Version	Change Reference
2014.10.22	Jeff Rich	Draft	First Draft
2014.10.27	Tom Callison	Draft	Second Draft
2014.10.28	Tom Callison	Draft	Third Update
2014.10.29	Tom Callison	Draft	Updates
2014.11.13	Linda Charron	Draft	Clean up from analysis sessions
2014.11.24	Paul Rose	Draft	Analysis inputs and review – Mobility and GIS
2014.12.02	Tom Callison	Draft	Updates
2014.12.04	Tom Callison	Draft	Updates
2014.12.08	Tom Callison	Draft	Updates
2014.12.11	Linda Charron	Draft	Reformat – Business Document
2014.12.15	Dane Quatacker	Draft	Analysis inputs – Data Conversion and Interfaces
2014.12.16	Tom Callison	Draft	Consolidation
2014.12.18	Linda Charron	Draft	Final Editing
2014.12.19	Clark County Review	Draft	Review Document content and structure
2014.12.22	Tom Callison	Final Draft	Final Revision
2014.12.29	Tom Callison	Final V1	Completed - Delivered
2015.01.14	Tom Callison	Final V2	Updated to add a comment on project docs
2015..1.22	Mike Trotter	Final V3	Revised to state costs are estimates and will be negotiated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the award of the Blitz System Services and License Agreement Request for Proposal (RFP), it was determined that a Gap Analysis should be conducted to verify that the statement of work requirements and County processes are still valid and identify new requirements; if needed. The RFP process for Clark County began over three years ago and Clark County has experienced turnover in personnel as well as departmental reorganizations. The RFP included the following Agency departments:

- Land Management (Phase I)
  - o Department of Building and Fire Prevention
  - o Public Response
  - o Water Reclamation
  - o Comprehensive Planning
  - o Public Works
- Business License (Phase II)

This project has been scoped as a phased implementation approach that consists of Land Management (Phase 1) and Business License (Phase 2). This Gap Analysis document concentrates on the processes and requirements for Phase I; including data conversions, interfaces, GIS and citizen web access.

Both on and off-site analysis sessions were conducted to review the stated 85 business processes and 99 general requirements in Phase I. Most gaps were identified to be included in the existing scope of work.   Five gap items were identified as additional hard costs, two items were not needed and identified as savings. The summary of cost related gap items is $116,600. From this document, a separate change request will be created to address the findings and finalize Phase 1 scope.

1. ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

In 2011, Clark County initiated the Blitz System Services and License Agreement Request for Proposal (RFP). Several Agency Departments were involved and a thorough list of general requirements, business processes and use cases were identified. In July 2014, Accela, Inc. was selected to implement a solution to the RFP.   The Clark County CIO requested that Accela, Inc. conduct a Gap Analysis to assure that all of the existing RFP requirements and processes are still necessary and valid. Due to the large scope of this project, this gap analysis effort will address Land Management in Phase 1 and a separate gap analysis to address the Business License Department in Phase 2.

The RFP identified business processes (85 Land Management) and the desired To-Be Solution. During this review, any new requirements or processes should be identified and incorporated into the future solution. Specifically, Accela staff reviewed the following components of the implementation:
- Permit Types/Processes
- Legacy Systems that will be replaced
- Integration Requirements
- Geospatial Requirements
- Citizen Portal Requirements
- Mobility Requirements
- General Requirements

Accela staff was on-site for several days reviewing requirements with Clark County subject matter experts. All previously identified business process requirements were discussed and several additional processes were identified below. For the purposes of this document, a gap is considered any item not identified in the original RFP. Once this gap is identified, a further breakdown is determined to advise if this additional item is within the original scope of the RFP or will result in additional workload or costs to address the requirement. In the Analysis Detail section, the definitions for the columns in the business process table are as follows:

Current Process: Clark County Process name defined in the RFP
Valid: Yes or No - Identifies if the process is needed in Accela Automation
Gap:

Type of Gap	Definition
Yes	Gap Identified, increase in workload, additional process
No	No Gap
No – No Cost	No Gap and duplicate process previously identified or efficiency gain
Yes – No Cost	Gap Identified but within original scope of RFP

Future Process: Accela Automation process name or function
Comments/Notes: Accela reference in gap documentation and future analysis sessions

This project is designed to be a shared implementation approach between Clark County and Accela. As stated in the contract, 90 business processes are identified for Accela to analyze and configure across both Phase 1 and Phase 2. There were 85 Land Management and 25 Business License processes (110 total) to be reviewed in the Gaps. Therefore Phase I incorporated approximately 77% of the business processes (85/110), and 23 % for Business Licenses to be reviewed by Accela. Applying this percentage, Phase I will include 70 business processes and Phase 2 the remaining 20. During the gap analysis, an estimate number of record types to configure in Accela Automation will be identified to determine the record type count to the business process requirement.

2. ANALYSIS DETAILS

2.1   BUSINESS PROCESSES/PERMIT TYPES

A.   BUILDING AND FIRE PREVENTION

Building: Provides construction and development customers with state-of-the-art permit management, plan review, and inspection services.
Fire Prevention: Provides construction and business customers with state-of-the-art permit management, plan review, and inspection services.

Attendees

Name	Date Attended	Agency
Tom Callison	11/4/2014	Accela
Matt Hart	11/4/2014	Accela
Linda Charron	11/4/2014	Accela
Jeff Rich	11/4/2014	Accela
Nan Manning	11/4/2014	Clark County
Michael Trotter	11/4/2014	Clark County
Dee Fannin	11/4/2014	Clark County
Chuck Horne	11/4/2014	Clark County
Mike Lane	11/4/2014	Clark County
Carolyn Ideker	11/4/2014	Clark County
Janet Odom	11/4/2014	Clark County

Requirement Verification – Building & Fire

Current Process	Valid	Gap	Future Process	Comments/Notes
BD001-New Commercial Plan Submittal and Review	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Submittals	Submittal Process –Beginning of the application and workflow review.
BD002-Plan Submittal for Commercial or Residential with Grading	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Submittals	With extra Parallel Review Tasks
BD003-Permit Issuance	Yes	No	Permit Issuance	Assure fees are paid and issue permit (Same as BD016)
BD004-Civil Engineering Plan Review	Yes	No	Plan Review	Workflow - Reviews
BD005-Commercial Plan Review	Yes	No	Plan Review	Workflow - Reviews
BD006-Commercial Short Plan Review	Yes	No	Plan Review	Workflow - Reviews
BD007-Commercial Over the Counter (COTC) or Over the Counter (OTC) Plan Review	Yes	No	Plan Review	Workflow - Reviews
BD008-Inspection Scheduling and Residential Inspection and	Yes	No	Inspection Scheduling	Plumbing/Electrical/Building Inspection Scheduling – Includes overtime, regular and same day

Current Process	Valid	Gap	Future Process	Comments/Notes
BD009-Inspection Scheduling and Shell Inspection	Yes	No	Inspection Scheduling	Plumbing/Electrical/Building Inspection Scheduling – Includes overtime, regular and same day
BD010-Inspection Scheduling and Commercial or Tenant Improvement Inspection	Yes	No	Inspection Scheduling	Plumbing/Electrical/Building Inspection Scheduling – Includes overtime, regular and same day
BD011-Inspection Scheduling and Phased Construction Inspection	Yes	No	Inspection Scheduling	Plumbing/Electrical/Building Inspection Scheduling – Includes overtime, regular and same day
BD012-Plan Exam Revision Review	Yes	No	Plan Review	Revision Process – needs to be tied back to application; assigned a unique suffix in current system
BD013-Plan Submittal for Mobile Home on Private Property or Estate Property	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Submittals	Submittal Process –Beginning of the Application and Workflow Review (similar to BD001 & 17)
BD014-Residential Plan Review	Yes	No	Plan Review	Workflow - Reviews
BD015-Residential Over the Counter Plan Review (ROTC)	Yes	No	Plan Review	Workflow - Reviews
BD016-ROTC,COTC or OTC Permit Issuance	Yes	No	Permit Issuance	Assure fees are paid and issue permit Same as BD003
BD017-Residential Short or Mobile Home on Private or Estate Property Plan Review	Yes	No	Plan Review	Submittal Process –Beginning of the Application and Workflow Review (Same as BD001 & 13)
BD018-Standard Plan Review (Step 1 of 3)/Residential Track Homes	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Submittals Modeling	Standard Home Plans - Review
BD019-Standard Plan (Step 2 and 3 of 3 Steps)	Yes	No	Modeling/Intake	Subdivision Plat Map approval and issue standard home permit on Lot
BD020-Zoning Plan Review	Yes	No	Plan Review	Workflow - Reviews
BD021-Complaint Process	Yes	No	Code Enforcement	Complaint process - Complaint inspections for Fire and Building are the same group of inspectors as permit inspections.
BD022-Resort Inspection Process	Yes	No	Unique Record Process/Intake/ Inspections/ Plan Review Fees	Requires separate record type, these are initiated by Clark County and several notices are generated. Appropriate permits will need to be pulled and paid for by resort contact. Mobile units would be great, and time tracking will be a good tool. Same group of inspectors do these and regular permit inspections.
BD065-Daily Cash Balancing	Yes	No	Cashiering	Accela standard functionality
BD066-Escrow Accounts	Yes	No	Cashiering	Accela Trust Account Process. Debit only accounts for Fire and Building use. Need monthly

