



DRAFT
Administration Committee
Tuesday, April 13, 2021
8:00 A.M.
Via Teleconference - Zoom

Members Present: Carmella Williams, Chairperson, Council Member
Tres Roeder, Council Member
Rob Zimmerman, Council Member
Kim Bixenstine, Resident Member
James Brady, Resident Member
Brian Rosenfelt, Resident Member

Others Present: David E. Weiss, Mayor
Jeri Chaikin, CAO
Bill Gruber, Law Director
Sandra Middleton, Human Resources Director
Frank Miozzi, Information Technology Director
Julie Voyzey, Communications & Marketing Director
Patricia Speese, Public Works Director

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Carmella Williams at 8:01 a.m.

* * * *

Approval of the March 9, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Chair Williams asked if there were any changes or comments to the minutes of the March 9, 2021 meeting minutes.

It was moved by Member James Brady and seconded by Member Brian Rosenfelt that the minutes be approved as submitted.

Minutes of the March 9, 2021 meeting were approved as submitted.

* * * *

Property Casualty Insurance Renewal

Human Resources Director Sandra Middleton recapped at the previous meeting, where the committee discussed the renewal process and Laurie Gundlanch, of the City's insurance broker McGowan Governmental Underwriters, provided an industry overview. However, at that time, the City had not received quotes for insurance renewal. Two quotes were received on March 25, one from Argonaut, the City's previous provider, and another from Liberty Mutual.

CITY OF SHAKER HEIGHTS

3400 Lee Road Shaker Heights, Ohio 44120 P 216.491.1400 F 216.491.1465 Ohio Relay Service 711
shakeronline.com www.shaker.life

The Director provided a comparison of the new quotes as well as the previous coverage. The general liability deductible remained the same while the law enforcement and public officials deductible remained the same, \$50,000, with Argonaut, it decreased to \$25,000 with Liberty Mutual. The add-to-fleet coverage remained the same from Argonaut, automatic coverage for vehicles valued at less than \$250,000. The Liberty Mutual quote requires an endorsement and is an additional cost of \$400-\$600 per vehicle. The collision deductible from Argonaut remained the same at \$500 while the cost under Liberty Mutual is \$1,000.

There is a notable change with Argonaut, the City's carrier for many years, in that they excluded the dam from their quote, which would result in high-risk exposure for the City. Argonaut indicated they would provide coverage once the City meets the recommendations and compliance on the Dam Inspection Report. Due to this exclusion, it was determined it was not a viable quote and therefore, not an option for the City. The City has selected the quote from Liberty Mutual as a result, effective April 1, 2021.

Patricia Speese, Director of Public Works, provided a brief background of the status of the dams and why it is concerning to Argonaut. The Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR), which inspects the dams every five years, provided a report regarding Lower Lake and Horseshoe Lake, both Class I dams. If Class I dams fail, it is a loss of life and property. The sewer district, following their lawsuit with storm water management a number of years ago, has taken over repair of these dams under the ODNR reports. During one of our weekly inspections, it was noted Horseshoe Lake dam had a lot of seepage and was seriously compromised. As such, the lake was drained awaiting information on how to proceed. These are earthen dams, not concrete, and subject to the earth. Trees and embankments are beginning to seep, especially Lower Lake, which if breached could potentially wipe out the University Circle area. Repairs have been in the planning stages for a long time with a many different designs and changes from ODNR. Additionally, they have been a couple of major failures recently that were extremely damaging and costly. As such, whenever a potential issue arises, ODNR examines the data and provide advice on how to temporarily proceed. The situation is quite serious. If we were to grade the condition of these dams, they would be a D+ at best. The City has worked, and continues to work, with the sewer district, ODNR and other regulatory agencies as to the best way to approach these repairs.

Director Middleton continued with comparison of the insurance quotes stated another difference between Argonaut and Liberty Mutual is the excess liability insurance. Liberty Mutual does not have a silo aggregate. This means that \$10 million is the maximum amount of excess liability coverage available for the term of the policy rather than the previous \$10 million per event. In addition, Liberty Mutual excludes property classified as being in a flood zone, which includes the bathrooms and shelters at Horseshoe Lake. However, a significant difference is the cost of the annual premium in which Argonaut quoted \$351,811 and Liberty Mutual quoted \$282,842. Additionally, Liberty Mutual offered an additional \$5 million of aggregate insurance at a cost of \$11,000.

