

WILL COUNTY BOARD
TECHNOLOGY AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES

July 7, 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 10:02 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Present were Members: Dralle, Brooks, Maher and L. Smith.

Absent were Members: Deutsche.

Also Present: County Executive Chief of Staff Nick Palmer, ITC Director Mike Shay, Finance Director Paul Rafac and Steve Caruso-Public Affairs Specialist-Sheriff's Dept.; County Board Chief of Staff Bruce Friefeld

Present from State's Attorney's Office: Mary Tatroe.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Maher led the committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mrs. Dralle, second by Mr. Maher, to approve the minutes of October 7, 2010. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

A motion was made by Mr. Maher, second by Mrs. Dralle, to approve the minutes of May 5, 2011. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

OLD BUSINESS

Update Re: PTI Consultant-Executive Branch IT Assessment

Discussed later in the meeting.

Update Re: Administration Adjudication Process/Progress

Mr. Shay advised that the County Board will be looking at the ordinances. Regarding the software vendor, we have finally arrived at a dollar amount versus services. The dollar amount is \$181,000 and change. We were able to lower the amount by \$55,000.00.

Mrs. Dralle stated that was a great price and inquired if they lost any modules.

Mr. Shay stated the purchase price will be \$181,000.00; we need to budget an additional \$15,000.00 because originally the conversion costs from the existing system, they wanted \$15,000.00 flat fee. We are unconvinced that it will take that much money or effort to do the conversion so they agreed to allow us to pay an hourly rate for the conversion until it is complete up to \$15,000.00.

Mr. Shay said the maintenance costs did increase about \$6,000.00 which is about \$43,000.00. We are waiting on the final contracts and all the preliminary paperwork has been sent to the State's Attorney's office for review.

Ms. Smith inquired if the State's Attorney has come back with a final ordinance.

Mrs. Dralle replied they are doing 2 changes and we will be meeting with them before August to complete.

Mr. Shay advised that they found cheaper scanner packages, for example those all come bundled, the license, the hardware and software which are only \$200.00 a piece versus a \$5,000.00 server. We cut out the interface portion. They had \$15,000.00 in there for interfaces with the judicial system which are unnecessary because they have not chosen a new judicial system but their data does supply the NIEMS standard so it should be transferable.

Ms. Smith inquired what was the estimated revenue.

Mrs. Dralle replied estimated revenue after 5 years about half a million with the new adjudication after we pay all of our start up costs back. It doesn't include all of the Sheriff's new fines because we do not have any history.

Mr. Maher asked where was the income coming from?

Mr. Shay stated the data conversion would be fines from the courts and legal records. Right now when they receive a complaint it is often attached to an existing permit or is created as new incident. The complete history is in there so we want someone when they go into the adjudication system to not have to do retroactive entry or gather retroactive data. We want everything in the new system referenced in the same basic format.

Mr. Brooks arrived at this juncture.

Mr. Rafac inquired if the \$15,000.00 is on top of the \$181,000.00 or is it part of the \$181,000.00.

Mr. Shay replied it is on top of the \$181,000.00.

Mr. Rafac stated we budgeted \$226,000, maintenance is going down by \$6,000.00 per year that is a \$30,000.00 cost and if the conversion is \$15,000.00, you are still paying the same amount. It is still \$226,000 and we just lowered the upfront costs.

Mr. Shay explained that there have been actual cuts in the costs. Part of what happened was while negotiating some costs were hidden or not extended in the one page proposal. The \$226,000.00 was not a good number.

Mrs. Dralle stated that we are going to get \$40,000.00 from the JAG grant.

There was a short discussion regarding the difference between administrative adjudication and integrated justice system programs and software and their purposes.

Mrs. Dralle explained that by statute there are requirements that we have to meet. We do not have a hearing process in Will County and are behind the times in terms of bringing violations to a system to expedite those violations. The system will also be used by Land Use for other purposes.

Mr. Shay advised that the other purposes are that they will be replacing the complaint system within LIPS but it will not take over permitting, contractor licenses, etc.

The IT Assessment Implementation Planning workshop power point from June 22, 2011 was distributed for members.

Mr. Shay advised that coming out from that workshop there are a number of adjustments and we should be getting a draft plan by the end of July. Then we will review the draft plan and it will be forwarded as the assessment and implementation plan.

Ms. Smith understood that PTI would be coming August 18th for the Committee of the Whole. We are looking for acceptance of this plan.

Mr. Shay reviewed that at the end of July we should have a draft of the assessment from PTI; we review it and get back to them; have the meeting with the Ad hoc Technology Committee on August 4th and if there are any changes we have to forward them to PTI.

Ms. Smith reiterated that PTI will be ready to give us an Executive Summary and presentation on August 18th.

Mr. Shay replied yes.

Ms. Smith stated that from this workshop, she thought we asked that priorities be changed at that time because one had a longer lag period than the other.

Mr. Shay advised that the study for how the real estate should be replaced needs to be started now.

There was a discussion of the real estate replacement system process.

Mr. Palmer inquired if August 4th was where the Ad-Hoc Technology committee would have a discussion on finalizing that prioritization.

Ms. Smith replied yes but stated we need a committee of the whole because this topic needs more discussion.

A motion was made by Mr. Maher, second by Mrs. Dralle, to move to the Executive Committee the plan that will be finalized at the August 4th Ad-Hoc Technology Committee with a request to hold a committee of the whole meeting on August 18th. All in favor.

MOTION CARRIES.

Mr. Shay advised that the August 4th Ad-Hoc Technology meeting with PTI would be a teleconference meeting at these offices.

Update Re: Integrated Justice

Mr. Palmer advised that they are meeting tomorrow. They will be having a regular monthly schedule which is the last Thursday of the month. We are wrapping up the study which was paid for from the grant which is doing a review of our system and coming up with a blueprint. We have also applied for a couple of grants; one will be discussed tomorrow and the other is the JAG grant which comes to Judicial every year. We receive a disparate allocation to the City of Joliet and Will County. About 5 years ago we have been splitting it 50/50 even though the County's portion is a smaller amount. We should receive about \$40,000.00 from this year's allocation. We are asking for the MOU with the City of Joliet for the County Executive to sign for the 50/50 split and then the allocation of that money. One proposal is to use the money for software on the administrative adjudication. No formal action has been taken yet and there will probably be some other uses introduced. This will be discussed at the Executive Committee meeting as there is no Judicial meeting this month.

Mr. Palmer advised that previously with the JAG money we have done laptops and cameras.

Mrs. Dralle explained the dollars have decreased over the years so we have determined to keep the money within the county.

Ms. Smith inquired about the fee increase for automation by the Treasurer.

Mr. Rafac replied yes, currently the Treasurer receives \$5.00 in total for automation; \$2.00 goes to him and the remaining \$3.00 goes somewhere else. Comparable counties charge about \$15.00 so he is asking to increase his Treasurer's automation special fund and that would allow him to shift more of the corporate treasurer costs to that special fund.

Currently the money is paying a portion of a staff person's salary. We have discussed shifting either a whole person or parts of multiple people relating to the automation to that fund.

ASA Tatroe arrived at this juncture.

County Board Chief of Staff Bruce Friefeld arrived at this juncture.

There was a discussion regarding the treasurer's automation funds as well as other offices automation funds and centralizing the funds.

Other Old Business

NEW BUSINESS

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mrs. Dralle, second by Mr. Brooks, to adjourn the meeting at 10:40 a.m.