JUDICIAL AND PUBLIC SAFETY TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION


Present: Judge Brown, Chief Judge Spence, Childress from the Public Defender’s Office, State’s Attorney McMahon, County Board Members Davoust and Mitchell

Absent: County Board Chair McConnaughay, County Board Member Lewis, Circuit Clerk Seyller, Public Member Pierson, and Sheriff Perez

Also Present: Executive Director of Information Technology Fahnestock, Purchasing Director Chris Rossman, Director of Court Services Lisa Aust, Monica Lawrence and Karen Herwick from the Circuit Clerk’s Office

Judge Brown called the meeting to order at 3:40 pm. A quorum was present.

MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of March 23, 2012, were approved by voice vote upon motion of Spence seconded by Davoust. By voice vote the motion carried.

EXTENSION OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR CASE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS: Brown noted that the vendors had agreed to extend their RFP with the exception of MTG who wanted to amend their RFP to reflect a change of personnel. Rossman confirmed that MTG couldn’t guarantee that the staff that were committed for this project would be available. Brown asked for discussion about extending the RFP.

By motion of Davoust seconded by McMahon, the Commission moved to extend the RFP’s for court case management consultants. By voice vote the motion carried.

COURT SERVICES RFP: Naughton stated that Court Services had, previous to the consideration of the case management consultant by this Commission, received a proposal based on a prior RFP from The National Center for State Courts and that their office had an urgent need to move forward with this project and would like to issue an RFP for mid-July that would go to contract negotiation in November or December.

McMahon asked why it was important to move forward now. Naughton noted that statistics for reporting currently were being done by hand and that it wasn’t uncommon for reports to be issued late because of the time it takes to prepare them. It was also noted that the needs of Court Services are different than criminal justice as there are social service requirements and other reporting that funding is based on. Naughton stated that because Court Services issued an RFP a couple of years ago they felt they were ready to move forward now and had an urgent need.

Mitchell asked if the reporting requirement was the main need to move forward and if it wasn’t just a matter of getting additional staff for that purpose. Fahnestock noted that case management development and support has a long term time frame with a year or two of development required and that this isn’t a quick process that could be solved by getting people temporarily to fill in for immediate reporting needs. It was also noted that his staff and Court Services personnel are already assisting with the reporting and that over time it has become more manual and acquisition of software is critical.

Brown suggested that with the anticipated changes in the Circuit Clerk’s Office it might be a good idea for Court Services to move forward and that the Public Defender, State’s Attorney, and Judiciary may want to proceed with a similar process. McMahon suggested moving forward noting that although his Office had support from the Information Technology Department there was still a lot of manual input and with the reduction of staff that has occurred over time the process has become difficult.

McMahon made a motion to allow the individual stakeholders to move forward to pursue their own RFP. The motion was seconded by Davoust.

Discussion was held and it was noted by McMahon that this process would also assist in moving to a system-wide court management system. Lawrence noted that there was still a requirement to meet national standards. McMahon agreed that
these standards had to be part of each system and that he was in support of utilizing those national standards. Fahnestock stated that the URL study reviewed the standards that have been implemented by the State of Illinois and that in doing the vendor selection you can validate that those specifications have been met.

Davoust inquired if the RFP’s would come back to this Commission for review. Brown indicated that would be the case. Brown stated that due to the critical need by Court Services and their desire to move forward, and with the desire of others to participate, that this gives the County the ability to be flexible, have a better opportunity for integration with the Circuit Clerk and do so at a reasonable cost.

Mitchell stated he didn’t think the County Board would fund anything at this point without approval. Davoust suggested that this proposal could work and that to date the process has come to a halt. He also noted that there was the expectation that the stakeholders would coordinate their efforts and that this was the opportunity to continue the process. Childress stated that the process should move forward.

Mitchell asked why these systems cost so much if there are basic standards. Fahnestock noted that these are specialized systems for courts with a strategic focus and they are not just general software programs like Microsoft Word and Excel and that there are still extensive costs of development, business intelligence, and implementation that go into these systems.

Discussion was held about collaboration. Brown noted that it would be a good idea to share with the candidates from both parties what is being considered. With regard to the desire to go forward with the RFP, the current stakeholders with the exception of the Circuit Clerk will be in office and are desirous to move forward. Brown also noted that he didn’t feel this would diminish the RFP process in any way. Brown suggested that the negotiating team meet to explore moving forward with those stakeholders who will be participating and that they come back to this Commission. It was noted that the intent of the resolution was to develop individual RFP’s for an integrated system and that some resolution on a budget would need to be addressed in the future. It was also noted that no one would want to choose a system for a future Circuit Clerk. It was further noted that the new Circuit Clerk would need some time to acclimate to their Office before being able to move forward on choosing a new system. Brown noted that one of the vendors for the RFP’s that were just issued withdrew their proposal after being contacted by the Circuit Clerk. Spence stated that the stakeholders should pursue their own RFP and that they should not have to wait because the Circuit Clerk is not ready. Proceeding individually following the national standards and then coming together at the end of the process when a new Circuit Clerk is in office is the most judicious way to proceed he noted. Spence stated that he felt that this process should get started immediately and that when the Circuit Clerk is ready that Office can participate.

Brown stated that the RFP’s would be issued, the cost determined and that the Commission would go to the County Board with a recommendation. Brown stated that he felt the County Board would appreciate the Commission’s position and the Commission in turn would expect a reasonable decision by the County Board. Mitchell stated that the Settlement Agreement with the Circuit Clerk indicated that the Commission would issue the budget. Brown noted that the Commission would propose the budget.

By motion of McMahon seconded by Davoust the motion was amended to allow the individual stakeholders to move forward to pursue their own RFP and coordinate with the negotiating committee. By voice vote the motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS: Commission members agreed to meet next on June 14, 2012 at 3 pm. Brown noted that if there were any other projects that the stakeholders needed to be considered and funded that he needed to be made aware of that prior to the next meeting so those items could be included on the agenda.

By motion of Mitchell seconded by Davoust the Commission moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:20 pm. By voice vote the motion carried.

Barbara Garza
Recording Secretary