

**BOARD OF ALDERMEN
COMMUNITY RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2014 – 7:00 P.M.

JOAN WILLIAMSON ALDERMANIC CHAMBERS

MINUTES

Chairman Arthur T. Gerckens called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. All rose and pledged allegiance to the flag.

Roll Call

Present: Arthur T. Gerckens, Ronald M. Sill, Peter M. Olenoski

ADDITIONS, DELETIONS, CORRECTIONS TO THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED

There were no additions, deletions, or corrections to the agenda.

PUBLIC PORTION

Mr. Gerckens asked three times if there was anyone from the public who wished to address the committee. Hearing no requests the Public Portion was closed.

APPROVAL OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 11, 2014

A MOTION was made by Mr. Olenoski with a second by Mr. Gerckens to approve the Minutes of the February 11, 2014 meeting as submitted. Mr. Sill abstained as he was absent from the February 11, 2014 meeting. **Motion carried.**

**INTRODUCTION OF DERBY DOG PARK ADVISORY BOARD. DISCUSSION AND
RECOMMENDATION OF VOLUNTEER NAMES TO THE FULL BOARD**

Mr. Gerckens said he asked Alderman Felicia Monaco to contact the volunteers in our community who have offered to volunteer to be on this advisory board. He then asked Ms. Monaco to read the names of the volunteers for the board.

Ms. Monaco read the names of the volunteers who have agreed to be on the advisory board into the record:

- Lynn Saroka
- Jessica Stein
- Felicia Monaco
- Anthony Bartholomew
- Harvey Finkle
- Carmen DiCenso

Mr. Gerckens said this is going to be an advisory committee and he suggested to Ms. Monaco to have the committee meet and their charge is to figure out the way to run the beautiful dog park, noting that Ms. Monaco's son Anthony helped put it together.

Rules and regulations need to be drawn up. Ms. Monaco said she is going to reach out to the surrounding communities to see how their dog parks are operated. She asked Mr. Gerckens if the advisory board would have to come before the Community Relations once they have the rules and regulation in order. Mr. Gerckens said that is correct. Whatever the advisory committee proposes then the Community Relations committee would present it to the full Board of Aldermen. Mr. Sill said as time goes on he's sure the board is going to find more and more things to do for the park. Ms. Monaco said there has already been some vandalism and she would be seeking some assistance from Public Works. Mr. Gerckens stated that it takes a special person to volunteer and he thanked them all for volunteering on behalf of the city. He said if this committee can be a resource or any help just let us know.

**CITY OF DERBY WEB SITE QUOTE/PROPOSAL UPDATE, CONSIDERATION, DISCUSSION,
POSSIBLE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE FULL BOARD.**

Mr. Olenoski said he compared the two quotes received – one from Qsend and the other from EvoGov. As everyone knows we're searching for a municipality website provider. Although we have one now we want one that is going to provide more functionality and also one that would have a complaint system that would be filtered in so if any citizen has a complaint it would be right there. You would be able to view how the complaint is handled from receipt to resolution.

Mr. Olenoski said it would also assist with all meetings that the city holds. Someone would be able to actually click on the actual agenda of the meeting, which will definitely lessen the paper used. He said both Qsend and EvoGov provide the same technology and functionality. Mr. Olenoski said there is something called "Responsive Design." He explained that you would be able to bring its up on your phone, tablet, computer – you would get that same type of website. He said he broke down the differences of each company:

Qsend is located in Waterbury, CT. EvoGov is located in Dover, Del. Mr. Olenoski noted that as far as websites it doesn't really make a difference where they're located. We have Skype, Microsoft Link, etc... Either company would be able to work on the site without even coming to Derby.

Qsend gives a 30% discount for CT customers. The initial startup costs and support for Qsend for the first year is \$23,240, which includes the 30% discount and it is payable upfront.

EvoGov's initial startup costs and support is \$17,800 with an option to pay in four separate installments.

Qsend's annual support fee is \$6,120. EvoGov has annual support fee of \$1,500 with an option to pay monthly.

Qsend offers a separate app for \$4,500. EvoGov offers a separate app for \$2,500.

Mr. Olenoski said based on the numbers for the first year it's a difference of \$10,000 between the two companies and they both provide the same service. He said he works on computers on a daily basis and his recommendation is EvoGov.

Mr. Gerckens told Mr. Olenoski that he truly appreciates the work that he has done to compare both the companies. He said that this subcommittee can't award anything – all we can do is recommend to the full Board to either take an action or don't take an action. Mr. Gerckens noted that Mr. Olenoski kept saying "we" and asked if he were charged with taking on this project – is there a committee – is it a committee of one or are there others helping you? Mr. Olenoski said they had Qsend come in for a demonstration and had a webinar with EvoGov – we did it on line and he said the Mayor was involved and Ray since he is an IT guy. He said Ron wasn't here for the demonstration with Qsend but even with that demonstration the representative was new, which was disappointing. He said he asked her questions that she didn't have the answers too and also gave us information regarding EvoGov which was incorrect. Mr. Olenoski stated that Seymour is using EvoGov, although they also looked at Qsend. He noted they got a better deal since they were the first town in CT to go with EvoGov. Mr. Sill said he has only heard good things about Seymour's website.

Mr. Gerckens asked Mr. Olenoski if the goal is just to get the full Board to award the contract or are we going to have a request for proposal or bid prepared or do you feel comfortable with the two proposals that you have presented. Mr. Olenoski said he feels comfortable with the two proposals. Mr. Sill asked if there is a sense of urgency to this. Mr. Olenoski said just looking at other towns – having a website especially one with the capability of receiving complaints is wonderful. Also every department head's report would be on there. He noted that Mr. Walsh has done a great job with the website; however he feels compared to other towns we are behind and this should have been done a couple of years ago.

Mr. Sill said since this is over \$20,000 he feels that the full Board of Aldermen has to make the decision. He would like to present the two companies and let the full Board decide.

A MOTION was made by Mr. Sill with a second by Mr. Olenoski to bring to the full Board for discussion and possible action to either go out to bid or to waive the bid and go with either EvoGov or Qsend. **Motion carried.**

ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION was made by Mr. Sill with a second by Mr. Olenoski to adjourn the meeting at 7:14 p.m. **Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

Patty Finn
Recording Secretary

THESE MINUTES ARE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN COMMUNITY RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE AT THEIR NEXT MEETING.