Current Process	Valid	Gap	Future Process	Comments/Notes
				statements, low balance notifications, capability of online deposits and escrow accounts management.
BD067-RAI Financial Process (RAI-Resort Annual Inspection)	Yes	No	Batch Process/ Reports (Billing)	Resort Group related to BD022. Not able to complete annually any longer, currently cyclical based. Invoice and billing process, preferred to send monthly invoicing. Currently a very manual process.
BDNEW01 - Result Inspections Process (with / without penalty fee assessment)	Yes	Yes – No Cost	Inspection Results/ Fees	Inspections can result in additional penalty fees which could be auto assessed.
BDNEW02 -Occupancy Certificates	Yes	Yes – No Cost	Close Out/Reports	Temp C of O/C of O & Compliance Certificate (Resorts & Amusement rides) Verify clearances received from other departments.
BDNEW03 Amusement Transportation Systems	Yes	Yes	Unique Record Process/Intake/ Inspections/ Plan Review Fees	Amusement Transportation System review and inspections done by Geotechnical Engineering group. Includes review and annual permit renewal process.
BDNEW04 - New Approved QAA Businesses (Quality Assurance Agreement or Agency) & Renewable	Yes	Yes	Contact Data + Unique Record Process/Intake/ Inspections/ Plan Review Fees	Special Inspection Database County responsible for monitoring 3rd party activity/approval. Will be a Contact Type in AA with ASI template data. Annual permit renewal process, to include tracking qualified employees associated with this contact. Will use notifications.
BDNEW05 - New Approved Fabricator Businesses	Yes	Yes – No Cost	Contact Data + Unique Record Process/Intake/ Inspections/ Plan Review Fees	Similar to BDNEW04 (QAA) Contact Type for Approved Fabricators. The inspections are performed at place of fabrication and done cyclical, alpha order.
BDNEW06 - Annual Facilities Permit	Yes	Yes – No Cost	Unique Process/Intake/ Inspections/ Plan Review Fees	Blanket permit for the year for various facilities and inspections are performed to assure compliance.
BDNEW07 - Alternate Plan Review	Yes	Yes – No Cost	Contact Data + Unique Record Process/Intake/ Inspections/ Plan Review Fees (FUTURE)	In design right now to allow 3rd party companies to be certified to do plan reviews

Current Process	Valid	Gap	Future Process	Comments/Notes
FD070 - Administrative-Create-Modify Contractors	Yes	No	Reference Data Licensed Prof	Accela Standard Functionality. Will need to address a business process to handle Fire Contractors which can hold an Out of State license as Building only allows Nevada Licensed contractors
FD071- Administrative-Imaging	No	No	NA	Not an Accela project
FD072 - Administrative-Inspection Scheduling	Yes	No	Inspection Scheduling	Same as Building, both customer and internally initiated. Select from parcel/address and schedule the inspection with notes. Relates to FD0088 (Occupancy). Manually scheduled today but would like to use ACA
FD073-Administrative-Manage Time & Availability	Yes	No	Inspection Calendar/Inspection Results	Workload management for inspections and plan check. Inspectors are assigned geographical areas already defined in a GIS system. Inspections would like to include drive time. Currently in Naviline, an Admin Inspection type is used to track time like Admin/Meeting/Code Research. Time Tracking is DESIRED for all time Account for 85% of time
FD074-Administrative-Overtime Process	Yes	No	Inspections/Fees	Customer service oriented to allow inspections when convenient for business but additional charges are assessed; expedited plan check, overtime Inspection (3 hours min for base fee + per hour after that). Weekends/holidays are different fees. Automatically invoiced and then billed monthly.
FD075-Administrative-Permit-Modify-Address	Yes	No – No Cost	Parcel Genealogy and Address function	Accela Standard Functionality. Address changes by incorrect entry or Assessor or street name changes.
FD076-Administrative-Permit-Ownership Change	Yes	No	Owner/Contact Portlets	Ownership Changes to be tracked and identified. Would like the history of the ownership to stay with the records. Business License (CLIPS) will also receive these changes and coordination will need to be considered to assure that the original data/ownership is

Current Process	Valid	Gap	Future Process	Comments/Notes
				maintained and new records for new owners are still required to be created
FD077-Citation	Yes	No – No Cost	Code Enforcement	Citation process very similar to the notice of violation in BD.
FD078-Complaint	Yes	No – No Cost	Code Enforcement	Same as Building/PRO
FD079-Create-Modify-Application-Request Process	Yes	No – No Cost	Application Intake/Submittal	System Functionality
FD080-Finance-Cash Balancing Daily Deposit	Yes	No – No Cost	Cashiering	Same as BD065
FD081-Finance-Daily Cashier Balance	Yes	No – No Cost	Cashiering	Same as BD065
FD082-Finance-Escrow Accounts	Yes	No – No Cost	Trust Accounts	Same as BD066
FD083-Finance-Fee Adjustments	Yes	No – No Cost	Cashiering	Would not like this to be part of system for all users. Supervisor Permissions
FD084-Finance-Month End Process	Yes	No-No Cost	Reports	Same process as BD; unified reconciliation and on reports. May be multiple reports by department
FD085-Finance-Refund	Yes	No	Cashiering	Building and Fire will use the same process
FD086-Inspection-Business License	Yes	No	Inspection	Will be on a Business License record and no fee is charged for this inspection. An inspection must be completed within 10 days after zoning approval.
FD087-Inspection-Courtesy	Yes	No	Inspection Scheduling	An inspection before issuance to discuss issues and concerns.
FD088-Inspection-Occupancy	Yes	No	Assets for Records/ Addresses/ Inspections	Annual Occupancy record with Renewal Discussed using Assets as part of the solution to track the stores and floors. An existing Inventory Database will need to be converted into Assets
FD089-Inspection-Perform Inspection	Yes	No – No Cost	Inspection Results	Result – same as building BDNEW01

Current Process	Valid	Gap	Future Process	Comments/Notes
FD090-Inspection-Record Search	Yes	No – No Cost	Search	System Functionality
FD091-Permit-Apparatus Standby Process	Yes	No	Workflow Notifications	Relates to a Special Event and communication is required at permit to inform customer of process to work Suppression Group, not on Accela.
FD092-Permit-Permit Survey	Yes	No	Workflow	Business Licenses Requirement which will be improved once all departments are using one system by using workflow tasks in all relevant record types.
FD093-Permit-Renewable-Expiration	Yes	No	Renew/ Batch	Annual Renewal to send notices every year; includes renewal fee, delinquent fees, inspection scheduling. If delinquent a complaint is generated
FD094-Plans-Civil Plan Review	Yes	No – No Cost	Plan Review	Workflow - Reviews
FD095-Plans-Review	Yes	No – No Cost	Plan Review	Workflow - Reviews
FD096-Plans-Review-ElectronicPlans	Yes	No – No Cost	Plan Review	Accela EDR.
FD097-Suppression-FireDrill	Yes	No	Workflow/ Alerts	Reach out and communicate to suppression/fire departments. To provide information of new sites/new facilities opening up which require witness/tests At Minimum notification via email to inform of new facilities. May include school monthly required drills.

Department Observations and Discoveries:

Observations/ Discoveries	Comments	Deliverable Category
Observations	Need to be able to verify that contractors are licensed for the type of work. License types are categorized Commercial or Residential for plumbing, mechanical and electrical. Will need to discuss this more in depth during analysis.	Script
Observations	Interim License check to make sure that the State Contractors is valid and Clark County has a current up to date County Business license. Currently updated daily by file by Nan.	Maintain existing process until business license is integrated.

