

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Lawson-Remer, Terra](#); [MontgomerySteppe, Monica](#); [BOS, District1Community](#); [Supervisor Joel Anderson District 2](#); [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** [External] Re: DIRECTION ON THE FUTURE OF COUNTY TECHNOLOGY (Please include with documents for Agenda item 23.)  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 18, 2026 7:37:40 PM

---

Good Afternoon, Supervisors,

The recommendation (#1) is to “approve the proposed changes.” Yet I see no specific proposed changes, either in the Board Letter or the non-attachments except to the contract duration, which I think is a mistake.

In these days of fast changing technology, a contract for 6 years may lock us into a certain provider who may be unable to acquire a better technology if and when it becomes standard.

The November report said that 'the County's IT services are stable: systems are reliable and there are no recurring outages or failures;' and 'most assets are current, with 96% of hardware within support cycles (which is quite high for a County of this size and caliber).'

The report says you are strong in WiFi 6 adoption. Speed is nice, but the electronic frequencies cause havoc with medically sensitive people. Caution is advisable.

It then says Artificial Intelligence (AI) operations are limited. This would seem to include Dedicated robotic process automation (RPA) tools (e.g., Ansible, Terraform, UiPath, BluePrism) to the extent they use AI.) They should be limited or non-existent.

If the info technology you have is so good, I don't think you need AI. Period. AI is basically the same old algorithms enhanced and run by a machine without a conscience.

My advice would be to limit the use of WiFi 6 and make the contact period shorter, maybe 1 or 2 years renewable for 1 year.

Regards,

Paul Henkin