Considering the differences between quotes, including the additional costs for aggregate insurance and an estimate of the per vehicle cost under the fleet coverage, it was determined that the premium from Liberty Mutual is still significantly less than Argonaut. Acceptance of this insurance does not require committee or council approval as the ordinance accepting McGowan's proposal states that

as long as funding is available in the annual budget, council approval is not required. As such, Director Middleton asked the committee for any suggestions for future insurance renewals.

A member asked if the dams were the reason the City received so few estimates or could it be another reason to which Director Middleton stated feedback indicated it was the dams. The City is waiting for the sewer district and until significant movements are made toward improvements, insurers will not want to insure the dams. In response to another question of whether the city might obtain separate insurance for the dams that possible provide more options, Director Middleton thought it might be an idea. She also stated the City would reach out to Cleveland Heights to see if they have the dams insured and if so, with whom.

Chair Williams asked for clarification regarding insurers reluctant to insure the dams and whether it was due to their current condition or if there was a change in the industry, where insurers are shying away from covering the dams. Director Middleton indicated it was both. Although the City has not had any claims related to the dams, there have been some problem nationally, which plays a role. For instance, last year there was a major dam failure in southern Ohio as well as Michigan.

An inquiry was made regarding a cost estimate from the sewer district for repairing the dams. Director Speese stated the City has been in discussions with the district however, when conditions change such as a storm last year that wreaked havoc on University Circle, the district goes back to the drawing board. It is a complex watershed, so there are no specifics or actual dollar amounts at this point. Estimates have fluctuated from \$2.5 to \$10 million and it is unknown if Shaker will be responsible for any funding.

It was mentioned that although the item does not need to go before Council, it is something that Council should be informed about. CAO Jeri Chaikin stated it would be in her next update to Council.

* * * *

Discussion on Telephone System Replacement Project

Director Miozzi stated he is asking the committee to view the process of replacing the telephone system as well as gauge the level of support moving forward. The current system, purchased around 1989 and last upgraded in 2004, has been due for replacement for quite some time. The City deferred replacement due to economic reasons and, more recently, department workload.

Work is now moving forward. We discussed the process of seeking bids with CAO Jeri Chaikin, and determined there would be a significant cost in hiring a consultant to put out a formal bid, and instead we would utilize available cooperative purchasing contracts to seek proposals. A formal bid would be a challenge, as we did not have a clear analysis of needs due to the age of the current system and its lack of new features developed over the years. Using cooperative purchasing, we could ask vendors to design a proposal based on an internal analysis and voice platform requirements, and evaluate each solution. Under a formal bid, you identify specifics so vendors design solutions accordingly rather than leveraging features of their systems.

Most telecommunication systems is functionality dependent on the underlying proprietary software solution. The telephone sets on the desk, will all have multiple line appearances and similar functionality.

When we began the process of replacing the system in 2019, we hired a consultant for an initial internal discussion, meeting with department directors as well as staff, to determine the needs in a telecommunications system. Many of the needs mentioned by staff were already available on the existing system, indicating a training and implementation requirement. The vendor compiled a voice platform requirements document, identified equipment needs and provided a budgetary proposal. The City presented this document to vendors, requesting a proposal based on cooperative purchasing contracts. Vendors included a technology vendor the City used for networking, the existing telecom maintenance provider, the vendor that performed the initial analysis, and another technology vendor utilized for our digital multifunction devices. Vendors were instructed to provide solutions that best fit the voice platform document, which also identified the number of buildings, telephone set locations, required features, etc. We had received one proposal, when the pandemic hit. The project was put on hold as the department's priorities shifted to establishing work from home capabilities and new services such as Zoom video conferencing, etc. In the second half of 2020, we restarted work on the project, receiving two additional proposals.

Analyzing the proposals, there were questions regarding cooperative purchasing proposals not listed in the City's ordinance, which identifies specific contracts. We contacted Law Director Bill Gruber for clarification. Director Gruber indicated Council could approve the proposal as cooperative, waiving the formal competitive bidding process and utilizing the cooperative purchasing contract.