Observations/ Discoveries	Comments	Deliverable Category
Observations	Fire allows work to be done by Out of State Contractors and they have a need to add record specific information to the contractor like contact names. Separate database currently. Fire Contractor Database needs to be loaded to AA (on-time load)	Conversion/ Contact ASI
Observations	Common Names Database list of reference contacts.	Conversion/ Contact ASI
Observations	Resort group will want the capability of invoicing monthly the fees, and they will want a way to track if the invoice is 30/60/90/120 days delinquent. The invoicing will be based on the time they are out inspecting.	Report/ Monthly batch
Observations	Address verification is an issue today. Need to have a way to validate the GIS location	AGIS, smart choice, script

Building and Fire Business Process Summary:

After reviewing the requirements and processes with the Building and Fire Departments, no significant gap concerns were found. Several processes were identified as duplicate processes already identified or system functionality not requiring specific configuration. The combination of Fire and Building also provided some efficiency gains and reduced the total unique processes required.

Processes – Not Valid	1
Valid Processes (RFP & new)	60
Efficiency/Duplicate Processes	-14
Net Valid Processes	**46**

During the discussions, seven new processes were identified as gaps not originally stated in the RFP. All gaps identified are configurable into Accela and do not pose a concern or risk.

Gaps – no additional cost	5
Gaps with additional cost	2
Total Gaps Identified	**7**

Five observations were notated. Additional scripting and reporting will be necessary to meet some of the requirements. Some of the observations related to conversions will be addressed in the Legacy Systems, data migration section below.

B.   PUBLIC RESPONSE

Public Response: Centralized service to receive citizen complaints, requests and inquiries related to zoning, building, solid waste, sign enforcement, graffiti and other issues regarding the enforcement of County Codes.

Attendees

Name	Date Attended	Agency
Tom Callison	11/05/2014	Accela
Matt Hart	11/05/2014	Accela
Linda Charron	11/05/2014	Accela
Jeff Rich	11/05/2014	Accela
Nan Manning	11/05/2014	Clark County

Michael Trotter	11/05/2014	Clark County
Chuck Horne	11/05/2014	Clark County
Jason Allswang	11/05/2014	Clark County

Requirement Verification – Public Response Process

Current Process	Valid	Gap	Future Process	Comments/Notes
CCPRO101 - CCPRO Business Process	Yes	No	Code Enforcement	Anticipate up to 3 record types may be developed, including a general complaint which can be include ASI and scripting to route the workflow to the appropriate responsible agency.
CCPRONEW01 - Sign Violation/Impound	Yes	Yes-No Cost	Fees/Payment	Unique because there are fees involved at time of pickup at impound, will include extra workflow or AdHoc task for fees.
CCPRONEW02 - Shopping Carts	Yes	Yes-No Cost	Intake/ Notifications/ Fees	Unique record type to track payments and notification to shopping cart owners; example Walgreen carts at 71 possible locations across the County.

Department Observations and Discoveries:

Observations/ Discoveries	Comments	Deliverable
Observation	There will be some concerns with data being viewed online regarding resort complaints and viewing details by anonymous/registered users. Limited to Accela's ACA functionality. Searching capabilities will be determined by login rights, anonymous versus registered. Need to be cautious when created ASI fields that will have restrictions for type of ACA access and resort complaints may require a separate record type.	Existing Functionality/ Configuration
Observation	The County requested one workflow that may work for all complaint types across all the departments.	Functionality/ Configuration
Observation	A County SAP project has an ERP Complaint System that seems redundant to our CPRO processes we are creating in Accela Automation. Mike has confirmed that we are supporting a different group. No overlap exists.	NA

Public Response Business Process Summary:

After reviewing the requirements and processes with the Public Response Department, no significant gap concerns were found.

Processes – Not Valid	0
Valid Processes (RFP & new)	3
Efficiency/Duplicate Processes	0
Net Valid Processes	**3**

During the discussions, two new processes were identified as gaps not originally stated in the RFP. All gaps identified are configurable into Accela and do not pose a concern or risk.

Gaps – no additional cost	2
Gaps with additional cost	0
Total Gaps Identified	**2**

Three observations were notated with no concern and will require some additional configuration or include using system functionality.

C.   WATER RECLAMATION

Water Reclamation:
The Water Reclamation gap review process was abbreviated due to the department's apprehension to continue analysis without direction from County leadership. At the time it was determined that existing processes are in scope and still valid. No new Gap were discussed or identified through our brief conversations.

Attendees

Name	Date Attended	Agency
Tom Callison	11/5/2014	Accela
Matt Hart	11/5/2014	Accela
Linda Charron	11/5/2014	Accela
Jeff Rich	11/5/2014	Accela
Nan Manning	11/5/2014	Clark County
Christine Dudas	11/5/2014	Clark County
Michael Trotter	11/5/2014	Clark County
Chuck Horne	11/5/2014	Clark County

Requirement Verification – Water Reclamation Process

Current Process	Valid	Gap	Future Process	Comments/Notes
WR 101- Water Reclamation District As -Is Process Flow (Offsite)	Yes	No	Plan Review/Inspection Scheduling/ Inspection Results	Review plans; perform inspections on record created by Public Works and possibly Planning or Building. Will need own set of standard comments.
WR102-Water Reclamation District As-Is Process Flow (On Site)	Yes	No	Plan Review/Inspection Scheduling/ Inspection Results	Connection fees are collected to tie buildings into sewer. Currently collected in Billing Financial system when sewer customer account is set up. Accela they would need a record to result inspections.

Department Observations and Discoveries:

Observations/ Discoveries	Comments	Deliverable
Discovery	Internal IT project has been started to automate the inspections and scheduling in a separate County custom developed system. County confirmed at this point there is no conflict.	NA

Water Reclamation Business Process Summary
During the brief review with Water Reclamation Department, no gaps were identified.

Processes – Not Valid   0
Valid Processes (RFP & new)   2
Efficiency/Duplicate Processes   -1
Net Valid Processes   **1**

D.   COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

Comprehensive Planning: Develops and implements land use, zoning and growth plans and programs.

Attendees

Name	Date Attended	Agency/Department
Tom Callison	11/6/2014	Accela
Matt Hart	11/6/2014	Accela
Linda Charron	11/6/2014	Accela
Jeff Rich	11/6/2014	Accela
Mara Weber	11/6/2014	Comp Planning
Mario Bermudez	11/6/2014	Comp Planning
Tanuja Puvvula	11/6/2014	ITD
Michael Trotter	11/6/2014	ITD
Chuck Horne	11/6/2014	ITD
Janet Odom	11/6/2014	ITD
Kevin Skinner	11/6/2014	Comp Planning

Requirement Verification – Comprehensive

Current Process	Valid	Gap	Future Process	Comments/Notes
CP101 - Administrative Design Review Process (ADR)	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Submittals	Application and Notice of Final Action is issued for Administratively approval of minor changes. Does not go to any boards unless appealed and is routed to several departments for comments. Staff report is created
CP102 - Administrative Application (Street Naming, Minor Deviations)	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Submittals	Two types and does not go to board unless appealed; routed to several departments. Staff report can be created
CP103 - Administrative Temporary Use Application	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Submittals	Similar to CP102, but case information is sent to commissioners for review.
CP104 - Development Agreement for High Impact Project and Major Project	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Submittals/ Conditions/ Conditions of Approval/ Parcel/ Hearings	Identified during Pre-submittal conference or application submittal (CP105, CP108). Involves various fee payments, deliverables, and conditions of construction. Will stay open and

				active during the life cycle of the development of this area. The conditions are created prior to the parcel splits and parcel genealogy may need to be used with scripting to carry down these requirements to the future parcels to be developed; tracking via reports. At thresholds, things are required to be completed and could cause a STOP on continued construction. Land Use cases are relevant to the building application process and the use of parcel conditions with a start date and end date will assist. Staff Report for the agreement to be approved, then Ordinance needs to be developed and a hearing 2 weeks later.
CP105 - Pre-Submittal Application Process	Yes	No	Intake/Plan Review/ Meetings/ Notification Script	Application process which requires a lot of communication across internal and external agencies. When approved it would be great to use as a clone for the land use application and relate. Staff Determination and Staff Report but no board approval. Incorporation of using ACA to post the plans/documents and have outside agency access. If staff deems feasible, a neighborhood meeting is held but developer is responsible.
CP106 - Reconsideration Process	Yes	No	Workflow/ Plan Review/ Hearing	Infrequent request within 5 days of denial and must be requested by Commissioner on the prevailing side of the vote. Requires a discussion item on first Agenda and then actual reconsideration discussion will be on future agenda within 30 days. Most likely same record with additional workflow steps
CP107 - Text Amendment Process	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Review/ Hearings	Developer requests a commissioner to agree, in writing to TA before submittal. Citizen

