

WILL COUNTY BOARD
TECHNOLOGY AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES

May 5, 2011

**Immediately following the Executive Committee
but no sooner than 10:00 A.M.**

Will County Office Building
County Board Committee Room
302 North Chicago Street
Joliet, IL 60432

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Smith called the meeting to order at 11:10 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Present were Members: Dralle and L. Smith.

Absent were Members: Deutsche, Brooks and Maher.

Also Present: County Board Chair Jim Moustis, County Board Chief of Staff Bruce Friefeld.

Present from State's Attorney's Office: Melanie Manning.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Jackie Falbo led the committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mrs. Dralle, second by Mr. Moustis, to approve the minutes of February 24, 2011. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

OLD BUSINESS

Update Re: PTI Consultant-Executive Branch IT Assessment

Ms. Smith advised that there was a 3 hour meeting yesterday with PTI for the technology assessment. They will be back in June.

Mr. Shay presented his Power Point which represents the assessment regarding where we are at and where we should be. They are done with the assessment and are in the Phase II Strategy Development. He stated the preliminary findings are that the majority of ICT as

customer oriented. Historically ICT has not been a priority for Will County and is understaffed which is exacerbated by unfunded support to the non-Executive Branch departments. Key infrastructure elements are not sufficient to support modern applications. There are siloed IT decision making and we have mission critical functions which are reliant on antiquated, custom-developed applications. We are also vulnerable to the loss of necessary support skills.

Mr. Shay reviewed the position summary where he reviewed the 4 aspects of IT that they reviewed to form the assessment. IT delivery is nearly centered; technical infrastructure falls within the reactionary quadrant; IT decision making and applications are very near where we do not want to be. Under the IT decision making the expenses for the Executive Branch IT about 14% is software; about 60% in personnel; 23% is hardware and about 5% is outsource labor. The outsource labor includes support from consultants and shadow staff.

Mr. Shay reviewed the IT decision making opportunities for improvement which are there has been no capital funding for IT in the last 4 or 5 years; operation money is below our target range for high performing organizations. There are few defined roles for branch wide decisions and no specific tools meaning committees or leadership organizations dedicated to that other than the Ad-Hoc Technology Committee. Siloed IT investment authority across department is an issue because some offices have their own funds and make their own decision to spend the money the way they choose and the responsibilities do not align perfectly with those organizations of funding.

Mr. Shay stated the IT service delivery is a ¼ of assessment that we are in the best position. Distribution of IT support labor by personnel category is that 90% of the County Executive staff are within the IT department; 10% of those are shadow staff. The shadow staff are people within department that are not title IT staff but help us with varying degrees.

Mr. Shay reviewed the opportunities for improvement stating that IT is significantly understaffed which is exacerbated by support of non-Executive Branch functions. The target range is 3% to 5% and we are at 1%. We do not have help desk software here and we are limited or have no opportunities in end user training. There is a lack of structured after hours IT support and a perception of inconsistent project management.

Mr. Shay stated in our applications we have one strength in this area which is the ViewWise program. He reviewed that several major applications are running on end of life platforms which include the real estate system; finance system and the county permitting system. We have an over reliance on shadow systems which means, for example, information in the New World system must be moved to another program, such as an Excel spreadsheet. We should have a finance system that executes reports within the financial system.

Ms. Smith requested Mr. Shay to explain the LIPS program since it would be gone in 2 years.

Mr. Shay explained the permit management system (LIPS) would not be gone but the individual, a former Will County employee who supports that system, is going to retire and will no longer be supporting the system. He wrote the system for the county as a county employee then left the county's employ and sold the system to a number of municipalities. He has continued on an hourly pay basis to maintain the permitting system. That is building permits, which is inspections, contractors registration and receipting.

Mr. Moustis clarified that we have no other ability to support that.

Mr. Shay replied that is correct.

Ms. Smith stated that we have budgeted money for this program to change and twice they have spent the money on something else.

Mr. Palmer inquired what are the estimated costs for replacement systems.

Mr. Shay replied those have varied.

Mr. Moustis stated we need to have a committed IT budget and this will be discussed.

Mr. Shay advised that he would forward this power point presentation to anyone interested in receiving it.

Mr. Shay continued with his presentation regarding the Ideal Application Architecture and the Gap Analysis Detail indicating the severe areas.

Ms. Smith stated that we will have to replace everything that has 2003 within the next 2 years otherwise they will not be able to communicate.

