

MCHENRY COUNTY BOARD – COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
667 WARE ROAD - WOODSTOCK IL 60098

MINUTES OF TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2011

Chairman of the Board – Kenneth D. Koehler (District 2)

District 1	District 2	District 3
Bob Bless	JS "Scott" Breeden	Mary Donner
Anna May Miller	James Heisler	Nick Provenzano
Marc Munaretto	Kenneth Koehler	Kathleen Bergan Schmidt
Robert Nowak	Donna Kurtz	Barbara Wheeler
District 4	District 5	District 6
Sue Draffkorn	Tina Hill	Randall Donley
John Hammerand	John Jung, Jr.	Diane Evertsen
Pete Merkel	Virginia Peschke	Mary McCann
Sandra Fay Salgado	Paula Yensen	Ersel Schuster

The Honorable County Board of McHenry County, Illinois met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, November 1, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chairman Koehler. The following members were present: Bob Bless, Scott Breeden, Randy Donley, Mary Donner, Diane Evertsen, John Hammerand, James Heisler, Kenneth Koehler, Donna Kurtz, Pete Merkel, Anna May Miller, Robert Nowak, Virginia Peschke, Nick Provenzano, Sandra Salgado, Kathleen Bergan Schmidt, Ersel Schuster, Barbara Wheeler and Paula Yensen. Ms. Hill, Ms. McCann and Mr. Jung arrived at 8:37a.m.
ABSENT: Sue Draffkorn and Marc Munaretto.

Also in attendance: Peter Austin, County Administrator; John Labaj, Deputy County Administrator; Ralph Sarbaugh, Associate County Administrator-Finance; Adam Lehmann, Assistant to the County Administrator; Pam Palmer, Auditor; Phil Dailing, Court Services; Paul Lerner, Tina Sheldon, Carol Wegner and Tom Sullivan, IT; Scott Block, Mental Health Court; Dan Wallis, Court Administration; Judge Michael Sullivan; Kathy Keefe, Circuit Clerk; Mark Cook, Public Defender; Lou Bianchi and Karen Rhodes, States Attorney; staff; interested public and the press.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

NEW BUSINESS: *Review of the Integrated Justice Program:* Mr. Provenzano, Chairman of the Law and Justice Committee reminded the committee members that Integrated Justice has been a part of McHenry County for many years. During this time they have been looking for solutions to this issue. Several milestones have already been met. In December the Law and Justice Committee reviewed where we were and where we should go from here. He stated that he has heard concern voiced by several stakeholders on why the committee members took three months off for review of this project. They did not understand the long term plans for this project. Meetings have been held during this time to review ideas on how to get an understanding in order to bring this project back to the committee for review. A presentation was held with the Law and Justice Committee. The committee was pleased with the progress made on the project and they approved the new stage, but, concern was voiced that this was such a complicated issue they felt it was appropriate to take this to a Committee of the Whole meeting in order to get the questions of the whole County Board answered. The Chairman of the County Board agreed so this Committee of the Whole meeting was scheduled to allow the County Board members to discuss the details of the project. There is a lot of money being considered for the next stage of this project and the County Board members have a fiscal responsibility to thoroughly review this project and that is why this meeting was called. Doing nothing is not a choice that can be made. The issues currently going on in Kane County highlights the need for a product like this.

Ms. Hill, Mr. Jung and Ms. McCann arrived at 8:37a.m.

Mr. Provenzano introduced Mr. Tom Sullivan for presentation of the Integrated Justice Program. Mr. Sullivan reminded committee members that this is a proposed case management system for the Public Defender and State's Attorney's offices. In May of 2009 the County Board approved Integrated Justice as part of its strategic plan. The vision was to provide safer communities through the sharing of public safety information. This includes the Circuit Clerk, Courts, Sheriff, Corrections, Court Services, Police Agencies, States Attorney and Public Defender. This product will continue to evolve over time. The States Attorney and Public Defender are in need of a Case Management System which included pieces of software and modules that will exchange information among the various departments. The Courts have had a system in place since 1990 so this is not a

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

November 1, 2011

Page 2

new idea. They began imaging of their documents in 1991. The Courts system went live in May of 2009. The Court Services Case Management System went live in February 2010. The Specialty Courts Case Management System is due to go live in October 2011.

Electronic tickets began in 2004. Now when an officer makes a stop, they enter the license plate number into the system and the ticket is sent in electronically to the data base. The ticket is then stored in OnBase and is indexed electronically. They no longer have to type information into the system. The image of the ticket is indexed and stored. Data entry has been reduced by 98%. Arrests or Incidents in the Public Safety Case Management System may reference the tickets.