				Advisor council/Town boards discussion items and if approved; effective date of change. Precursor to Ordinance. (Once a year)
CP108 - Annexation Request (all zoning districts), Design Review, Extension of Time, Street Name/Numbering Change, Tentative Map, Use Permit, Vacation and Abandonment, Variance, Waiver of Conditions, Waiver of Development Standards and Conforming/Non-conforming Zone Change)"	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Submittals	Land Use Applications are mostly similar with some uniqueness in workflow which include different internal and external agency reviews and the number of hearings a project may require. Would prefer ability to select multiple entitlement types on one record. Tent Maps, Vacations, Abandonments, and Waiver of conditions are unique and wouldn't be combined. Infrequently there are General Plan amendments. Notification and Agenda process for all of these, which include Public Hearing Cards, doing a GIS buffer search to obtain the addresses and sending designated data to the Agenda software SIRE Appeal process is included for all of the application to include a new meeting date. Could be separate record and workflow to be determined during analysis. Extension of Time would need to be related to the record of extension but unique record type with similar numbering scheme. At time of submittal the meeting calendar is used to determine when the meeting date will be for the record. Master Calendar for all the boards. This Meeting date is printed on the receipt
CP109 - Fee Payment Process	Yes	No – No Cost	Cashiering	Accela Standard Functionality

CP110 - Daily Funds Reconciliation	Yes	No – No Cost	Cashiering	Similar to the Building Group BD065. Report
CPNEW01 - Agenda Creation and Posting to SIRE	Yes	Yes – No Cost	Hearings/ Export process	This is an Interface. Specifics will be outlined in the Interface section.
CPNEW02 - Creation of the staff report	Yes	Yes – No Cost	Reports/ Documents	Created in AA and want to modify document in word. Save and attach versions to Document section of AA.
CPNEW03 - Zoning Plan review for Building Records	Yes	No– No Cost	Plan Review	Addressed in parallel workflow in Building records
CPNEW04 - Appointments	Yes	Yes	Intake/Plan Review/ Meeting	A request to set up a meeting with a planner in order for them to submit application or discuss zoning violation. Planners are assigned based on the type of application. Ideally request could be submitted through ACA with relevant documents attached. Planners would be assigned and use calendaring to set up the appointment.
CPNEW05 - Notification	Yes	No – No Cost	Reporting: Batch/Sets/ Hearing Calendars	Sending of Public Hearing Cards, includes word document, exhibit zoning map. Address validation with USPS and sent to mail room for printing. Vacations have delivery confirmation requirements that are printed in planning and sent.
CPNEW06 -Point of Sale System – purchase Comprehensive Plans, Zoning etc.	Yes	No – No Cost	POS	Accela Standard Function. Collect flat fees for zoning maps and plans.
CPNEW07 - Land Use Plan	Yes	Yes – No Cost	Intake/Plan Review/ Meeting	Combine with CPNEW08 Update every 5 years by Planning staff, not currently tracked.
CPNEW08 - Land Use Plan Minor Amendment	Yes	Yes – No Cost	Intake/Plan Review/ Meeting/ Related Records	Staff or developer driven to request a minor amendment to the land use plan; assigned a number. Additional request related to this minor amendment are associated to the minor amendment and listed as

				separate agenda items (CP parents PA children in Naviline) There are eleven planning areas, once a year a period of time is allowed for these amendment requests and go the same hearing.
CPNEW09 - Performance Bonds	Yes	No – No Cost	Intake/Fees/Plan Review	Similar process as identified in PWNEW01 for cell towers. Configuration required
CPNEW10 - Verification of Zoning	Yes	No – No Cost	Intake/Fees/Plan Review	Request for verification of zoning using predetermined selections; assess and collect fees and send a report of verification.
CPNEW11 - Agenda Items – for discussion only	Yes	Yes – No Cost	Intake/Plan Review/Hearings	Agenda items that deal with ordinances, changes in ordinances or code amendments to provide boards with background information. Normal hearing process; no fees collected or routing for review needed.
CPNEW12 - Mapping/ Tracking	Yes	No – No Cost	Reports – This will be captured through reporting.	Additional Reporting. Performance Reports to track the subdivisions/maps that are completed

Department Observations and Discoveries:

Observations/ Discoveries	Comments	Deliverable Category
Observation	Commissioners receive the information from scanned documents attached to individual emails. Would like to have this as standard to scan in up front and be able to add as attachment. Currently the process varies depending on the application with the format of information they receive; paper, email, scanned, etc. Application received – 5 or 10 days to approve it - The Commissioners would have access to the system – Send an email to advise that there is a review. Very basic information letter, site plan and application	Scripting
Discovery (Nice to have)	Conditions are often created which are called out to be verified/reviewed after Building process is complete. Like 6 months after C of O to remind planner something needs to be reviewed from this record type. Even if we could get a report to produce a list of records with expirations/time to inspect. Process today is on the applicant to schedule inspections/follow-up	Report and or Scripting - custom function
Discovery (Must have)	Staff Reports are created in Accela and it needs to be exported to the **SIRE** for the agenda items and discussions; see sample on line. http://agenda.co.clark.nv.us/sirepub/mtgviewer.aspx?meetid=1502&doctype=agenda	Interface requirement #13

Observation (Nice to have)	NOFA – Notice of final action - Today conditions are in Naviline and once approved they are updated in Naviline then they copy and paste out of Naviline and into **Granicus** for the NOFA to print. http://clark.granicus.com/MinutesViewer.php?view_id=17&clip_id=3929	Interface requirement #5
Observation	Will need a custom receipt to include meeting date of hearing.	Report/Comm Manager
Observation	Buffer search for the notification and fees to be determined based on the type of application and the boundary buffer search (200′, 1000′ etc.) Prices are varied based on notification boundaries. More for 1000.	GIS functionality/ scripting
Observation	Unlimited field space for comments. Capability of the adding on to the report to add new tables occasionally.	Configuration/Report

Comprehensive Planning Business Process Summary

After reviewing the requirements and processes with the Comprehensive Planning Department, no significant gap concerns were found.

Processes – Not Valid	0
Valid Processes (RFP & new)	22
Efficiency/Duplicate Processes	-5
Net Valid Processes	**17**

During the discussions, nine new processes were identified as gaps not originally stated in the RFP. All gaps identified are configurable into Accela and are not of concern or risk.

Gaps – no additional cost	11
Gaps with additional cost	1
Total Gaps Identified	**12**

Several observations and discoveries were stated. Most will be addressed by configuration, additional scripting and reporting. Interface requirements are identified and discussed in the integration requirements section below.

E.   PUBLIC WORKS

Public Works: Delivers a wide range of services to the community including the design, construction, inspection for the safety of the public and for the proper stewardship of the revenues expended on infrastructure construction and maintenance.

Attendees

Name	Date Attended	Agency/Department
Tom Callison	11/7/2014	Accela
Matt Hart	11/7/2014	Accela
Linda Charron	11/7/2014	Accela
Layne Weber	11/7/2014	PW Development Review
Nan Manning	11/7/2014	Building
Michael Trotter	11/7/2014	ITD
Chuck Horne	11/7/2014	ITD
Janet Odom	11/7/2014	ITD
Lorena Sherman	11/7/2014	PW Development Review

| Tina Garrison | 11/7/2014 | PW Survey (Works with Planning) |

Requirement Verification– Public works Process Review

Current Process	Valid	Gap	Future Process	Comments/Notes
PW001-Boundary Line Adjustment	Yes	No	Intake/Plan Review/	Submit plans, review, redlines, issue a letter at the end (Similar to CP101)
PW002-Off Site Inspection	Yes	No	Inspection Scheduling/ Inspection Results	Public Infrastructure inspections. Would like online requests and use of mobile devices. Inspectors are geographical assigned and a routing of inspections is desired. Contactors are given a time an estimate time of inspection. (Part of PW003)
PW003-Development Review Off Site Plan Check	Yes	No	Intake /Plan Review/Fees/ Conditions/Related Records	Submittal and Workflow - Reviews Will include bonds, Mylar's, and fees. Using conditions or related records will assist in determining if pre-submittal requirements are fulfilled from other departments.
PW004-DR Partial Cash Bond Release (Cash or Cash in Lieu)	Yes	No	Intake/Fees/ Workflow	Will track type of bond, bond amount, inspection fees and requirements. Letters of release are sent to bank once construction requirements are fulfilled.
PW005-Traffic Control Application/Permit	Yes	No	Intake /Plan Review/Fees	Application part of PW009
PW006-Traffic Control/Encroachment Inspection	Yes	No	Intake /Plan Review/Fees Inspections	Encroachment Permit and inspections(part of PW009)
PW007-Development Review Traffic Mitigation Review	Yes	No - No Cost	Intake /Plan Review/Fees	Workflow – Reviews (Related to PW008)
PW008-Traffic Study Review	Yes	No	Intake /Plan Review/Fees/ Report	Workflow – Reviews (Related to PW007) A letter is sent to advise of requirements to complete and acreage based fee is assessed.
PW009-Traffic Control Plan and Encroachment Permit	Yes	No No Cost	Intake /Plan Review/Fees	Part of PW005 & PW006

