



Draft-Minutes

OPS-County Operations Committee

Tuesday, October 19, 2021

1:00 PM

Meeting will be conducted via teleconference (Zoom). Simultaneous public access to the meeting will be available

(1) via live stream on DCTV's webpage,

(2) on DCTVChannel23.TV

Meeting Started At: 1:00PM

Attendees: Commissioners Terry, Patrick, Bradshaw, Cochran-Johnson, Rader, Davis Johnson

Present 3 - Commissioner Ted Terry, Commissioner Steve Bradshaw, and Commissioner Robert Patrick

I. MINUTES

2021-3213 Commission District(s): All Districts
Minutes for the October 5, 2021 County Operations (OPS) Committee Meeting;
MOTION was made by Robert Patrick, seconded by Steve Bradshaw, that this agenda item be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Terry, Commissioner Bradshaw, and Commissioner Patrick

II. STATUS UPDATE

County Website Update

-presentation from Director Matelski

-RP: requests update of calendar component on the County website for County events

-Question LCJ: Congratulations on the national ranking. As we are moving forward with reimagining our website, I am happy that we are addressing the website at this time. Regarding our departments, the website serves as a portal to our departments. The planning and sustainability portal is most concerning to me; it is my understanding that you're in the process of updating this. Will the website have better functionality? I want to ensure that other websites are also addressed.

J Matelski: We are definitely working closely with Permitting, Planning and related teams on this. Also working with the CEO and COO in two teams, one focusing on the technology and one focused on the broader picture. The new portal going live next year will have much greater functionality.

LCJ: understanding that this is being addressed gives me great hope and excitement.

Question JR: This may take work to vet, but I would encourage this committee to consider this. One of the top interactions we have with the public are open records requests. These requests go through a process of identifying and producing those requests, and often take longer than the 3 business day timeline to produce them. Will this committee work with IT and the Administration to develop a way to have the data in which open requests are made are made available as a policy on-line. We should be able to identify work products and other things we produce as being available for dissemination and accessible to the public either through our website or some other portal.

V Ernestes: That is a great idea and we are working on that. GovQA is a process to streamline; it's a computerized process currently used in Fulton County. It does allow a computerized process and allows departments to upload documents, tag them appropriately. We are working to create a pilot; a few things need to be finished first. Every department will have a records custodian who is accountable for this data input. We are working with HR on a job description, and will be working with Mr. Matelski and my office on that. This will help us keep track so that there are fewer missed responses. We are not quite there yet but hope to be there; there are several exemptions that have been worked on to date.

JR: I'm asking the committee to review data sets available without an open records requests. There should be elements of that is similar to the Hansen system. There may be other areas of county work product that would be appropriate to that discoverability, whether it is reporting in our Utilities department, our Oracle system, etc. For example, it would be ideal to click on an account and see real-time use data, and receive emails that alert users of anomalous water usage. I'm suggesting the committee may think about how to pursue that objective as a matter of policy.

J Matelski: As we modernize systems, we are looking at leveraging these systems, to provide better access to the data and better customer service. Regarding the water billing - absolutely. When we go live we will have ability to monitor that data Commissioner Rader.

JR: It all belongs to the public; we are a public agency, and I'd like to treat that data as though they own it

-Question MDJ: I have confidence that our technology department will upgrade as they see the opportunity and need to do so. Just because we are in the age of technology doesn't mean we can use technology for everything. I appreciate our experts to tell us what we can and cannot do. I agree with Commissioner Rader that the public deserves access, but we can only deliver what we are able to, I want the public to have as much possible access allowed by our technology and laws.

-TT: As a recap, it sounds like some of the data may not need open records requests first, but should be easily available.

J Matelski: We have found that most of the time when people have issues, is when they go from our website to the other site. We are going to double up our efforts on departments and agencies that are outside are being reviewed, as well as those inside.

-Question TT: The current platform and software that we have now can be included from this conversation today?

J Matelski: We haven't talked about specific functionalities, but everything we've talked about today, like the calendar, we definitely have mechanisms to get there, whether it is through modernization of the Drupal platform or another determination. Even the Calendar I'd say is more of a function of our people, regardless of agency, making sure their information is updated, available and provides good customer experience.

-Question TT: When the website was last updated, was that through a RFP process?