The modules speak with each other and pass information onto each other as well. The jail module went live in 2007 and the CAD system went live in 2009. Field reporting began in 2011. The VisionAir system allows information in the Record Management System.

To date the Courts have spent \$4.5 million dollars on their Case Management System. The Public Safety Case Management System costs \$4.038 million dollars. This includes the twenty six police agencies and Sheriff's Department. No general fund monies have been spent. The Courts paid for their system from the Court Automation Fund and the Public Safety system was paid for by E911.

At the time these systems were completed we knew there would be additional Case Management Systems needed in order to create electronic versions of paper flow. Today the committee is here to discuss the creation of a Case Management System for the State's Attorney and Public Defender and then provide integration of all groups so data exchanges can occur.

We recognized the original vendor had some limitations and they were not to the level that the product could be integrated. There was a time gap before they could move forward. They needed time to identify vendors that we wanted to use. They also needed to make sure support of their product would be provided by the vendors.

Committee members stated that they recalled that the County previously had a "priority" ownership in the software, when completed. It was stated that the vendor owns the "code" and the County abandoned its rights to future proceeds for this product. It was determined that there would be no market for such customized software. This software was customized to our needs. No extra expenditures were given in order to get this marketing piece.

Ms. Schmidt reminded committee members that the original contract was lacking in specifics. It was vague and through hard work the final contract was firmed up. The software works even though there were previous issues with the vendor. Reimbursements were part of their discussions but were never part of the contract. Mr. Sullivan stated that the County could obtain this source code in the future.

Committee members stated that the minutes from the various meetings should be reviewed and put into a step by step order so that the committee members would know what went on. Committee members were reminded that this would end up being a discussion on the previous vendor. They are now considering a new piece of software from a new vendor. This software will work in conjunction with the other products.

The State's Attorney's and Public Defender's offices have no case management system. They have had to make do with the tools they have been given. In July 2010 and RFP was sent out. The RFP included a high level of functional specifications, technology infrastructure and integration requirements. In January 2011 the RFP evaluation was completed. Business requirements have been evaluated by the States Attorney, Public Defender and Court Administration. In October they were informed that the RFP pricing would still be honored.

Currently these offices are working with an inefficient paper process. Each of the systems has evolved over time. A Case Management System for these offices will eliminate duplicate data entry. It will also automate business rules through workflow.

The Case Management System for the State's Attorney's office will cost \$1,153,750 over 18 months. There will be an annual cost of \$116,250. The system for the Public Defender will cost \$391,250 with annual costs of \$34,750. The systems will take six (6) to eighteen (18) months to implement. There will be a total annual fee of \$151,000. New Dawn Technologies, the proposed vendor, has been in business since 1996. They have handled over 300 client installations with the largest installation involving over 850 clients and they hold seven state wide contracts. This product also integrates with VisionAIR and OnBase.

Approved 11 15 11

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

November 1, 2011

Page 3

A structured contract will be implemented where billing will be based on milestones outlined in the project plan. Signoffs would be required by the department, IT, Administration and the Law and Justice Committee. There will be \$640,000 in license fees due. This will be billed at 10% of the total over 5 months. This will result in a \$130,000 monthly fee for five months.

Mr. Sullivan stated that it was the consensus of the Internal Justice Governance Committee to move forward with this project. This committee included the States Attorney, Public Defender, Court Administration, County Administration and Information Technology.

Enhanced Integration provides information consolidation by exchanging data amongst the multiple data systems. There are 259 data exchanges with a series of twenty projects planned. Value is added through each project. New Dawn Technologies will partner with URL for this integration. URL participated in the 2004 Data Exchange Study. They are already providing service to Lake, Will, Kane and Cook Counties. During the Lake County visit they stated that they have a 10 year plan in place for their integration project. They are currently seven years into the plan.

Mr. Sullivan provided a list of twenty projects for enhanced integration. They have prioritized the exchange packages and created a high level project plan for review. So far, \$8.6 million dollars has been spent for this process. This has not involved any general fund dollars. The State's Attorney, Public Defender Case Management System will cost \$1.6 million to implement. Enhanced Integration will cost approximately \$4 million dollars over 10 years. This would result in annual costs of \$530,000 after 10 years.

Chairman Koehler informed the committee that they would have to take their questions to the County Board meeting as they have run out of time for this meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 9:03 a.m. on a motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Ms. Hill. The motion carried with all members present voting aye on a voice vote.

Dated and approved by the McHenry County Board at Woodstock, Illinois this _____ day of _____, A.D., 2011.

KENNETH D. KOEHLER, Chairman
McHenry County Board

ATTEST:

KATHERINE C. SCHULTZ, County Clerk