PW010-Development Review-Administration Deviation /Finish Floor Waiver	Yes	No – No Cost	Intake/ Plan Review	Like CP102
PW011-Exception to Determination - Minor Subdivision Map	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Review	Similar to PW001, but no approval letter is generated
PW012-Geotechnical Report Review	Yes	No	Plan Review/Workflow	Workflow – Reviews Assigned a separate number currently.
PW013-Major Subdivision Final Map	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Review	Like PW001 & CP101- Planning. Unique Record Type
PW014-Major Subdivision Reversionary Final Map	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Review	Like PW001 & CP101- Planning. Unique Record Type
PW015-Minor Subdivision Map	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Review	Like PW001 & CP101- Planning. Unique Record Type
PW016-Reversionary Parcel Map - Minor Subdivision	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Review	Like PW001 & CP101- Planning. Unique Record Type
PW017-Revision Review	Yes	No	Plan Review/Workflow/ Fees	Workflow – Reviews Revision of Off-site work. Does not stop the work in field. Multiple revisions are possible.
PW018-Right of Way - BLM Process	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Review	Like PW001 & CP101- Planning. Unique Record Type
PW019-Separate Document	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Review	Like PW001 & CP101- Planning. Unique Record Type
PW020-Vacation	Yes	No	Intake/ Plan Review	Like PW001 & CP101- Planning Begins in Planning and Public Works consolidates the responses and records.
PW021-PAC Review	Yes	No – No Cost	Plan Review/Workflow	Workflow – Reviews Civil Review step within the Building application cross reference building number with the off-site number
PW022-Drainage Study Review	Yes	No	Plan Review/Workflow	Workflow – Reviews (Similar PW008)
PW023-Structure Review	Yes	No	Plan Review/Workflow	Workflow – Reviews Review of box culverts, drainage structures, light poles, etc. Associated to drainage and assessed acreage based fee.
PW060-Finance-Escrow Account	Yes	No	Cashiering	Escrow Accounts used for Traffic Control permits
PW061-Finance-Balance Daily Cashier Deposit	Yes	No –	Cashiering	BD065

		No Cost		
PWNEW01 -Bond Process, New bonds, Replacement bonds, and several types of bonds. Off-site work only.	Yes	Yes	Intake/Fees/Plan Review/ Reports	Excel spreadsheet which calculates the amount of bond that is required to be posted. A bonding agent is attached to record. During construction process, releases of bonds, partial or full, are given related to inspection process. Construction deadlines need to be met or letters are sent. Off-site Improvement Agreement is the master document that controls the bond process and has the language to act or cash in on the bond.
PWNEW02 - Point of sale items	Yes	No – No Cost	POS	Same as CPNEW05
PWNEW03 – Area Drainage Complaints	Yes	No – No Cost	Code Enforcement/Reports	Similar to CCPRO101 Send letters to have drainage ways cleaned up handled by maintenance division.

Department Observations and Discoveries:

Observations/ Discoveries	Comments	Deliverable Category
Observation	Plat work is related mostly to planning and may need to be part of planning.	Configuration/Analysis
Observation	Nice to have a tracking so that a report could show the number of mitigation versus traffic study and the amount collected on mitigation.	Reports
Observation	Will be participating in the Planning groups agendas, by contributing to comments which build the agenda items/summary	Interface requirement #13
Observation	Reports, about 8 to 10 currently, are important and would like probably around 20 reports for future.	Reports

Public Works Business Process Summary:

After reviewing the requirements and processes with the Comprehensive Planning Department, no significant gap concerns were found.

Processes – Not Valid	0
Valid Processes (RFP & new)	28
Efficiency/Duplicate Processes	-6
Net Valid Processes	**22**

During the discussions, two new processes were identified as gaps not originally stated in the RFP. All gaps identified are configurable into Accela and are not of concern or risk.

Gaps – no additional cost	2
Gaps with additional cost	<u>1</u>
Total Gaps Identified	**3**

Several observations and discoveries were stated. Most will be addressed by configuration, additional scripting and reporting. Interface requirements are identified and discussed in the integration requirements section below.

Summary of Business Processes

	Not Valid Process	RFP Valid Process	New Valid Process	Efficiency/ Duplicate Process	Net Process*	Gaps with Cost	Estimated Record Count
Building & Fire	1	53	7	14	**46**	2	89
Public Response	0	1	2	0	**3**	0	3
Water Reclamation	0	2	0	1	**1**	0	3
Planning	0	10	12	5	**17**	1	28
Public Works	0	25	3	6	**22**	1	15
TOTAL	1	91	24	26	**89**	4	138

*Net Process = RFP Valid Process + New Valid Process - Efficiency Process

2.2   LEGACY SYSTEMS (DATA MIGRATION)

SunGard Naviline: The "Land Development System" is comprised of four separate SunGard Naviline modules: Planning and Engineering, Building Permits, Land, Cash Receipts, and Code Enforcement. Database is currently DB2 which replicates to SQL Server in real-time using Data Mirror.

Fire Property Inventory: Spreadsheet that contains a list of properties, associated address and Fire Suppression devices installed.

Attendees

Name	Date Attended	Agency/Department
Dane Quatacker	12/8/2014	Accela
Tom Callison	12/8/2014	Accela
Jeff Rich	12/8/2014	Accela
Matt Hart	12/8/2014	Accela
Paul Rose	12/8/2014	Accela
Rick Curtin	12/8/2014	Clark County
Deena Stanbrough	12/8/2014	Clark County
Nan Manning	12/8/2014	Clark County
Michael Trotter	12/8/2014	Clark County
Chuck Horne	12/8/2014	Clark County
Carolyn Ideker	12/8/2014	Clark County

Requirement Verification – Data Conversions

Req #	Database	Valid	Gap	Comments/Notes
1	SunGard Naviline	Yes	No	Primary Data Source for Land Management. No specific gaps found.
2	BL Verify	Yes	Yes	This was confirmed to be a Phase 2 interface. Change Order is required to move this task to Phase 2. The existing process today is requested to remain until business license is integrated. No Cost Change Order to move to Phase 2.
3	Fire Property Inventory	Yes	No	Spreadsheet that contains a list of properties, associated address and Fire Suppression devices installed. Final location of data will be determined in the Analysis phase. No specific gaps found.
4 New	Special Inspection Program Database	Yes	Yes	Access database managed by building to determine the qualifications of contractors to inspect special types of work; welding, structural and other specific scopes of work. Approved 3rd party agencies. This list is a manually updated spreadsheet today. Initial Data Conversion will be required to load into Accela.

| 5 New | APO Data Conversion | Yes | Yes | The reference APO data from Naviline must be converted at go-live in a one-time conversion to allow the Assessors and CAMA interface to function properly post-go live, and continue updates to the APO. Currently Historical Data (record level data) is listed as in scope for the Naviline conversion. The Assessors interface is an additional conversion to handle the two separate sources, Naviline and Assessors. |

2.3   INTEGRATION REQUIREMENTS (INTERFACES)

Attendees

[*List staff who attended sessions related to this analysis session*]

Name	Date Attended	Agency/Department
Dane Quatacker	12/9/2014	Accela
Tom Callison	12/9/2014	Accela
Jeff Rich	12/9/2014	Accela
Michael Trotter	12/9/2014	Clark County
Rick Curtin	12/9/2014	Clark County
Deena Stanbrough	12/9/2014	Clark County
Nan Manning	12/9/2014	Clark County
Chuck Horne	12/9/2014	Clark County
Carolyn Ideker	12/9/2014	Clark County
Dan Starr	12/8/2014	Clark County

Requirement Verification - Interface Review:

