

**WILL COUNTY BOARD**  
**TECHNOLOGY AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING**

**MINUTES**

**February 24, 2011**

**1:00 P.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 1:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present were Members:** Brooks and L. Smith. **NO QUORUM-DISCUSSION ONLY**

**Absent were Members:** Deutsche, Dralle and Maher.

**Also Present:** County Board Chief of Staff Bruce Friefeld; County Executive Chief of Staff Nick Palmer, Treasurer Steve Weber; Brian McDaniel, Treasurer's Office; Finance Director Paul Rafac; ICT Director Mike Shay; Circuit Clerk Pam McGuire; Jamy Lyne and Don Piwowarski.

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

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

There was no quorum to approve the minutes.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Ms. Smith advised everyone that the Circuit Clerk's, Administration Adjudication, JMS and this committee's discussions are all moving forward. She will keep everyone apprised of what is going on and would like everyone else to keep this committee informed.

**Update Re: PTI Consultant-Executive Branch IT Assessment**

**Discussion Re: Scope of Services — PTI Consultants-Executive Branch IT Assessment**

Mr. Shay stated that the Executive Branch IT assessment continues to move ahead. We have 5 key points; contract; scope; data collection; kick off meeting and analysis. The contract has been reviewed and approved by the State's Attorney's office. The scope of services and costs have been ongoing negotiation. The largest portion of that discussion is the scope. The actual signed contract is due to arrive today. There are a number of changes to the scope. They added a scope matrix which he will be reviewing. We altered Section 3.1-the consultant was concerned that they would be expected to produce a return on investment for a very detailed cost analysis for every system that the executive branch operates and that was not the case. We clarified the expectations on that issue. We added a steering group review of the draft into the process under Section 3.5 and under application review, the consultant did not want us to tell them what systems they should be looking at. They wanted them to assess everything and tell us what they should be looking at. That was unacceptable on our side so we compromised where we listed a number of systems that must be included. We did not state how they should be prioritized or what they have to say about them but they have to analysis those systems in detailed. That includes real estate, finance, etc. Data collection is very important in this project.

Mr. Shay stated that the scope matrix will be part of the scope of work and it outlines what is included and what is not included in the scope of this project. For example, the Circuit Clerk is not part of the scope of this project. We explicitly state that but we also explicitly stated that they have to account for the network traffic generated by that system. We will get an accurate picture of the network without having to look at each individual system.

Mr. Shay advised that telecommunications is exempt from this as well as GIS.

Mr. Shay stated that they will be inventorying all of the equipment that we are responsible for maintaining.

Ms. Smith inquired which departments are included.

Mr. Rafac replied that everything the Executive Office-ICT Department is responsible to maintain.

Mr. Shay stated there is a budget tool. We will discuss this with Mr. Rafac but they will have to review the expenditures on network, etc. Some of our network expenditures are derived from our telecommunications budget because in a number of places, they are the same network.

Mr. Shay advised that each individual staff member will be providing us detailed information on their work tasks, what they do in a typical year. We will be asking some departments that are out of scope to provide us information on what their people do. The

purpose is not to review that information. PTI has a formula that indicates that an organization of this size, serving these functions, should be spending this number of hours each year on network security; this number of hours on server maintenance. Because we are not looking at the County as a whole, we have to parce out what issues are not being reviewed. We will be asking the departments who are out of scope for some basic information. The purpose is to subtract from the totals necessary for each one of those functions to determine that the Executive's Office has all the skills and staff necessary to fulfill its core functions efficiently. Each staff member will be interviewed by PTI concerning their work load, responsibilities, their view of problems or roadblocks are, etc. He explained that there are central IT staff which we refer to as ICT Department and then there are business unit staff people, for example Bob. He works for a separate business unit, he is not in the scope but he does work in our environment. He will be part of the focus group and will provide input because we provide services to them. The other portion we want to capture is shadow staff, for example, the Highway Department has Jeff Ronaldson, who is a civil engineer. When they receive new machines, Mr. Ronaldson is the person who opens the box, basic configuration, application installation and then we go over and we hook it up to the network to make sure it is properly accessed. This is not part of his job duties but that is real work that gets done. Other departments have people like this. We will be taking a very detailed look.

Mr. Shay stated that the data collection phase is not complete until all the interviews and focus groups are finished. In order to expedite this, our goal is to have those data collection tools completed and returned to them at least a week before the kickoff people come. They will adjust them after the interviews and focus groups are done. Then the data collection phase will be complete at that time.

