



Date: March 7, 2008
To: SanGIS Board of Directors
From: SanGIS Executive Director
Subject: Minutes of SanGIS Board of Directors Workshop on March 7, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 AM

Board Members Present:

Matt McGarvey, Mayor designee, Board Chair
Chandra Wallar, Chief Administrative Officer designee

Others Present:

Andrew Abouna, SanGIS Executive Director
Phyllis Chapin, GIS Manager, City of San Diego
Ross Martin, GIS Manager, County of San Diego

Regular Agenda (summarized here in numerical order)

Item #1: SanGIS IT Priority 1 Upgrade

In reference to the updated hardware and software quote from SDDPC, which was based upon meetings between SDDPC and SanGIS, Andrew noted that the quote contained the necessary requirements. The key requirements are 2 servers having robust CPU and RAM, sufficient sized SAN, and correct peripheral components each verified to work within a VMWare environment. Also contained in the quote are tape backup equipment and the VMWare operating system software. The quote total is \$94,134.72, with the hardware portion representing \$74,051.57. When prorated across three years, the annual cost to SanGIS for all of the equipment as quoted would be \$31,378.24.

In response to Chandra's question, Matt confirmed that the IT equipment would be reutilized by the City should the Board decide to move SanGIS into the County.

The Board approved SanGIS budgeting annually \$31,378.24 for the next three years to payback the equipment purchase. The equipment would either be purchased by the Office of the CIO and charged back to SanGIS annually for the next three years, or SDDPC could provide the equipment directly to SanGIS for payments over next three years. Phyllis and Andrew would work with Eric Culp of SDDPC determine the best purchasing option and to coordinate the prompt acquisition of the equipment for SanGIS.

Matt and Phyllis also advised Andrew to reflect this new cost in SanGIS's forthcoming FY09 SanGIS budget.

Item #2: SanGIS Business Models Comparison

Andrew introduced the seven attachments that supported the gap analysis of the two proposals, noting the FTE comparison tables were the key new documents that the Board had requested at the previous meeting. Ross did note that the County's Overall Financial Comparison Matrix and Itemized Budget Totals, as previously emailed, should be amended to note a total annual cost of \$1,473,783.53 and One-time Expense of \$243,460.

Since documents relating to the County are contained within the County's proposal and to minimize discrepancies and the number of documents circulated in the future, it was agreed to subsequently send out only County's proposal and related SanGIS documents.

Matt noted that the number of job duties listed in the FTE breakdown tables for the County and SanGIS are different, as the FTE document for SanGIS lists 10 additional duties, labeled q) through z). Andrew stated that that these additional duties relate to public facing mapping, administration, and IT support, which are duties that other departments or contracts within the County would be responsible for. Phyllis suggested that the County's document include these same items even if zero FTE is listed.

Matt also noted that several of the common job duties show a large discrepancy in the number of hours. One example was for item f) QA/QC, which the County proposes 3328 total hours of work versus 1631. Ross explained the higher hours for QA/QC by the County would be necessary in order to respond to customer demand for greater quality control. Other duties Matt noted the County showed as being significantly higher than SanGIS were j) Customer Service, k) Develop/Maintain Landbase Code, l) Maintain Data Model, m) Data Model Changes in Database, and n) Data Model Loads. He advised that these differences, and the reasons for them, be reflected as a gap in the gaps document.

Phyllis asked for clarification of the number of temporary positions shown in the SanGIS FTE table versus the positions shown on the SanGIS Organizational Chart on page 2 of the document. Andrew explained that there are four TOPS employees shown in the chart, three of which are the GIS Technicians shown in the FTE table and the other is the GIS Consultant. She also asked for clarification on the calculation of 10.975 FTE, which Andrew explained is based upon FTE savings being realized through the use of two contract workers for the budgeted positions of GIS Analyst and DBA. This FTE savings was also the basis for the projected salary savings of approximately \$122,000 that Andrew reported to the Board last month. He added that this savings was not reflected in the SanGIS total budget shown on page 13 of the Gap Document because earlier the Board had asked that only budgeted costs be used in the proposals analysis.