Mr. Shay clarified that now that we have the virtual environment if the application is compliant with 2008, we can buy the license, \$200.00 a piece, to make them usable. We still have a web server and a DMZ which were a windows desktop operating on windows XP as a web server. We have no document disaster recovery plan. He clarified that if something happened to this building we can set up real estate and finance and have offices up and running outside of the county to service those needs. We do not have documented plan for everything.

Mr. Shay stated that we have off site back up sites. We have a site outside of the county that operates an identical real estate system and has an additional finance system. There is no countywide e-mail domain which is a perception and maintenance issue.

Mr. Moustis stated that this report is on our countywide IT in its entirety.

Mr. Shay replied no, we excluded 9-1-1, telecommunications, GIS and the judicial departments which are not entirely serviced by the Executive Department. It does not include

Sheriff and is just the Executive offices. The IT still provides services to those departments, we do everyone's phones, everyone's building connectivity, we do high tier support for a number of applications. They are outside the scope and have their own authority but we still continue to provide services to them.

There was a short discussion regarding funding.

Mrs. Dralle inquired if our situation is unique to ourselves in that we are not more cohesive and if so, is it because of our lack of policy or our lack of controlling the dollars.

Mr. Shay stated that we are the 115th county that PTI has worked with and have extensive county experience. Integration varies greatly. Kane County has one IT department and it does everything, radios, 9-1-1, jail to assessment. DuPage has been consolidating.

Mrs. Dralle asked regarding consolidation, how did the county merge into a single IT.

Mr. Shay replied that there are big offices that have automation funds and are still on the outside. The smaller offices and some without automation funds were moved into one department.

Mr. Moustis stated that anything that comes out of the corporate fund, he believed we have the ability to influence. We should have a discussion with the departments that are supported out of the corporate fund to move consolidation forward.

Mr. Shay stated the next steps would be that in June we will be meeting to start developing recommendation; in July we should have a draft assessment with cost ranges for the larger projects.

Ms. Smith stated in June they should have a dollar amount. This would be a 3 or 5 year plan.

Update Re: Administration Adjudication Process/Progress

Ms. Lyne stated that they are negotiating with the hearing officers as well as a software vendor and will report back to the committee when those negotiations are complete. We have passed the ordinances out of the Judicial Committee on Tuesday and we will be taking those to County Board.

Mrs. Dralle advised that the ordinances would be brought to County Board next month because we need a final form with all the corrections.

Ms. Lyne stated that once that is done we will be trying to identify the funds to implement the software and get the hearing officers finalized.

Mr. Shay advised that it would take an estimated 3 or 4 months of actual customization of the software and interview the people who will be doing the work to see what we will need to set up on line payment system, etc.

Update Re: Integrated Justice

Mr. Palmer advised that URL, the consultant we hired via the grant and court fees are paying for their two phases; the first phase is being paid out of the grant and the second phase are being paid out of court fees from the Chief Judge and Circuit Clerk. URL is coming tomorrow to meet with some county staff. We will give updates to Judicial and will come back to Technology Ad-Hoc with a formal report next month.

Mr. Moustis inquired if we support any of the judicial systems at all.

Mr. Shay replied he has a staff member that handles Adult Probation, Juvenile Probation court services and about 1/3rd of River Valley. We support their building connectivity, their external service and we handle their e-mail accounts.

Mr. Palmer stated that the County Board and the County Executive have interest in the Integrated Justice system because we are approving money. If we are going to build a courthouse the county will pay for the courthouse so all of these efforts, whether it is the executive branch or judicial branch, all benefit. Efficiencies are good across the board and hopefully at the end of the study they will determine they already have some efficiencies but then also have a clear plan. We want plans so we have a rough estimate on the costs.

Mr. Moustis stated that 30% of the costs coming from IT is to support the judicial system and for those that have the funds, part of those funds is to help support the IT system which they don't.

Mr. Palmer stated that he believed with working with the judicial system that they are budgeting their funds to help pay for some of those systems.

Other Old Business

JMS System

Mr. Piwowarski advised that they have signed the contract and are proceeding forward. We are starting the analysis next month with New World scheduled to be here for 3 to 4 weeks. The contract states that this project should be completed by March, 2012.

NEW BUSINESS

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Moustis, second by Mrs. Dralle, the meeting adjourned at 11:55 p.m.