Mr. Shay advised that kickoff is March 21, 22 and 23<sup>rd</sup>. The main meeting is March 21<sup>st</sup> at 8:30 a.m. in the County Board chambers and they will have staff here for three days. We have reserved various conference rooms for them. They will be conducting 4 activities: staff interviews of all technical staff which will range from 1 hour to 1 ½ hours each; focus groups which are smaller groups some of them outlining IT staff, some shadow IT staff and some by function. The first focus group meeting is the tax cycle meeting which is already scheduled for 10 00 a m that day, they will view that meeting to determine how it works and then use the tax cycle as a focus group. Focus groups include Land Use staff; EMA staff and non-executive elected officials. There will also be application reviews which is for example this is your finance system and someone from AP would tell whether it does what they want it to do. We will also be

doing technical reviews where they will have staff in our computer room looking at the network connections, etc.

Ms. Smith stated that she would be included in the scoping meetings and has invited Mr. Brooks to attend. We will not be participating but would like to listen. The project managers are Mike Shay, Annette Boyd and Paul Rafac. We may get an architect and then have a programmer work with all the people because we do not have enough staff to program our own.

Mr. Rafac is looking at the finance portion.

Mr. McDaniel inquired what interaction are they expecting from the Treasurer's Office.

Mr. Shay replied that they will be involved in the tax cycle focus group, the finance focus group and the treasurer staff has a focus group for whoever they choose to participate.

Mr. McDaniel inquired if they will send some parameters regarding on what they are trying to achieve.

Mr. Shay clarified that as he is sending out invites, they will also be receiving surveys to complete which will help make the focus groups more productive.

Ms. Smith stated that a lot of our technology is moving forward.

Mr. McDaniel inquired what will be the end product, the deliverable.

Mr. Shay advised that they will be providing a report with a variety of matrix. They have extensive experience in County government. For example, they will cover network support staff indicating where you are and what is needed. They will also include our major systems which will prioritize an analysis of each and discussion on the ranges of expenses on replacing those systems, staff and recommendations. They will be setting goals for IT.

#### **Discussion Re: Possible Joint Meeting between Integrated Justice Committee and Administration Adjudication Committee**

Not necessary as everyone is already present.

Ms. Lyne explained that the County has recently been afforded the opportunity to do Administration Adjudication due to a law that was passed last year. We are pursuing doing this as well as DuPage County and several other counties. It is a process of setting up a hearing that will be run by a hearing officer who we determined should be a licensed attorney in Illinois whereby ordinance violations can come through the hearing process instead of going through the court process. The three main points of doing adjudication are to get minor ordinance violations out of the court system which helps us serve the public faster by bringing these people who are in violation into compliance much quicker than through the court system and it allows us to get compliance faster from them.

Ms. Lyne stated they are about 90% through in order to do a presentation to the County Board. We have solicited proposals for software that would handle the adjudication cases in the system internally. We have interviewed vendors and have a recommended vendor that will hopefully go through the Judicial Committee next month.

Ms. Lyne advised that we have done one cycle of interviewing hearing officers and we have another cycle coming up. We are getting close to having a recommendation for the hearing officer.

Ms. Lyne stated that the ordinances are about 98% finished. The Judicial Committee had some comments, questions and concerns which have been addressed. We are in the process of working on the revenue projections to determine based on the number of cases that we think will come from the Land Use Department, the Health Department, Animal Control Division and the Sheriff's Department. How much money those violations will generate versus what it will cost us to pay for the software, hearing officers, etc. Based on the projections, it looks like this program will pay for itself within the first year. There was some conversations regarding whether or not adjudication needs to be part of the court system.

Ms. Smith stated she believed that adjudication is to be a stand-alone program. She has had a conversation with Circuit Clerk McGuire, understanding that adjudication has a vendor and Ms. McGuire has a vendor, sitting down with Mrs. Dralle and finding one vendor. She does not want to hold back the adjudication process and expressed to the Executive Committee that technology committee is moving but are not ready yet and neither is the Circuit Clerk. We should not hold anyone back.

Circuit Clerk McGuire inquired if anyone asked her office on the stats or information on the cases.

Ms. Lyne replied no, they received all of the case information from Land Use who is the bulk of what goes over to the court system now. The other information was from the Health Department and Animal Control. The Sheriff's Department, until now, has not been able to write tickets for ordinance violations. They will be afforded to do certain things now under the new law.