COO Williams: It was maybe 5 years ago; I believe it was the result of a RFP in terms of changing the look of the webpage. It was part of one effort that also included changing the logo. There has been a constant look to update our website overall. Regarding Hansen, we have been working for 5 years to update that system. My statement, even though revisiting the face of the website was years ago - our constant push to make the website more interactive and useful and provide a place to transact is where we are working towards. I envision more interaction through 311, where customers can track status of their concerns.

J Matelski: we did go live in November 2016

-TT: It seems we have opportunities here. To the committee members regarding next steps, do we want to embark upon the discussion about a new RFP for a website revamp, or do we continue to fix and upgrade things as we've done in the last few years?

RP: My expectation was to work with what we had already and update it to make it more functional

SB: I concur with that. I'd be curious of some analysis of the pros/cons of going on the path we're on vs. a complete revamp TT: The pace at which corporations and other government entities change their system is happening faster and faster. What did we spend on the last website revamp for the user experience and architecture of the website?

J Matelski: I believe it was around \$50,000 for the design and \$200,000 for the implementation. We did have a RFP for the actual development of the site. The total cost is \$250,000.

TT: feedback, survey, or focus group from the commissioners regarding an in-depth review of what we think on the current look of the website

Z Williams: I'm thinking on the appropriate course of action. I believe of thinking on what it is we want to solve. A survey or questionnaire may be helpful. One of the things we may be missing is keeping the data up to date, and interaction. If you could give IT and I the opportunity to talk, and some of the other departments.

MDJ: We are #2 in the nation. I'd like to know what is missing, and what is needed. Many of our constituents are not technology people.

TT: I agree. I have a suggestion that we look at other large urban county websites and use some of their best practices in terms of look and feel. That could be a way to ground-truth what we're looking for.

Z Williams: We will also look at the Nordstrom's, Walmart, Amazon, etc. So that can not only be the best in the nation for government but also best in class.

J Matelski: Just to Clarify earlier, the total cost last time was \$250,000. \$200,000 for implementation and \$50,000 for design. We would also want to keep any type of questionnaire short, asking for the top 3 or 5 concerns or opportunities.

TT: On my commissioner website there are accessibility features for those who may be color-blind, etc. Could you put together a short survey and include some your suggestions, like top concerns and changes we want to see, for commissioners, and come back to the OPS committee before the end of the year or beginning of 2022 to provide the data from the survey and we can continue this discussion from there.

J Matelski: absolutely, I will coordinate with COO Williams and try to get something out by end of the quarter and hopefully have early results at the beginning of next year.

Question TT: Commissioner Patrick does that sound good to you?

RP: Absolutely, I think this is a good process.

Commissioner Terry Request Technology and Innovation Staff to develop and distribute a survey regarding feedback and changes to the County website and provide results to OPS in 2022 to further any discussion.

III. AGENDA ITEM

New Agenda Items

2021-3092

Commission District(s): ALL

CA - Red Dyed Diesel Fuel (Annual with 2 Options to Renew): for Public Works-Fleet Management. Consists of piggybacking off the competitively let Omnia Partners Cooperative Purchase Agreement No. 53315 (Motor and Aviation Fuels & Related Services) for the purchase of red dyed diesel fuel used to fuel off-road County equipment.

Awarded to Mansfield Oil Co. Amount Not To Exceed: \$450,000.00.

MOTION was made by Robert Patrick, seconded by Steve Bradshaw, that this agenda item be recommended for approval to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Terry, Commissioner Bradshaw, and Commissioner Patrick

-information provided by Director Gordon

-Question RP: We had another contract for red-dye earlier this year?

R Gordon: Yes Sir, that was for Facilities management, Fire and, Police, they use it for various generators. They also get it in smaller deliveries so the cost is different than our contract. This contract is 7,500 gallon deliveries at a time.

-Question JR: Is this a straight purchase and is co-op method still a means of getting the purchase?

R Gordon: yes sir, this is a better deal.

2021-3123

Commission District(s): ALL

REN - Purchase of Gasoline and Diesel Fuel (Annual Contract -1st of 4 Options to Renew): Contract No. 1236147 for use by Public Works-Fleet Management. Consists of piggybacking off the competitively let Omnia Partners Cooperative Purchase Agreement No. 53315 for the purchase of gasoline and diesel fuel for County gas station locations. Awarded to Mansfield Oil Company of Gainesville, Inc. Total Amount Not To Exceed: \$7,000,000.00.