#	System Interfaces	Valid	Gap	Comments/Notes
1	State Contractors – Import Contractor data from the State of Nevada	Yes	No	Standard interface. No specific gaps found.
2	Payment processing – 3rd Party Payment Processor	Yes	Yes	Standard Payment Processing is within scope. No vendor has been identified to date. GAP Items: Back office wants EMV compliance for back office swipe/card reading which is not currently supported by the product or in project scope. Cannot fully identify if additional GAPs until there is a known target for this interface.
3	Melissa – Primary Address Data Source	Yes	No	This is not a mandatory requirement for phase 1 but is a nice to have as long as time permits to roll in prior to phase 2 when

#	Description			Notes
				needed. If not, this requirement is technically only a requirement for Phase 2. No specific gaps found.
4	CAMA gets the following information: 1. Permit Information 2. Site Addresses 3. Inspection Records	Yes	No	No specific gaps found.
5	Granicus - Outbound Project Conditions exported to Granicus for Agenda	Yes	Yes	Granicus does not currently have APIs available to allow import of Final Action information entered into Accela to be programmatically interfaced to Granicus.
6	SW Gas – Inspection Batch File	Yes	Yes	County prefers this to be exposed as a web service that can be dynamically queried by external resource as needed as opposed to a daily extract.
7	NV Energy – Inspection Batch File	Yes	Yes	County prefers this to be exposed as a web service that can be dynamically queried by external resource as needed as opposed to a daily extract
8	Assessors – Parcel file from the Assessor's Office	Yes	Yes	County defines addresses on a temporary parcel and later when parcel is defined by assessor automatically updates the temp parcel to the correct parcel based on legal description. This is currently not supported by the Standard APO import processes. APO data gets pulled from the Assessor's Office and Building creates Addresses. Then the file is sent back with addresses and permit information to the Assessor Office. Daily files currently get passed between the Assessor's office and Naviline to handle the changes. (see Assessor's interface)
9	CLIPS - Integration to CLIPS for phase 1 Land Management go-live. This interface will remain active until CLIPS go-live with Accela.	No	Yes	CLIPS interface was determined not to be needed during Phase I. Request to remove from scope. Fire requested to keep inspection process until BL is integrated.
10	File 360 – Document Management	Yes	No	File 360 is currently only used for Archival of scanned document. The County expressed that File360 may be phased out and potentially replaced with OpenText. An EDMS system was identified as being needed. To fill this GAP the County will need to make a decision to use File 360 for all document, use the Accela Document

				Service, or add a new interface for the to be EDMS system.
11	Selectron IVR - Accela will assist Selectron with the development of the IVR integration as required.	Yes	No	Effort is for Accela consultation and support. No specific gaps found.
12	Multi J – Regional Contractor License Data Exchange	Yes	Yes	This interface is currently specified as a phase 1 interface but after discussions it must be implemented in two parts. 1) Phase 1 is a pull of information from the MultiJ to get business licensing information for contractors. 2) Phase 2 is a push to MultiJ once the CLIPs system is migrated into Accela. The Gap is that this will become two separate interfaces
13 New	Export Agenda Information to SIRE (One way real time interface)	Yes	Yes	An interface would need to be developed to either (i) send information directly to SIRE from Accela to create the Agenda, or (ii) produce a report that outputs as a word document so the existing plugin can be utilized. From discussions a programmatic interface from Accela to the SIRE system is the ideal approach and would reduce some of the manual effort currently involved in the Agenda creation process.
14 New	Accela EDR Solution	Yes	TBD	Client may request to change the EDR solution to integrate with Accela Automation

2.4   GEOSPATIAL REQUIREMENTS (ACCELA GIS)

Attendees
[*List staff who attended sessions related to this analysis session*]

Name	Date Attended	Agency
Paul Rose	11/19/2014	Accela
Tom Callison	11/19/2014	Accela
Matt Hart	11/19/2014	Accela
Michael Trotter	11/19/2014	Clark County
Nan Manning	11/19/2014	Clark County
Janet Odom	11/19/2014	Clark County
Rick Curtin	11/19/2014	Clark County
Robert Vega	11/19/2014	Clark County
Chuck Horne	11/19/2014	Clark County

Observations and Discoveries:

GIS Observations/ New Discoveries	GAP: Yes/No/ TBD	Comments
Observation	No	"Open Door" is a 1998 GIS version of the City's GIS system. This was described as a County Portal for all land county data. Open Door is a viewer (read only) where research is being done prior to going to Naviline to create a permit. There is also a public accessible version called "Open Web". County will extract data out of Accela Automation potentially using our GOV.XML services
Observation	No	The County GIS department gets a daily data dump/parcel geometry from the County Assessor's office and it gets loaded into the GIS database.
Observation	No	Issue – The Assessor parcel data does not have a unique key other than the (APN) parcel number that gets loaded into the GIS database daily. This has been expressed as an issue. APN's frequently change due to parcel splits frequently that are known to break existing GIS linkage. County does not maintain the historical parcels.
Observation	No	Could you export/capture a GIS image and place on a document? For example a planning buffer search : Yes
Observation	No	The County provides address information to the Assessor's office and the Assessor's office provides ownership information back to the County. Address/Parcel/Owner – All available through the Assessors data This will be handled in the APO Data Conversion. Naviline loads Assessor file nightly The County adds addresses within the Building Department
Observation	No	Paul recommends that all address parcel owner data gets loaded into Accela Automation. Links to the GIS features on the map would be the Parcel/APN and as long as the parcel feature still exists in GIS on the Parcels layer then the parcel can be found by this linkage or else it would need geocode the Address.
Observation	No	The County has Interfaces that will need to be reconstructed to communicate between Open Door and Accela Automation. County Task
Observation	No	Accela GIS currently can only consume a single Cached map service and any number of Dynamic map services. If aerials are in a Cached map service then you would not be able to mash up with Bing Maps or ESRI online base maps since they are both cached.
Observation	No Gap – Include in APO load or store in GIS and pull into Accela	Parcel based files; roihte.txt, flood.txt, geoplan.txt, comtab.txt, mprojects.txt, sprojects.txt, pkdist.txt, pfna.txt. GIS creates these and places them in a folder on CCGIS1 on Saturdays. Jobs on the iSeries ftp these files and use them for updating Naviline records weekly. Flat files may not be needed and the decision is best to put directly into GIS and pull it at the GIS Layer

2.5   GLOBAL CITIZEN ACCESS REQUIREMENTS

Global Citizen Access Requirements that are not defined as department specific but discussed as a need.

Observations and Discoveries

Citizen Access Observations/ Discoveries/GAP	Dept.	Comments
Observation	Public Response	Streamline Intake: Want the goal of the Citizen portal to be simple without a lot of guessing what they are wanting to "Complain" about.
Observation	Building/Fire	Goal will be to have as many of the record types as possible be submitted in ACA. Plan Review fees will be collected at time of submittal. Adjustments may need to be made to plan check fee after validation by staff. Fire to go live with at least one process to start in ACA
Observation	Building	Existing On-line records will need to be live in ACA which are record types without plan reviews. Pay a fee and issue permit.
Observation	All	Desire to provide escrow account balances, activity of escrow, outstanding fees, list of records submitted, payment history. To be able to group by application type to show fees paid would require reports.
Observation	Planning/ Public Works	Would love the majority of applications to be available to submit online; have staff approve submittal before fees are assessed then have the customer be notified and pay online.
Observation	All	Workflow and documents could be viewed by most. The actual workflow steps may not be as important to be viewed. The hearing dates the project is scheduled for would be nice to have for public access. This could be done by a report located in the Attached Documents.
Observation	Public Works	Some of the attached documents (maps) will require integration with Utility Companies and they will need to be able to receive the drawings.

2.6   MOBILITY REQUIREMENTS

[*List staff who attended sessions related to this analysis session*]

Name	Date Attended	Agency
Paul Rose	11/20/2014	Accela
Tom Callison	11/20/2014	Accela
Nan Manning	11/20/2014	Clark County
Julia Staples	11/20/2014	Deputy Fire Marshal
Roger Gier	11/20/2014	Supervising Building Inspector
Danny Tinsman	11/20/2014	

Mobility observations and discoveries:

Mobility Observations/ New Discoveries	GAP: Yes/No/ TBD	Comments
Observation	No	Fire uses standard comments based on inspection failure

Observation	No	All users have internet outage areas so off line use is preferred. Online and off line solution
Observation	No	Hardware being used: Motion Computing Mobile tablets with Windows 7 OS
Observation	No	Fire is the only department currently using a mobile device to complete inspections
Observation	No	Fire, Building, and Code Enforcement have plans to build out
Observation	No	Inspectors record time per inspection in 15 minute increments
Observation	Gap	Being able to capture all the inspection data across multiple inspections. Example on a TI, an inspector completes 3 inspection types; sprinkler, hydrant, and electrical. The inspector would like to result all 3 inspections and identify the relevant contractor across all inspection approvals.
Observation	No	They expect the licensed person and data for that person to be kept with the Inspection(s) being performed and not on the Record that the inspection is associated to. Potential solution is to use an Accela Guide Sheet to accommodate this functionality request.
Observation	No	Mobile printing is available with the use of AMO, limited reporting is available in Code Officer/Inspector with no customization. County currently uses tablets in the field to produce Notice of Violations/Tags onsite. AMO can include more custom reports but will be a separate report from reports in AA.
Observation	No	Code Mobile piece must incorporate several pictures attached and lots of notes. Android smart phones are County issued.