Ms. Smith requested that when Ms. Lyne is ready to do the presentation to come back before the Technology Ad-Hoc Committee. She explained that she has spoken with the Executive Committee that we need to have a capital plan. They are thinking about that. They need to consider where the funding will come from as well as up-front costs for adjudication. She inquired when Ms. Lyne would have numbers together determining what revenues would be received from this.

Ms Lyne replied they still need meetings with Animal Control and Health Department to verify the numbers previously provided. Hopefully, those can be presented to Judicial in April.

Mr. McDaniel inquired with the changes in the law, have they changed any way the fines that are going to be deposited with the county. Will we have to set up a special collector's fund or manage it differently.

ASA Tatroe replied she did not believe there was anything in the statute. Chairman Moustis had mentioned that for tracking purposes we may want to have a special fund but did not believe a firm decision was made.

Mr. Rafac advised that it was discussed whether it would be a special fund or a department in the corporate fund. He believed the direction was that it would be a department in the corporate fund. I am sure these will have to be revisited once this is all finalized.

Circuit Clerk McGuire stated that they have been looking at different companies but have not chosen anyone because we will be doing an RFP. They are moving along with URL. We have had 3 meetings, one was with a large group which is the call for service with the officer on the speaker that he makes the call to; then E-9-1-1 center and then it going to the State's Attorney's office with filing a complaint. The second phase was the State's Attorney's office filing the complaint and it coming to the court and the third phase was sentencing and post disposition information, how it gets back out onto the street. Right now we are in separate breakout sessions with each judicial agency to determine what are some of the needs in the system we are going to want, what do we have that we want to keep and who are we giving information to, paper based, and how can we work to get it more electronic.

Mr. Enright stated that one of the goals of the Integrated Justice Committee is bringing in the URL, one of the deliverables is to have a 5 year plan. There are a lot of things we want to do that will take time. There will probably be a number of programs that will have to be put into place.

Ms. Smith asked if there is a product out there that other counties are using or are the designing it themselves.

Mr. Enright replied no, we are not designing it ourselves. There is someone at their offices now from the State of Colorado and they have a statewide case management system for their courts. In Illinois every county is on their own. They will be putting out an RFP. The assessment from URL should be done in June or July so we are looking to put out an RFP by late summer. URL will give them an update the 1st of March.

Mr. Palmer stated that URL was hired because of the federal earmarked grant. We have been meeting informally for the past few years. We needed this blue print, this long term plan

which has taken all the court people and criminal justice together to get that plan. We have been providing updates to the Judicial Committee.

Ms. Smith reiterated that the intent of the URL company coming to the Executive Committee is just for information. She was advised that is correct

Mr. Shay stated that whatever is selected will be need to be compliant which means that data should be able to move back and forth. A short discussion was held regarding the data moving between different departments.

### **JMS System**

Mr. Piwowarski advised that they will be going before committee next month, Judicial and Finance, requesting additional funding and approval to enter into contract by March 25th. The timeframe for the program is within 12 months which is the time from the signing of the contract until JMS is up and running. He explained that JMS is a jail management program to replace a state system that is no longer being supported. It tracks all of the activity of any individual once they are incarcerated at the jail until the time of release. This would include all court movement, medical movement, anything that goes on with that person while they are in the jail. It will maintain a history.

Mr. Rafac stated that the Integrated Justice System had reviewed a concept study which he believed was in the op warrants area but we need to make sure what it is interfacing with as the JMS is moving forward fairly quickly.

There was a short discussion regarding Vision Air and where it is a real time interface and needs standards and sharing data even though they are different systems and vendors so they will talk with each other.

Ms. Smith asked if the Sheriff's Office can pull down electronically the orders of protection and summons, subpoenas, wage garnishments, etc.?

Mr. Piwowarski replied technically yes, but they are receiving the electronic data to transfer to Vision Air. Most of the papers are electronically transferred but we still need the papers to travel through for confirmation and additional information.

Mr. Enright stated that civil is part of the \$300,000.00 federal earmark that we need to tackle. We are looking at utilizing New World to replace Vision Air.

Mr. Rafac advised that we received money from the state to change/upgrade our warrant system and we chose Vision Air. That product has not worked out so one of the items in the JMS program would be giving them access to their module to eventually not use Vision Air. He believed this was part of the integrated justice system as proof of concept.

Mr. Enright stated it should not matter if it is Vision Air or New World or any other vendor because we are talking the same language.

**Other Old Business**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN**

Ms. Smith stated that she would not have a meeting next week. There was a short discussion and it was determined that the next meeting is tentatively scheduled for 9:30 a.m. on March 24, 2011.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m.