MOTION was made by Steve Bradshaw, seconded by Robert Patrick, that this agenda item be recommended for deferral to the OPS-County Operations Committee, due back on 11/2/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Terry, Commissioner Bradshaw, and Commissioner Patrick

-information provided by Director Gordon

-Question SB: has this item gone through audit review?

TT: I'm up to the will of the committee on this item. Would this be a clear-cut item rather than an audit being needed?

SB: I know that PWI has a standing review of items above \$3M; I believe that's good public policy; even though we haven't adopted that in our committee I believe it would be a good process.

Question TT: yes, Director Gordon is there any concerns about this item going to audit? Time constraint or any complications?

R Gordon: We have done audits on plenty other items and the time frame is good. As long as we get it done before then we will be good.

-Question TT: In the near future could you discuss the breakdown in percentage of how much would be diesel vs. gasoline? R Gordon: yes sir

-TT: in my latest research the general electricity costs for electric vehicles tends to be about half the cost compared to gasoline or diesel is that correct?

R Gordon: It is; especially if you charge for peak-hours.

-TT: As we move forward on the adoption of electric vehicles, can you help us understand the cost differentials there and maybe we can get a general rule of thumb. For example if we increased EV Fleet by 10% over the next two years this contract cost would decrease by 20-25% or whatever the total may be.

R Gordon: yes, first we have to learn how much it is to charge, how much in peak verse off peak hours. As we do more it will be easier to come up with numbers.

Question TT: So for Sam's Street, are we setting up those chargers to be on separate meter so it's clearly defined what the cost is?

Gordon: Yes, we are also currently working on the ability to charge individual vehicles. We have a presentation this week on a company that could offer that monitoring.

Question TT: So a way to track individual departments and their vehicles?

R Gordon: yes sir. Right now we have non network chargers so we don't have that capability but if we decided to install network chargers it's going to be a significant amount of money. This company could provide software and mechanism to help us define each vehicle, but we will have to see, we are trying to prepare for the long term. I would like to point out that in 2020 we exceeded our usage of diesel and natural gas. This year we are going to use more natural gas than diesel and that's a huge thing and we are proud of that.

SB: Motion to Defer item depending Audit Review, request Chair facilitate request for Audit

2021-3129

Commission District(s): ALL

REN - On Call Electrical Services (Annual Contract - 2nd Renewal of 2 Options to Renew): Contract No. 1200933 for use by the Department of Facilities Management (FM). This contract consists of providing inspections, maintenance repairs and installations of electrical systems, components and equipment in County owned facilities. Awarded to GC&E Systems Group, Inc. Amount Not To Exceed: \$750,000.00.

MOTION was made by Robert Patrick, seconded by Steve Bradshaw, that this agenda item be recommended for approval. to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Terry, Commissioner Bradshaw, and Commissioner Patrick

- information provided by Kevin Buford

2021-3148

Commission District(s): All
CO - Change Order No. 4 to Contract No. 1247326 for Plumbing Services (Annual Contract with 2 Options to Renew): for use by Facilities Management (FM). This contract consists of the repair, replacement, maintenance, and installation of plumbing fixtures at County-owned facilities. Awarded to J2 Connect, Inc. Amount Not To Exceed: \$180,000.00.

MOTION was made by Steve Bradshaw, seconded by Robert Patrick, that this agenda item be recommended for approval. to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Terry, Commissioner Bradshaw, and Commissioner Patrick

-information provided by Kevin Buford

K Buford: this was a last minute request for an additional \$70,000 in association with the original \$180,000.

Horner: Facilities has worked with us, the increase rate is \$250,000, we will provide a substitute tomorrow.

Question TT: are we trying to move over to the waterless urinals, is this the standard moving forward?

Z Williams: yes and low-flow, this is a part of our strategy we have been working on; about three years ago there was a massive upgrade to all the toilets and urinals in the County

Buford: That is correct we've spent over a million dollars upgrading water fixtures to provide low flow fixtures. As we design new buildings we are incorporating these changes when possible.

Question TT: As you all move forward can you send the committee information details on all upgrades, what are the models, ect.

Williams: My suggestion we schedule a sustainability update in OPS, there is a host of things we are looking at including water and lighting, we will prepare something to present

Question SB: Does this cover all DeKalb facilities or just some?