2.7   GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

After reviewing the general requirements and Accela's responses to the requirements in the RFP, one requirement was identified as a gap, requirement #40. In discussion with Accela's technical resource, there is a concern that adding 2000 attachments to any document server would be crippling to the server when rendering the documents. There has been a case at the County when working with Resort properties when this amount of attached documents is necessary. A more thorough review of the business process needs to be completed to determine the best practice to handle this issue.

Req #	General Requirement	System Function	GAP?	Proposer Explanation
40	System shall have maximum limit of no less than 2000 attachments limit per record.	Out of Box	Concern	Under our proposed licensed perpetual hosting option, the storage of these documents are covered as part of the managed services fees. 2000 attachments would cripple any document server in rendering the documents

2.8   CONTRACT REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

#	Name	Description
1.	Contract SOW and PO $ Conflict	In the Payment Terms section of the SOW/Contract the Phase 1 and 2 schedules do not equal the total contract value of $4,337,720.00 a. Phase 1 in Schedule Total = $2,851,385.84 b. Phase 2 in Schedule Total = $1,518,202.00

		c. For a combined Total of $4,369,587.84 d. For a delta of $31,867.84 e. In Open Air milestones are the dollar amounts of the two payment schedules which don't total the contract value.	
	Contract SOW and # of Business Process Identified	The gap analysis was to include review of 85 business processes. During the review there were actual 91 processes identified in the itemized portion of the RFP. All 91 processes were reviewed with appropriate departments and included in the gap analysis. We ended our Gap analysis with 4 net new processes.	
	Reporting	County requested additional reporting support as well as reporting needs identified throughout the gap analysis. Phase 1 and Phase 2 report development maximum is limited to 25 high and 75 medium complexity.	
	Scripting	Given the complexity of automation identified, additional scripting maybe required to fulfill the County's more complex automation needs. Phase 1 and Phase 2 scripting development maximum is limited to 200 scripts.	

3. GAP FINDINGS/CHANGE REQUEST SUMMARY

#	GAP Name	Description	Deliverable	Estimated Cost Summary
1.	Contract Reconciliation	Adjust the total project amount with the scheduled amounts	Add verbiage into the Change Request to balance out total contract amounts	No Cost Change
2.	Contract Reconciliation	Adjust the total number of business processes analyzed as part of the Gap. SOW stated 85, RFP stated 91 and a total of 116 were reviewed.	SOW stated 85, RFP stated 91 and a total of 116 were reviewed.	No Cost Change
3.	Analysis of Additional Business Processes	A total of 89 processes have been determined. Contract states 70 in P1 (77/23% process number split between P1/ P2) 19 additional business processes will need to be analyzed and To Be Documents created by Accela. County staff will complete the configuration.	Increase the total business process analysis by 19 additional processes.	$76,000.00
4.	Additional Reports	Additional Reports maybe requested by the County. A report split assumed to be 50/50 between P1 and P2.	50 reports are defined for Phase 1 and 50 reports for Phase 2.	No Cost Change: Unless additional reports are requested to be written by Accela.

5.	Additional Scripting	Additional scripts maybe requested by the County. A scripting split assumed to be 50/50 between P1 and P2.	100 scripts targeted for P1 and 100 for P2.	No Cost Change: Unless additional scripts are requested to be written by Accela.
6.	Planned AA Upgrades	As Accela releases new versions AA Environments could be upgraded.	Provide a maximum of 2 additional AA upgrades to DEV, Test, and a Prod env.	$9,600 ($1,600.00 per environment each time)
7.	Conversion (#2)	BL Verify	This was confirmed to be a Phase 2 interface.
Change Order is required to move this task to Phase 2.	No Cost Change
8.	Conversion (#4 New)	Special Inspection Database	Data Mapping, 2 test conversions, validation support	$28,000.00
9	Conversion (#5 New)	APO – Naviline Data conversion	Data Mapping, 2 test conversions, validation support	$16,000.00
10	Interface (#2)	3rd Party Payment Processor	EMV Compliance for back office swipe/card readings is not currently supported by produce	No Cost Change: Unavailable to support card reading. No change in cost as 3rd Party Payment Processor is still required
11.	Interface (#5)	11E - Granicus	NA	<$25,000.00 Savings > Unavailable/TBD
12.	Interface (#6)	SW Gas – Inspection Batch File	SOW change - batch or web service option	No Cost Change
13	Interface (#7)	NV Energy – Inspection Batch File	SOW change - batch or web service option	No Cost Change
14	Interface (#8)	Assessors – Parcel file from the Assessor's Office	SOW change Automation Unavailable/ Configuration can support update options	No Cost Change: Automation Unavailable – Process is configurable.
15	Interface (#9)	CLIPS integration Phase I	SOW change.	< $20,000.00 Savings >
16	Interface(#12)	Multi J - Regional Contractor License Data Exchange	SOW change to Split interfaces ½ P1 and ½ P2	No Cost Change: Split between Phase I and Phase 2
17	Interface(#13 New)	Export Agenda Information to SIRE	One way real time interface	$32,000.00
18	Interface (#14 New)	Accela EDR vs alternate solution (Project Dox)	TBD	TBD

4. CONCLUSION

After evaluating Clark County's 116 Land Management business processes, a total of 89 Phase 1 business processes were determined to be required to support functionality. This project is designed to be a shared implementation approach between Clark County and Accela. Referencing the contractual percentage split between Phase 1 and Phase 2, Accela should be responsible for 70 business processes and the County would be responsible for the remaining 19. Accela recommends that all business processes be analyzed by Accela staff to promote consistency in documentation and maintain best practice approach. The final count of business processes have been defined to equal 138 Accela record types (as shown in Addendum A below). Accela and the County will split the configuration of these record types proportionately.

Most gaps identified above did not pose a significant risk or cost and will be handled through contract verbiage change. The table below summarized the gap items which impose a hard cost to incorporate requested scope. Two gap items were identified as no longer required which help offset the additional costs.

Gap Items with Costs:

ID #	Description	Type	Amount
3	Analysis of 19 Additional Business Processes	Hard	$76,000.00
6	Planned AA Upgrades	Hard	$9,600.00
8	Conversion (#4 New) Special Inspection Database	Hard	$28,000.00
9	Conversion (#5 New) APO – Naviline Data conversion	Hard	$16,000.00
17	Interface(#13 new) Export Agenda Information to SIRE	Hard	$32,000.00
Sub Total			$161,600.00
11	Interface (#5) 11E - Granicus	Hard	$25,000.00
15	Interface (#9) CLIPS integration Phase I	Hard	$20,000.00
Sub Total			$45,000.00
Total Change			$116,600.00

Optional Gap Items with Costs:

ID #	Description	Type	Amount
4	Additional Reports maybe requested by the County. A report split assumed to be 50/50 between P1 and P2. Recommendation to increase to 75 reports per phase.	Optional	Medium complexity reports $4,000 per report High complexity reports @ $7,200 per report (estimated)
5	Additional scripts maybe requested by the County. A scripting split assumed to be 50/50 between P1 and P2. Recommendation to increase scripting for P1 by an additional 100 scripts	Optional	Low complexity scripts $800 per script Medium complexity script @ $1,600 per script. High complexity scripts (vary in cost)

ADDENDUM A – ESTIMATED RECORD TYPES - DETAIL

Total Record Count: 138

Group	Type	Subtype	Category
Building	Project	Residential	New
			Remodel
			Repair
			Addition
			Phase
			Pool
		Commercial	New
			Remodel
			Repair
			Addition
			Phase
			Pool
Building	Building	Residential	New
			Remodel
			Repair
			Addition
			Phase
			Pool
		Commercial	New
			Remodel
			Repair
			Addition
			Phase
			Pool
		Standalone	NA
Building	Electrical	Residential	New
			Remodel
			Repair
			Addition
			Phase
		Commercial	New