The next step in the project calls for a vendor to perform onsite survey for work such as cabling, set location, networking, etc. It is a significant amount of work involving a complex and comprehensive system. The project addresses seven buildings, over 300 sets, new circuitry, configuration and training. The proposal from Laketec, the vendor that completed our network engineering and redesign project, was determined as the best proposal. We ask for the committee's support in moving the project forward and by working with them to complete the onsite survey. This site work will allow the vendor to prepare a detailed final proposal.

Laketec's proposed system is an Avaya IP office system, a hybrid solution using virtualized servers internally hosted on virtual infrastructure. Servers could be moved to the cloud; however, the platforms requirement document as well as two of the three proposals indicated hybrid onsite solution is the best design for Shaker. While cloud based systems does have some additional benefits for mobile staff, they are subscription based per user at a higher cost.

Director Miozzi asked the committee for their feedback on moving forward in this manner or hire a consultant to compile a formal bid. He then asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Zimmerman commented he would defer to the judgment of the City directors for their expertise and experience as to the recommended direction of the project. As a communications device, the telephone system is important and should be upgraded as quickly as possible so residents, vendors, new residents and business are able to communicate with the City. The system should be user friendly, technology appropriate for our times and as cost effective as possible.

Member Rosenfelt asked if the City was limiting itself through cooperative purchasing agreement, which may limit access to larger vendors that have interesting solutions in the marketplace and integrations around unified communications. The City needs to be careful as there are hundreds of software based IP phone vendors and many of them are not appropriate for the City, but do the

cooperative agreements provide enough breadth of selection? Director Miozzi responded there are many choices available via cooperative purchasing. He does not feel the City is limited in solution choices, although the department cannot reach out to representatives of all vendors. We did reach out to vendors that represented several solutions providers. Additionally, we reached out to other communities to see what they were using and who their representatives were.

Director Miozzi further stated the recommend vendor Laketec, is proposing Avaya hardware. Since we will rely on outsource services for telecommunication support rather than our own system administrator we also looked extensively at their managed services component. Further, there are multiple companies that could offer managed services for the Avaya system.

Member Rosenfelt agreed smaller hosted providers would not be appropriate and there does need to be a long-term solution where other vendors are available for support. The City is taking the right approach and offered his assistance, if requested, as he has expertise in the specific area to which Director Miozzi indicated he welcomed his help and would reach out.

A member asked if there was a cost for the vendor coming on site for the audit. Director Miozzi stated no. The audit will be conducted as pre-sales work included in their projected project estimate. It was made clear to the vendor there was a considerable amount of networking, cabling, configuration of switches, etc. They know the amount of engineering and they are willing to take the pre-sales risk. The City has made no financial commitment to them yet.

CAO Chaikin added if the committee supports moving forward, the actual contract would come back to the committee with all details, dollar amount and scope of work for approval and then on to finance and council.

In response to an inquiry about the anticipated timing, Director Miozzi stated the vendor could complete the work in approximately a month. The vendor is ready to go, but will need to coordinate work with directors in multiple departments in seven buildings and consider planned city hall renovations. The contract would most likely come before the committee at their June meeting at the earliest.

Chair Williams asked if the committee agreed to proceed to which committee members indicated their approval.

* * * *

Other - NEOGOV Learning Management System

Human Resources Director Sandra Middleton reminded the committee of the demonstration given by NEOGOV back in February for a learning management system as the committee had requested a demonstration from another vendor for comparison. She stated she has diligently been searching and unable to find a good comparison. One vendor wanted to replace the entire system and another vendor was unable to provide a platform for talent management/performance evaluations that NEOGOV could support. She asked to move forward with NEOGOV without bringing another demonstration to the committee. Although there are other vendors, NEOGOV specializes in government and understands city operations.

Chair Williams indicated she would support that approach and asked for feedback from the committee. A member commented they defer to the expertise and trust the City has done due diligence and therefore support moving forward. The committee agreed to move forward without another demonstration.

*

*

*

*

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:53 a.m.

Carmella Williams, Council Member, Chair
Administration Committee