Burford: this is for all faculties, our goal is to have a backup contractor but for right now this is our sole contractor, they are very capable of handling this work and do a good job,

2021-3197

Commission District(s): ALL
CO - Change Order No. 1 to Contract No. 1217880 for the Renovation and Development of the 178 Sams Street Facility: for use by the Department of Facilities Management (FM). This contract consists of the renovation and development of the buildings located at the 178 Sams Street Facility. Awarded to Hogan Construction Group, LLC. Amount Not To Exceed: \$316,678.98.

MOTION was made by Robert Patrick, seconded by Steve Bradshaw, that this agenda item be recommended for approval. to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Terry, Commissioner Bradshaw, and Commissioner Patrick

-information provided by Director Stovall

SB: How are we tracking in regards to the completion of Sam's Street?

Stovall: We've had no major delays, the project may push into December or early January, but things are going well and progressing. We try to get these small change orders done as they come up to reduce any more delays

Commissioner Terry: Request progress photos be sent every few weeks to commissioners as an update to the progress of Sam's Street.

TT: is there a changes for Commissioners to tour?

Stovall: We can schedule that, there are safety protocols we have to comply will but we can do that

2021-3122

Commission District(s): 1 & 6

RFP - Request for Proposal No. 21-500588 for Westside Aviation Tract W-3 Development on DeKalb Peachtree Airport (Multi-year Lease): for use by the DeKalb Peachtree (PDK) Airport. Consists of the design, construction and management of business directly related to aviation at Parcel W-3 at the PDK Airport. Recommend approval to the sole, highest scoring proposer: Trinity Development Group, Inc. Estimated Revenue Amount: \$2,574,949.29

MOTION was made by Steve Bradshaw, seconded by Robert Patrick, that this agenda item be recommended for approval. to the Board of Commissioners, due back on 10/26/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Terry, Commissioner Bradshaw, and Commissioner Patrick

-Information by Director Mario Evans

Question TT: So we are not receiving 2.5 million dollars that's just how much their proposal is?

M Evans: Correct

Question RP: This contract is only for the constructor for the hangers, is that correct?

M Evans: Yes, correct, they win the RFP then we will go into a lease negotiation, then we will bring back to you the proposed lease agreement doe this particular development.

Question JR: What type of aircraft will be placed there?

M Evans: Because of where the T Hangers are located you can only put something smaller than 54 feet wide.

Question JR: What is the business, Is this a third party rental?

Evans: yes, or right now we do not have space for mechanics to work, so that could also be a potential use.

Question JR: This proposal does not have a compliment of DeKalb based aircraft we would be able to leverage?

M Evans: Not until we get to negotiations of the lease and the bidder identifies who they will lease the hanger to. It could be aircraft storage or mechanical workshop, If it is aircraft storage then we could have those aircraft to claim as personal property tax for the County but we don't know until we get to lease negotiations.

Question JR: So this particular aspect of businesses operated will be governed by a lease and is unrelated to the construction of the hanger, will the configuration of the hanger further limit what activity can occur there?

M Evans: that is correct, size, complexity of the location and utilization of space is outlined in the RP for all bidders. Question JR: but the particular design does not further constrain the space?

M Evans: No sir

Question JR: Just so I understand, who will pay the cost of construction amount, the county or bidder? If there were two bidders would we be looking for the low or high bid?

M Evans: The bidder will pay that amount, this is how much they believe it will cost to build a hanger in that location. We would be looking for the high big, we had others but they withdrew due to finances

Question JR: Once we get to leasing phase, is it going to be the constructor that will also apply to lease, could they be outbid by someone else?

M Evans: No, we will have a lease with the tenant, Trinity Development, and they will have a third party lease with someone else, a sublet.

Question JR: We still have some say on who the sublet is correct?

M Evans: Yes. This item is the first step to getting to lease negotiations.

JR: I would solicit the committee to get a report back on this project, it's important to the public and airports impact on physical development. We have a lot of options of what could be developed and these decisions could affect other departments such as fleet usage.

M Evans: We will report back

Question TT: Will this added hanger reduce some of the transient flight noise issues?

M Evans: no this will not impact that. Most of the transient operations we have are much bigger, this will help some of the congestion of hanger storage space or provide mechanic space

Question TT: in terms of our current wait list, how many do we currently have, will this hanger have any effect on this?MDJ: excuse me chair, we are ten minutes over time

TT: Director Evans if you could just provide that response in an email

M Evans: Yes Sir

Meeting Ended At: 2:24 PM

MOTION was made by Robert Patrick, seconded by Steve Bradshaw, that this agenda item be adjourned meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Terry, Commissioner Bradshaw, and Commissioner Patrick