Chandra endorsed the continued use of contract workers by SanGIS to perform the work that is now being done by them. Consequently, it was agreed to use projected costs for SanGIS when making the comparison to the County's proposal. These projected costs for SanGIS would in essence be reflective of SanGIS's forthcoming

FY09 budget. Ross suggested that the County use similar estimates of reduced labor for the GIS Analyst and DBA positions in its proposal. Matt advised using whatever estimate was reasonable in order to perform the necessary job duties at the same level that is currently being performed.

Andrew added that there could be an additional cost savings to SanGIS if the agency can be included in the ESRI Site License (ESL) of either the County or City. Initial feedback to the County from ESRI indicated that SanGIS could be included in the County's ESRI, possibly saving the agency about \$15,000 per year. Ross noted, however, that recent communication from ESRI did not reflect SanGIS as being included; Ross is awaiting a response from ESRI and will update the Board when he learns more.

The group acknowledged that both proposals are reporting near equal costs, and that it would take approximately 2.5 years to offset the transition costs of moving SanGIS to the County. Therefore, while two years ago a reason to move the agency to the County was one of cost savings, this is no longer the case. The development of the analysis has been very beneficial in not only helping derive a realistic cost comparison, but in identifying potential differences in levels of service in each proposal. Chandra stated that knowing the level of service differences will be important when she and Matt take the final recommendations to their respective management.

Chandra suggested reviewing the current timeline for decision-making, then acknowledged that the three managers have had to spent a great deal of time on the gaps analysis. She added that she had never seen a finer group working so well together to provide a thorough, unbiased analysis.

Phyllis addressed the timeline shown at the end of the Gap document and added that a number of interested groups have been kept informed with updates. These groups include the SanGIS Technical Advisory Board (STAB), the City's GIS Advisory Committee (GAC), and SDSU Foundation. She also noted that the GAC will be meeting with Matt in the coming weeks to voice their concerns about the proposals.

Matt requested that the three managers (Phyllis, Ross and Andrew) work together to prepare a recommendation of which proposal to accept. He also said to be creative in that the final recommendation as it could be different than what has been prepared so far. Matt acknowledged that this could be the most difficult part of the analysis and that there could even be minority viewpoint or recommendation. High-risk gaps would be addressed in the document.

Chandra added that the recommendation should be a white paper, about 2-3 pages in length, and which would include proposals such as the need for service level agreements. She also suggested addressing short and long-term issues in the recommendation, but it should also note that efficiencies and improvements had been found or remedied through the BPR and the gap analysis. Chandra asked that the draft white paper be provided to the Board in Word format as soon as possible so that they could make comments that could and tracked for the group to review prior to the next Board meeting.

Item #3: Other

Given scheduling conflicts with the Board the regularly scheduled Board meeting for March 14 was cancelled. The next Board meeting for April was also proposed to be moved to Thursday, April 10 at 8:00AM at SanGIS, which Andrew would verify through Ellen and Maria.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55AM.

Action and Pending Items:

1. Contact SDDPC to coordinate prompt financing and acquisition of the IT upgrade equipment quoted by SDDPC

Phyllis and Andrew. Report to Board at next meeting.

2. Ensure FTE differences between the proposals are reflected in the Gap Document

Phyllis, Ross and Andrew. Provide to Board at next meeting.

3. Determine if SanGIS can be included in the County's ESL.

Ross. Provide to Board at next meeting.

4. Prepare white paper, or executive summary recommending which proposal for the Board to accept.

Phyllis, Ross and Andrew. Provide draft to Board when ready, but prior to April 10th Board Meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,



Andrew Abouna
Executive Director

4-10-08

Date

Approved,

Matt McGarvey, CIO
Board Chair

Date