BOARD MEETING DATE: July 10, 2015   AGENDA NO. 30

REPORT: Special Administrative Committee

SYNOPSIS: A Special Meeting of the Administrative Committee was held on
                     Wednesday, June 17, 2015 to interview proposers for website
                     improvements and to consider the purchase of OnBase software
                     support. The next Administrative Committee meeting is scheduled
                     for Friday, July 17, 2015 at 10:00 a.m.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Receive and file.

                                        Dr. William A. Burke, Chair
                                        Administrative Committee
GC

Attendance: Attending the June 17, 2015 meeting were Committee Member Dennis
Yates at SCAQMD headquarters and Committee Members William Burke, Clark
Parker, Sr. and Judith Mitchell via videoconference.

JULY AGENDA Items:

1. **Execute Contract for Website Evaluation and Improvement:** Assistant
    Deputy Executive Officer Chris Marlia reported that this item is to execute a
    contract for the planned website evaluation and improvement effort. An RFP
    was released in May with bidders given one month to respond. A Bidders
    Conference was held on May 12 with four proposals submitted on June 1. A
    panel reviewed and evaluated the proposals and selected three companies to be
    interviewed by the Committee. The fourth company did not meet the minimum
    technical scores required and was eliminated from further consideration.

    Dr. Burke commented that after reviewing the proposals and noting the disparity
    in the costs and timeframes presented, he did not understand how a qualified
    company could perform the needed work required. He indicated that he did not
    think any of the bids were responsive to what the agency had in mind for the

website. Mr. Marlia responded that two of the companies have standard ways of evaluating websites, and they review them by using Google analytics and conducting interviews of stakeholders with set procedures where they can prepare the evaluations fairly quickly. The third company proposes to evaluate the website over a period of time, take surveys, make adjustments and measure how well those adjustments perform over time. Hence, there are two different approaches. If they are not doing migration work and not doing a lot of wholesale changes to the website, it is possible for the work to be done within the timeframe proposed.

Dr. Wallerstein added that there are three tasks associated with the contract. One is the review and evaluation, the second is recommendations for improvement, and the third is actual implementation. Until the contractors perform Tasks 1 and 2, including interviews with the Committee Members and other stakeholders, and examine the website in more detail, they will not know how big the remodel will be. It may be that as they go through this information-gathering process and present their recommendations, the cost for Task 3 may be quite large. He recommended that the Committee interview the proposers to discern their philosophical approach as well as get better information regarding their experience in evaluating websites.

Mayor Yates inquired whether it was possible for the three bidders to perform Task 1 first and have staff evaluate their recommendations. The Committee would then conduct interviews based on the recommendations they submitted and award Tasks 2 and 3 to the proposer with the best presentation on the results of Task 1. Dr. Burke thought that was an excellent idea.

Dr. Wallerstein clarified Mayor Yates' recommendation by stating that because two of the contractor proposals are very similar in price and the contract is for a nominal amount considering what the project means to the agency, the Committee would have all three proposers review and evaluate the website, return to the Committee not having developed their complete recommendations, but able to give a presentation of their initial assessment of the website and how well it performs with some general indications of what their strategy would be during the implementation phase. The Committee determined that the planned interviews for this meeting were not necessary and agreed that the proposers be given 30 days to perform Task 1. Dr. Burke directed staff to inform the bidders that the Committee has changed direction for the project and would like them to participate in the new approach.

2. **Authorize Purchase of OnBase Software Support:** Dr. Burke mentioned that this item was not passed at the regular meeting of the Administrative Committee on June 12 because he and Dr. Parker had questions regarding the fiscal aspects of the issue. However, after speaking with Dr. Wallerstein, Dr. Burke requested

that this item be placed on the agenda for this special meeting of the Administrative Committee to be reconsidered and forwarded to the full Board since the software license expires on July 31. However, Dr. Burke still expressed his dissatisfaction with the company's demands for the purchase of their software. Dr. Wallerstein thanked the Committee and commented that before this item comes up for renewal next year, staff will research other software companies to determine whether to renew with this software vendor or go elsewhere. Dr. Parker recommended that this effort be done at least 60 days prior to the license expiration.

Moved by Yates; seconded by Parker; unanimously approved.

3.   **Public Comment:** None

Meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.