
ROLL CALL: PRESENT: Commission Chair Judge Brown; Chief Judge Brawka; Public Defender Childress; Public Member Felton; Circuit Clerk Hartwell (3:25 p.m.); County Board Chair Lauzen; County Board Member Lewis; State’s Attorney McMahon; Sheriff Perez; Bar Association Representative Cat Battista.

ABSENT: County Board Member Ford; County Board Member Wojnicki; County Board Member Hoscheit; Public Member Pierson.

ALSO PRESENT: Court Services Director Aust, Court Administrator Naughton, CMS Project Manager Enright, ITD Project Manager Garza, Circuit Clerk CIO Monica Lawrence; Members of the Public

Judge Brown called the meeting to order at: 3:15 p.m.
A quorum was present.

Minutes of December 12, 2013: The minutes were approved by voice vote upon motion of Perez seconded by McMahon.

STATUS OF COURT SERVICES PROJECT: Aust noted that work continues with vendor Capita on business processes. This is anticipated to take several months and the project is continuing to progress.

STATUS OF CMS PROJECT – PROJECT MANAGER’S REPORT: Enright noted that the CMS project is still in the vendor evaluation phase. Site visits have been completed. It was noted that some of the offices need to get clarification on a couple of issues with the two finalist vendors and that a list of questions is being developed to review. Lewis inquired about each office’s preparedness to do data conversion. Enright noted that the ITD staff is currently working with the Circuit Clerk’s Office on data cleansing and that the vendor’s tool sets will be used during the data conversion phase of the project. Brown noted that some of the issues related to selection of a vendor was choosing a vendor that met the needs of each of the offices of the State’s Attorney, Public Defender, Judiciary and Circuit Clerk in the most cost effective method and that it had come down to some specific issues that needed to be addressed. Brawka noted that because these issues could have an impact on contract negotiations that perhaps the discussion should occur in an executive session. Brown indicated that the goal had been to select a vendor at today’s meeting but that with the ITD Executive Director not being able to participate over the past couple of weeks and with a few specific questions, the decision will be delayed. Brown noted the impact of this decision, and the importance of having everyone involved. Brown inquired about the status of the contract negotiator. Enright noted that a request for quotation had been issued and those were due back on February 26, 2014 with three vendors expected to bid.

RECOMMENDATION ON SELECTION OF VENDOR FOR COURT CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM: With the delay in the selection of a Court Case Management System vendor, it was noted that one of the issues that had arisen was concern about the Open Meetings Act and that the Circuit Clerk, Chief Judge, Judge Brown, the State’s Attorney, Public Defender and the Circuit Clerk were hampered in their ability to discuss the vendor systems among themselves. Brown suggested establishing a committee of the Commission to include the Public Defender, Chief Judge, Circuit Court Clerk, Chairman of the Judicial and Public Safety Strategic Planning and Technology Commission, and the State’s Attorney that could meet in executive session to discuss the contract and make a formal recommendation to the entire Commission. Brown also noted that other members of the Commission would be able to attend if they wanted to participate but that the importance of this decision required the need to have an open discussion.

McMahon noted that he was in favor of this and that one of the issues his office had was confidentiality and how information is shared between departments and offices through internal operations. Brawka noted that the Justice Managers have been meeting for over 35 years and that they constitute a quorum of the Board which puts the members
in a difficult position as far as being able to discuss items related directly to the CMS. Brawka suggested that the Commission consist of 18 members. Brawka suggested another judge be added for continuity since her terms ends in November of 2015 and that it was important to have another judicial voice for program continuity. It was also noted that another County Board member and another person from the community in the educational field would be a good choice. Discussion continued about who could attend executive sessions, and it was noted by the State’s Attorney that staff would have to leave unless they were designated ex officio and that having information technology staff and especially the Executive Director of Information Technology were a crucial part of the project.

Further discussion was held about using a team consisting of the ITD Executive Director, the CMS Project Manager and ITD Project Manager as ex officio participants along with the Public Defender, State’s Attorney, Circuit Clerk, Chief Judge and the Commission Chair. Lewis inquired about the contract negotiators role, and it was noted that this committee would not handle the contract negotiation directly but would be more involved with the technical aspects including budgets and scope. It was determined that the Subcommittee could be identified as the Technology Stakeholders Committee. Inquiry was made if the Sheriff should participate. Perez noted he would do what was good for the group noting that he had been down this road when choosing a system for the Sheriff’s Office and that his office would be required to interface with the new system.

Felton noted that the contract negotiator was usually responsible for handling that aspect of the project. Brown agreed but also noted that they had not yet reached a consensus on a vendor and that at this point no vendor had been eliminated. Brown also noted that with clarification needed on some outstanding issues that the committee might be a better solution. Brown stated that he thought that it was realistic that a vendor recommendation could be made by March 20, 2014 and then contract negotiations could proceed.

Discussion was held about expansion of the entire Commission and Judge Brawka noted that it might be helpful to provide a film that had been presented to the Bar Association at a future meeting so people could understand how the court system worked. Brown noted that might be a good presentation at the next meeting when a vendor is selected. Brown noted that there would be an executive session at the next meeting and that confidentiality among the stakeholders was imperative.

A motion was made by Lauzen seconded by Hartwell to form the Technology Stakeholders Committee of the Judicial and Public Safety Strategic Planning and Technology Commission consisting of State’s Attorney McMahon, Public Defender Childress, Circuit Clerk Hartwell, Chief Judge Brawka, Chairman of the Judicial and Public Safety Strategic Planning and Technology Commission Brown, Sheriff Perez, and ex officio members ITD Executive Director Fahnestock, CMS Project Manager Enright, and ITD Project Manager Garza. By voice vote the motion carried.

RESOLUTION FOR BUDGET ADJUSTMENT FOR JUROR INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM: Naughton provided the Commission with information regarding the enhancements to the jury software system noting that two people in the office handle juror inquires and the proposed phone system will greatly assist their efforts. Naughton also noted that the system is expected to pay for itself in a year because postcards could be used to send out notices rather than first class letters. The savings is expected to be $12,000 to $18,000 with about 100,000 pieces of mail generated annually. Brawka noted that they currently have a potential for 15 jury courtrooms and that about 35,000 jurors are summoned annually. This system will allow potential jurors to call in to see if they need to appear on a certain date and location. The automation would be a great aid to the public and also to the jury commission.

Discussion was also held about the Commission’s waiting to present this resolution until the CMS project was farther along. Lauzen noted that the cost is $21,000 and could pay for itself within a year and that from the standpoint of efficiency it was probably a good idea to address this sooner than later.

Brawka made a motion to approve the resolution for the budget adjustment for the juror information system and send it to the Judicial and Public Safety Committee and then to the Finance Committee. Perez seconded the motion, and by voice vote the motion carried.
STRATEGIC PLANNING FOR FACILITIES: Brown noted that the County Board had expanded the Commission’s charge to include strategic planning but that it would be May or June before that will be addressed so as to focus the Commission’s work on the court case management system.

NEW BUSINESS: There was no new business.

NEXT MEETING: Brown suggested that the next Commission meeting be Thursday, March 20, 2014 at 3 pm but that if the stakeholders were not in a position to make a recommendation the meeting would be delayed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm by motion of Lauzen seconded by McMahon. By voice vote the motion carried.

Barbara Garza
Recording Secretary