Group	Type	Subtype	Category
			Remodel
			Repair
			Addition
			Phase
		Standalone	NA
Building	Mechanical	Residential	New
			Remodel
			Repair
			Addition
			Phase
		Commercial	New
			Remodel
			Repair
			Addition
			Phase
		Standalone	NA
Building	Plumbing	Residential	New
			Remodel
			Repair
			Addition
			Phase
		Commercial	New
			Remodel
			Repair
			Addition
			Phase
		Standalone	NA
Building	Amusement Ride	Permit	NA
		Renewal	NA
	Grading	NA	NA
	Demolition	NA	NA
	Fence	Standard	NA
	Change of Occupancy	NA	NA
	Miscellaneous	NA	NA
	Facility Permit	NA	NA

Group	Type	Subtype	Category
	Manufactured Home	NA	NA
	Resort Inspections	*NA*	*NA*
	Sustainability	NA	NA
	QAA - Fabricators	Permit	NA
		Renewal	NA
	Signs	NA	NA
		Billboard (Electric)	NA
		Repair Remodel	NA
	Standard Plans	Pool	NA
		House	NA
		Other	NA
	Solar	NA	NA
Building Total			**78**
Fire	Operational	Temporary	NA
		Permit	NA
		Renewal	NA
	Construction	New	NA
		Altered	NA
		TI	NA
		Emergency	NA
	Fire Damage	NA	NA
	Occupancy	Occupancy Types Inspection	NA
		Renewal	NA
		Amendment	NA
Fire Total	11		**11**
Public Response	Complaint	Casino/resort	NA
		General(Complaint)	NA
		Shopping Cart	NA
Public Response Total			**3**
Water Reclamation	Sewer	Connection	NA
		Waiver	NA
	Septic	Connection	NA
Water Reclamation Total			**3**

Group	Type	Subtype	Category
Planning	Administrative	Street Naming	NA
		Minor Deviation	NA
		Temp Use	NA
		Design Review	NA
		Verification of Zoning	NA
		Extension of Time	NA
		Zoning Compliance	NA
		Agenda Items/Discussions for boards	NA
	Land Use	Design Review	NA
		Extension of Time	NA
		Street Numbering	NA
		Annexation	NA
		Tentative Map	NA
		Use Permit	NA
		Vacation/Abandonments	NA
		Variance	NA
		Waiver	Conditions
		Waiver	Development Standards
		Zone Change	Conforming
		Zone Change	Non-conforming
		Clarification of Conditions	NA
		Application Review	NA
	General Plan	NA	NA
		Plan Amendment	NA
	Pre-submittal	NA	NA
	Development Agreement	NA	NA
	Text Amendment	NA	NA
	Reconsideration	NA	NA
Comprehensive Planning Total			**28**
PW	Administrative	Minor Deviation	NA
		Finish Floor Waiver	NA
		Boundary Line Adjustment	NA

Group	Type	Subtype	Category
		Exception to Determination - Minor Subdivision Map	NA
		Traffic Mitigation	NA
	Maps	Major Subdivision	NA
		Major Subdivision	Reversionary
		Minor Subdivision	NA
		Minor Subdivision	Reversionary
		Vacation	NA
		Separate Docs	NA
		BLM (Right of Way)	NA
	Development	Off-Site Improvements	NA
	Encroachment	NA	NA
	Traffic Control	Traffic Study	NA
Public Works Total			**15**
Grand Total			**138**

APPENDIX E – GLOSSARY

Accela Citizen Access (ACA) - A customizable Web-based application that integrates with Accela Automation to provide citizens with online access to government services and information.

Accela Geographic Information System (AGIS) - An interface that integrates with Accela Automation to provide automated maps from a central database. This system provides a geographic representation of all land-use, zoning, and infrastructure information associated with a parcel, permit, inspection, or plan.

Accela Mobile Office (AMO) - A mobile application that works in conjunction with Accela Automation and Accela GIS to extend processing capabilities to the field for assigned jobs such as inspections or work orders and the related application information. Accela Mobile Office runs on Windows operating systems including Windows XP, making it compatible with a variety of mobile devices. After the 7.1 release, Accela Mobile Office can operate using the .NET framework.

Accela Automation Vantage360 - A series of Accela products including Accela Automation, Accela Citizen Access, and reporting solutions. This is a three-tier application, which consists of a Web server, an EJB application server, and a reporting server. Among them, Accela Automation Web tier is hosted on a Jet speed Web server. This architecture provides users with the ability to use personalized consoles to access and display a targeted view of agency information. Also called Accela Vantage360.

Activity-Specific Information - User-defined data items the administrator configures for a Case, Application, and Permit activity based on activity types. An Accela Vantage360 term only.

APO- Address, Parcel, and Owner information. Addresses are physical locations related to parcels. Parcels are a piece of land with a specific location and legally defined boundaries. A parcel may have multiple addresses. Owners are linked to specific parcels and can be considered the main person responsible for a parcel, as well as a point of contact.

Application-Specific Information (ASI) -Fields an agency includes on an application (permit or form) in addition to the standard application fields.   Administrators can customize the fields within each Application-Specific Information (ASI) group, and determine whether users can search for an application based on those fields

Condition - A certain requirement surrounding an application that an applicant must fulfill in order to qualify for approval. Although conditions do not necessarily impose holds, they may prolong the planning process until they are met

Console - The entire working area of the page within Accela Automation, including the control panel, main links, portlets, and all the information displayed for the user.

EDMS - Electronic Document Management is an automated system that supports the creation, use, and maintenance of electronically-created documents.

EMSE - Event Manager and Script Engine are tools to automate and simplify agency processes. Certain scripts are programed to run for managing and controlling events.

Fee - An established price that must be paid for a specific service, planning or other case-related task, as specified in an agency's ordinances.

Inspection - A general observation of an asset or permit application. An inspection may include many specific observations.

Application Intake Form - An intake form which allows the user to view many fields when creating, editing, or reviewing an application, work order, or service request. The single portlet entry and review form is organized into sections that correspond with record tabs. Accela Vantage360 feature only.

Module - A solution is a group of modules and add-on products that work together for a specific purpose. All modules share the same interface and several other major features. In addition to the similarities, each module lets you perform a specialized set of tasks related to land management, planning, permitting, or other agency-specific tasks. Some of the modules available for Accela Automation are Accela Asset Management, Accela Land Management, Accela Licensing & Case Management, and Accela Public Health & Safety.

Portlet - A section of the Web page dedicated to display information or perform tasks. Portlets divide main links into smaller functional areas and act as containers, or frames, for certain operations, files, or links.

Record - A term that represents the identification number of broad range of items or forms that users manage within Accela Automation, such as application, case, license, permit, service request, and work order.

Record ID - The identification number of a record in Land Management or Service Request modules, or a work order in Asset Management module.

Reference Data - Administrator-defined information that can be copied into a Record. For example, a parcel record is created by an administrator, with information on the location and size of the parcel. This information is reference data. When a user creates an application to build a house on the parcel, the information contained in the parcel record can be copied into the building application. The copy of the reference data is called transactional data, and it is independent of the reference data.

SmartChoice Group - This feature provides information about standard sections on a Web page. It displays what information is required, where in the application they are listed, and whether a user can validate information against values that already exist in the database.

Standard Choice - Configurations used by Accela to set up feature functionality such as options available in drop-down lists and default values for a field.

Status - Status describes the state of an application or inspection. A status might indicate a phase of a process, such as "Pending," or it might indicate a state of being, such as "Accepted" or "Failed."

Transaction Data - Data in a Record that has been copied from Accela reference data. For example, a parcel record is created by an administrator, with information on the location and size of the parcel. This information is reference data. When a user creates a permit application to build a house on the parcel, the information contained in the parcel record can be copied into the building permit application. The copy of the reference data is called transactional data, and it is independent of the reference data.

Workflow - A set of tasks an agency defines and follows in order to process a planning application. Workflow functions as a checklist once a plan is submitted.

SIGN OFF

The Clark County BLITZ Management Leadership Team has reviewed this document and agrees that the defined business processes are an accurate representation of the envisioned "to-be" process within the Accela Automation platform.   It is noted that references to reports, scripts, and data coming from the County's GIS environment will be evaluated and finalized through subsequent discussions and are included here for reference only. Clark County understands that any changes to this document would require discussion with the Accela team and agreement by both parties that a change was warranted.

All Costs/Pricing are yet to be finalized and agreed upon between Clark County and Accela.

Accepted By:	Accepted By: Accela, Inc.
By:	By:
Print Name:	Print Name:
Title:	Title:
Date:	Date: