

Clearwater, Florida, July 21, 2011

The Pinellas County Business Technology Services Board met in work session at 1:03 P.M. on this date in the County Commission Assembly Room, Pinellas County Courthouse, Clearwater, Florida, with the following members present:

Susan Latvala, County Commissioner, Chairman
Rick Becker, representing Deborah B. Clark, Supervisor of Elections
Ken Burke, Clerk of the Circuit Court
Jeff Byrkit, representing Pam Dubov, Property Appraiser
Bob Dillinger, Public Defender
Robert S. LaSala, County Administrator
Bernie McCabe, State Attorney
Chief Judge J. Thomas McGrady, Sixth Judicial Circuit
Captain Jim Main, representing Jim Coats, Sheriff
Carlos Thomas, representing Diane Nelson, Tax Collector

Not Present

Deborah B. Clark, Supervisor of Elections
Jim Coats, Sheriff
Pam Dubov, Property Appraiser, Vice-Chairman
Diane Nelson, Tax Collector
Kenneth T. Welch, County Commissioner

Also Present

Paul F. Alexander, III, Director of Business Technology Services (BTS)
Dennis R. Long, Chief Assistant County Attorney
BTS Department Staff
Tammy L. Burgess, Board Reporter, Deputy Clerk

AGENDA

1. Call to Order (Chair, Commissioner Latvala)
2. Designation of Voting Proxies (Chair, Commissioner Latvala)
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes (Chair, Commissioner Latvala)
BTS Board Meeting – April 21, 2011
4. Action Item – Approval of Financial Subcommittee Recommendations (Billy Young)
5. Action Item – Approval of BTS Board Web Access by Extra-Net (Mike Roiland)
6. Project Status Report – Enterprise GIS (David James)
7. Action Item – Transfer Enterprise GIS Service Bureau (David James/Jeff Byrkit)

8. Project Status Report – OPUS (Project Sponsor, Bill Berger)
9. Project Status Report – JUSTICEccms (Project Sponsor, Susie Jennings)
10. Project Status Report – CHEDAS (Project Sponsor, Clark Scott)
11. Project Status Report – Enterprise Asset Management (David James)
12. Project Status Report – Enterprise Content Management (David James)
13. Presentation – Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity (Jason Malpass)
14. Discussion Item – Current/Future Mainframe Capacity (Tom Fredrick)
15. Discussion Item – Enterprise Licenses and Maintenance Consolidation (Paul Alexander)
16. Adjournment (Chair, Commissioner Latvala)

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Latvala called the meeting to order at 1:03 P.M.

DESIGNATION OF VOTING PROXIES

In response to comments by Chairman Latvala, Mr. Alexander indicated that only Captain Jim Main, representing Sheriff Coats, would be unable to vote, as he also represented Sheriff Coats at the April meeting; and that the representatives for all other members who are absent would be eligible to vote.

MINUTES OF APRIL 21, 2011 MEETING – APPROVED

Upon presentation by Chairman Latvala of the April 21, 2011 minutes, Chief Judge McGrady moved, seconded by Mr. LaSala and carried, that the minutes be approved as submitted.

APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Billy Young, Senior Manager, BTS, indicated that following review, the Financial Subcommittee is recommending that Justice services, County web services, and personal computing services be accepted as enterprise in nature and have notional billing, adding that the measure to consider costs for the Justice services will be the number of primary users, the measure for County web services will be the number of unique users, and the measure for personal computing services will be the number of devices.

Thereupon, Mr. Burke moved, seconded by Chief Judge McGrady and carried unanimously, that the recommendations of the Financial Subcommittee be approved; whereupon,

Mr. Young reported that the three services approved today and the five services already approved account for over 39 percent of the BTS base budget.

APPROVAL OF BTS BOARD WEB ACCESS BY EXTRA-NET

Michael Roiland, Manager, BTS, indicated that Commissioner Welch previously questioned why BTS Board meeting materials are not posted on the Internet; and that he was asked to provide options regarding the Board's ability to easily access the information while offsite and the level of information accessible by the public; whereupon, he provided input regarding how the information is handled for other County boards.

During discussion regarding making meeting materials accessible through the Internet, handling sensitive and detailed information, and the need to password protect the information, Mr. Roiland responded to queries by Mr. Burke, and recommended that the primary documents be moved to the Internet with password protection, noting that another option would be to put all of the documents on the Internet without a password. Mr. Alexander indicated that posting of summary information on the Internet and allowing additional detailed documentation to be provided through a public records request would help eliminate public confusion; whereupon, Attorney Long advised that discretion be used to ensure that security-related and sensitive documents are not posted.

Thereupon, Mr. Burke moved, seconded by Mr. LaSala and carried, that the BTS Board meeting agenda items and supporting documentation be posted on the Internet and be accessible without a password, with the exception of documents with security concerns.

PROJECT STATUS REPORT – ENTERPRISE GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS

David James, Deputy Director, BTS, conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record, and indicated that the Enterprise Geographic Information Systems (EGIS) initiative began about a year ago at the request of the County Administrator, and provided input regarding the research conducted to determine EGIS objectives for the County; whereupon, he discussed the EGIS objectives, the EGIS committee, the EGIS bureau, EGIS technology consolidation, EGIS benchmark, and aerial imagery.

Mr. James noted that the BTS Board approved a resolution authorizing the formation of an EGIS subcommittee, which meets once a month; that there has been a lot of interest in the initiative; and that the position of a committee member who has retired remains

open; whereupon, Mr. LaSala indicated that he was unaware of the vacancy and will ensure that it is filled.

Mr. James pointed out that other counties have created a shared service bureau to assume responsibility for GIS data maintenance, as staff and budget reductions have resulted in the loss of critical GIS resources and GIS data not being maintained, which has a ripple effect on government functions dependent upon GIS data; and that not maintaining the GIS data could have serious consequences; whereupon, he indicated that the County has formulated a bureau, consisting of three existing Property Appraiser staff and two existing BTS staff, that will become the GIS data authority for the County.

Mr. James reported that upgrading and consolidating the GIS technology is necessary to reduce duplication throughout the County and to ensure GIS platform sustainability during a catastrophic event, such as a hurricane; and indicated that there is a potential for modest savings if the EGIS is handled properly; whereupon, he discussed the efficiencies and cost savings realized by using aerial imagery, provided examples of ortho and oblique images, and in response to query by Mr. Dillinger, indicated that the images are typically updated in December to obtain the best view, and have been updated bi-annually in the past.

During discussion and in response to queries by Mr. Burke, Mr. James indicated that the County currently does not have redundant servers in place, but that servers will be addressed as part of the technology consolidation; and that the primary server would be located in the data center and the backup server would be located at the Public Works building, noting that the aerial images are currently hosted by the Property Appraiser. He pointed out that Emergency Management Director Sally A. Bishop was consulted regarding the aerial imagery and the technology consolidation process; that as part of the oblique image contract, the vendor will fly to the County immediately following a hurricane to assist with damage assessment; and that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) rules regarding compliance and reimbursement have been taken into consideration. Mr. Alexander commented that the BTS Board approved approximately \$100,000 in funding for operational redundancy and failover as part of his budget presentation; and that the hardware for the initiative can be purchased and installed after the County budget is approved.

APPROVAL OF ENTERPRISE GIS SERVICE BUREAU TRANSFER

Mr. James conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record, and referring to the current EGIS governance and organization structure, related that the original intent was to have BTS provide administrative oversight of the

EGIS bureau staff on behalf of the EGIS committee, with the EGIS committee directing and prioritizing the work of the EGIS bureau; whereupon, he noted that BTS staff made it clear from the outset that BTS typically would not support data maintenance activities performed by the EGIS bureau.

Referring to the proposed EGIS governance and organization structure, Mr. James stated that Property Appraiser Pam Dubov has proposed that the EGIS bureau staff be moved into her organization, since it has mapping and GIS data maintenance experts, pointing out that the EGIS bureau staff would work exclusively on County geographic information system activities; that the EGIS bureau would continue to be directed and have its work prioritized by the EGIS committee; and that BTS would continue to support all GIS technology on behalf of the EGIS committee; whereupon, he indicated that in order to facilitate the transfer, \$480,000 would need to be transferred from the proposed BTS Fiscal Year 2012 budget to the proposed Property Appraiser Fiscal Year 2012 budget.

Mr. Dillinger moved, seconded by Chief Judge McGrady, that the EGIS bureau be administered by the Property Appraiser on behalf of the EGIS committee; and that the \$480,000 be transferred as proposed; whereupon, during brief discussion, Mr. James responded to comments and queries by Mr. McCabe, pointing out that the funding transfer is revenue neutral.

Thereupon, upon call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

PROJECT STATUS REPORT – ORACLE PROJECT UNIFIED SOLUTION (OPUS)

OPUS Project Sponsor William M. Berger conducted a PowerPoint presentation titled *OPUS Project Update*, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record.

Mr. Berger related that Phase 1A was implemented on October 17, 2010, which included Human Resources, Advanced Benefits, and Chart of Accounts; and that Phase 1B, Payroll, Time and Labor, Self-Service Human Resources, and Learning Management, was rolled out in three stages beginning on December 19, 2010.

Mr. Berger related that Phase 2A, Financials, Project, Assets, Procurement, and Business Intelligence, was expected to be brought online on July 1, 2011, but was reset to September 6, 2011, to allow time for adequate training and to ensure a quality implementation; that user training has begun; that a performance test is scheduled for late July to early August; and that Business Intelligence reporting has been moved from Phase 2B to Phase 2A;

whereupon, he discussed the major components of Phase 2A, including procure-to-pay, invoice to cash, and expanded chart of accounts and outlined the major process change impacts to the organization.

Mr. Berger indicated that the go-live dates for Phase 2B, Hyperion Budgeting and Performance Scorecard, and Phase 2C, Advanced Procurement, have been reset to October 31, 2011 for Phase 2B, and September 30, 2011 for Phase 2C; that the system configuration for Phase 2B is underway; and that the requirements and gap analysis for Phase 2C is currently in progress; whereupon, he discussed the support model and change management and communications components of the project.

Mr. Berger displayed the distribution of the funds from the originally approved project budget of \$17.1 million and indicated that the revised project budget is based on approval of a change order memorializing the changes in the schedule and scope of services associated with Hyperion that will be brought before the Board in August for consideration, pointing out that the project is still within the appropriated and approved budget; and that with approval of the change order, about half of the contingency remains available.

During discussion and in response to queries by Mr. Dillinger, Mr. Berger indicated that the Purchasing Department would know whether non-OPUS users can access blanket purchase agreements, and Messrs. Alexander and McCabe provided input. Mr. Berger related that the purchasing component of OPUS has not been implemented yet, but is intended to be leveraged on an enterprise-wide basis; and Mr. Alexander stated that the licensing would allow everyone throughout the County to access the system; whereupon, Mr. Burke commended Mr. Berger for his work with the OPUS project.

PROJECT STATUS REPORT – JUSTICEccms

JUSTICE Project Sponsor Susan M. Jennings conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record, and reported that the contract for Tyler Technologies was signed in December 2010; that the pre-implementation planning phase followed and lasted approximately 30 days; and that the seven primary stakeholders have unique needs regarding criminal justice and business requirements; whereupon, she discussed the following topics relating to the gap-fit analysis:

- Development Requirements
- Interface Requirements
- Hardware/Software Plan

- Conversion Plan
- Baseline Schedule

Ms. Jennings indicated that even though the analysis was anticipated to last no more than 90 days, it was extended by 52 days so that the information obtained through the business scenario workshops could be thoroughly vetted and the necessary project hardware and software obtained.

Ms. Jennings indicated that the data conversion process is ongoing; that the goal for the “first court type” is for the data to be provided to Tyler Technologies by August 1 so that data mapping can begin; that it is expected that BTS will be moving forward with Civil records; and that if the baseline schedule is adhered to, BTS will go live with its first court type by the end of August 2012; whereupon, Ms. Jennings reported that the Consolidated Justice Information System (CJIS) User Board and the Justice Management Team are currently reviewing the numerous Task 2 deliverables provided to them on July 19.

Ms. Jennings indicated that the current project schedule predicts that all court types, including the State Attorney and the Public Defender, will be in operation at the end of September; that on July 25, she will request that the CJIS User Policy Board approve the issuance of a project notice to proceed, which is required for moving forward with the implementation of a court type; that the project notice to proceed will trigger the need to initiate a change order for the requirement enhancements; that BTS will be able to move forward with the development requirements upon approval of the change order by the BCC; and that with the notice to proceed, BTS will ramp up data conversion activities and will commence training regarding configuration and mapping activities.

Concluding her presentation, Ms. Jennings provided financial information regarding the estimated expenditures and project budget for JUSTICEccms during the next three years, relating that during the current fiscal year, project funding and project expenses are approximately \$6.5 million and \$4 million, respectively; whereupon, she related that BTS would be presenting a request for an additional \$1 million during Fiscal Year 2012 and a request for \$3.9 million during Fiscal Year 2013 to cover ongoing and final project expenses.

In response to queries by Mr. Burke, Ms. Jennings indicated that BTS has a contract with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) for quality assurance purposes; that even though \$350,000 had initially been budgeted for the contract, it was executed at an approximate annual cost of \$112,000; and that even though the contract was approved for a

three-year time frame, BTS retains the option to review the contract on a yearly basis and decide whether it wants to continue for an additional year.

Referencing recent correspondence from the Tyler Corporation to the Chief Judge, Mr. Burke expressed his concerns regarding the Odyssey system being used by the 6th Circuit in Pasco County, with the exception of the Clerk; whereupon, Chief Judge McGrady indicated that a decision has not been made for Odyssey to be used by the Public Defender, the State Attorney, and the Court in Pasco County.

In response to queries by Mr. Burke, Ms. Jennings stated that the JUSTICEccms project is specific to Pinellas County, noting that it can be confusing because some of the primary stakeholders are not bound by the parameter of Pinellas County as their work lies across both counties. She related that the goal of the Public Defender, the State Attorney, and the Court is to eventually have one system that would run across Pinellas and Pasco Counties; that the JUSTICEccms implementation has no users outside of Pinellas County; and that although the capability is there for future interfacing, it would have to be agreed upon by all the stakeholders. Chief Judge McGrady stated that the assumption is that Odyssey will be used in Pinellas County; that the preference would be to have a similar system in Pasco; that a meeting was held yesterday which would account for the correspondence referenced by Mr. Burke; and that he does not expect a decision to be made soon.

In response to query by Chief Judge McGrady, Mr. Alexander, with input by Mr. McCabe, indicated that the enterprise license extends to Pasco County for the State Attorney, the Public Defender, and the Court; and that if the Pasco County Clerk decided to join in the enterprise license agreement, the 30-month window in the current contract could be re-negotiated.

In response to query by Mr. Burke regarding the statement of Ms. Jennings that the JUSTICEccms implementation has no users outside of Pinellas County, Mr. Alexander clarified that from a licensing prospect, the Pasco County Public Defender, State Attorney, and the Court have full rights to the software; that the license agreement would allow Pasco County to have a separate implementation, including separate hardware, separate project, and separate cost; and that the system has the ability for a single platform, with part of the system being in Pasco and part in Pinellas, with both counties sharing the system.

In response to query by Mr. Burke as to the amount Pasco County is paying for the licenses for the State Attorney, Public Defender, and the Court, Mr. Alexander indicated that there is no cost over and above what is in the contract, as they were added as authorized users

during the contract negotiations; whereupon, Ms. Jennings clarified that there is no plan or funding available to provide training or to assist Pasco County with any type of implementation.

Mr. Burke indicated that part of his obligation as Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners is to assure that any expenditure must meet the public purpose test for the taxpayers of Pinellas County; that he has concerns with Pinellas County resources being used to benefit Pasco County; and that while a unified system would be a noble thing to accomplish, Pinellas County citizens would be paying the brunt of the cost for a unified system; whereupon, Attorney Long advised that the implementation costs would need to be separated out from the licensing costs; that he originally had the same concerns as Mr. Burke; and that, based upon his involvement in the process, he is now satisfied that Pinellas County is not running afoul of any Constitution or statutory limitations of how Pinellas County tax dollars can be spent.

In response to query by Mr. Burke, Ms. Jennings confirmed that under the current storage module, no data from Pasco County will be stored on the computers housed in Pinellas County, only data from Pinellas County, and Mr. Alexander concurred, noting that it is not included within the scope of the project and would require an agreement with Pasco County.

Following lengthy discussion regarding the implementation of the system, the free licenses for Pasco County, where the Tyler software will reside, and the storage of Pasco County data, Mr. Burke indicated that in fairness to the Pinellas County taxpayers, his ongoing concern will be to ensure that Pasco County will pay for the benefits it is deriving from Pinellas County; whereupon, Mr. Alexander indicated that there is no restriction in the contract that prohibits Pinellas County from collecting revenue.

COMMUNITY HELP AND ELECTRONIC DATA ANALYSIS SYSTEM (CHEDAS) PROJECT UPDATE

Clark Scott, Health and Human Services Financial Manager and CHEDAS Project Sponsor, conducted a PowerPoint presentation titled *Community Help and Electronic Data Application System "CHEDAS,"* a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record, and indicated that the CHEDAS application system is primarily a client-based, client-central system for Health and Human Services (HHS) to manage client-related data; that the application will allow three different systems to be blended into a single system; and that the project is a joint endeavor between HHS and BTS; whereupon, referring to a project schedule, he indicated that the project began in September 2009; that it is currently in the implementation phase; and that during implementation, various programs and projects will be staged to occur at different times.

Mr. Scott discussed recent activities relating to CHEDAS, including:

- Testing of First-Round Customizations for CareScope
- Testing and Training for Mobile Medical Unit (MMU) implementation
- Preparing for July 26, 2011 MMU Go-Live
- Working with HHS Partners on interfaces
- Planning with Labcorp for interface
- CareScope Buildouts/Configuration in process

Concluding his presentation, Mr. Scott presented information regarding the budget, and indicated that approximately \$384,000 remains in the cost center for the CHEDAS project; and that the remaining funds are essentially encumbered toward current contracts and are anticipated to be fully expended by the end of the project.

In response to queries by Mr. Dillinger, Mr. Clark indicated that entities such as the Tampa Bay Information Network (TBIN) and Directions for Mental Health each have their own computer network; that the CHEDAS application currently has the capability to interface with those individual systems allowing for the sharing of data; and that an interface is being developed in order to reduce the manual inputting of similar data into both the TBIN and HHS networks.

ENTERPRISE ASSET MANAGEMENT PROJECT UPDATE

David James, Deputy Director, BTS, conducted a PowerPoint presentation titled *Enterprise Asset Management Project Update*, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record, and provided information regarding the following:

- Project Scope
- Project Strategy
- Current Status
- Provisional Level Schedule

Mr. James indicated that the Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) system has over 700 users across the County; that it relates to automated work and asset management functions, which are relied upon heavily in departments such as Fleet, Utilities, Public Works, Parks and Conservation, and Real Estate Management. He related that the project consolidates the numerous asset and work order systems that have proliferated throughout the County; that

BTS will utilize the Maximo program to provide for a robust, reliable, and well-maintained system that can be used across the enterprise; and that the intent is to use the program off-the-shelf, with no vendor customization.

Mr. James presented the following highlights regarding the two phases of the Project Strategy:

- Phase One – Detailed Business Requirements Assessment and Planning
 - Deliverables
 - Implementation Plan
 - Implementation Cost Estimates
- Phase Two – System Implementation
 - Deliverables – To Be Determined as part of Phase One

Mr. James indicated that Starboard Consulting has been selected as the vendor; that final negotiations are taking place regarding Phase One; and that the approximate cost of Phase One will be between \$250,000 and \$275,000; whereupon, he indicated that upon completion of the negotiation process, the contract review process would begin and would be followed by the contract authorization process; that Phase One is provisionally planned to begin in early September 2011; and that the project would continue until early 2013.

In response to queries by Mr. McCabe, Mr. James, with input by Mr. Alexander, indicated that the estimated cost of Phase Two would be approximately \$2.5 million to \$3 million; that the Enterprise Asset Management system would be used for inventory and asset control and would replace the current outdated and unstable system; and that funding would come out of the two project funds within the BTS budget.

ENTERPRISE CONTENT MANAGEMENT UPDATE

David James, Deputy Director, BTS, conducted a PowerPoint presentation titled *Enterprise Content Management Update*, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record.

Mr. James discussed the term “enterprise content management,” indicating that it relates to document imaging and storage, document control and version management, workflow and process management, content search and retrieval, and online content management. He indicated that locating data quickly is important to the organization; and that enterprise content management (ECM) will assist in that endeavor and, if implemented wisely, can help the County

realize lowered costs, reduced risks, and improved service delivery; whereupon, Mr. James discussed the present state of content management within the County, indicating that there are numerous basic imaging solutions already in use; that most current content management solutions are vertical implementations; that only minimal enterprise content management standards exist; that there is overlap and redundancy within the County; and that currently there is no integration between County content management platforms and other business systems.

Mr. James discussed potential ECM opportunities and presented information regarding next steps; whereupon, he requested that the members consider sponsoring an ECM Stakeholders Steering Committee similar to the EGIS Committee.

During discussion and in response to queries by Chief Judge McGrady, Messrs James and Burke presented information regarding the Global 360 Imaging System and the Documentum System. Mr. Burke indicated that the Clerk's Office uses Global 360 for non-court uses, noting that court records have different rules and requirements; whereupon, he indicated that Documentum is used in the Board Records Department; and that much progress has been made in the attempt to store records in an electronic format and reduce the number of paper documents.

Discussion ensued regarding the makeup of an ECM Stakeholders Steering Committee, with input by Mr. Burke and Chairman Latvala, and Mr. Dillinger indicated his interest in serving on the committee.

Thereupon, Mr. Alexander indicated that a resolution would be drafted by the County Attorney's Office and presented to the BTS Board; that the resolution would place the ECM Stakeholders Steering Committee in charge of the initiative; and that BTS would take instructions from and would support the committee through a service level agreement.

DISASTER RECOVERY/BUSINESS CONTINUITY

Mr. Alexander reminded the members that the presentation regarding disaster recovery and business continuity has been placed on today's agenda as an action item from the last meeting; whereupon, Jason Malpass, Enterprise Architecture Manager, BTS, conducted a PowerPoint presentation titled *BTS Disaster Recovery*, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record.

Mr. Malpass presented historical background information, relating that only a few years ago, business critical systems resided only in the data center located in the basement at 315

Court Street, with no offsite tape storage, no offsite equipment storage, and no contract for offsite recovery. He indicated that during the years following the 2004 hurricane season, stakeholders had been requested to provide input regarding where BTS should focus its efforts; and that the overwhelming response was that disaster recovery and business continuity should be a top priority.

Mr. Malpass discussed the initial steps to reduce vulnerability, indicating that a risk assessment had been completed to determine which critical core functions needed to be addressed across the organization; whereupon, he presented information regarding the contract that BTS has with Iron Mountain for offsite tape storage and with Sungard Recovery Services for offsite recovery services.

Mr. Malpass presented information relating to the benefits of virtualization, relating that approximately 285 machines have been virtualized; that virtualization protects against service disruption should a piece of hardware fail; and that an advanced option is being developed which would provide for a full recovery mode; whereupon, he discussed the culture shift regarding disaster recovery, relating that issues regarding budgeting and similar topics are now a forethought rather than an afterthought; and that disaster recovery has been integrated into BTS processes such as OPUS and JUSTICE.

Mr. Malpass discussed the current status of disaster recovery and presented information relating to the emergency responder building, indicating that it is located at 22211 U.S. Highway 19 North in Clearwater; that it is designed to withstand a Category 5 hurricane; that it has shower, sleeping, and kitchen facilities; that the building will have an uninterruptable power supply and dual generator backup; and that redundancy will be included in the network, phone system, and Internet. Mr. Malpass related that while Sungard will continue to provide mainframe disaster recovery services until the mainframe is retired and has the ability to bring up the mainframe in any of their facilities around the world, the emergency responder building will be utilized for all other disaster recovery services due to the cost savings and efficiencies it will provide; and Mr. Alexander related that when the JUSTICE project is complete, \$1.1 million of recurring dollars will be able to come out of the budget.

Mr. Malpass discussed the following steps toward the strategy moving forward and requested the support and patience of the members toward the effort:

- Update Risk Management
 - Determine and prioritize systems required during an emergency situation

- New Projects and Systems
 - Operational redundancy and disaster recovery requirements determined as part of new project/system initialization
- Existing Systems
 - Operational redundancy and disaster recovery requirements determined as part of system upgrades of technology refresh

Mr. Malpass presented information regarding the mainframe, indicating that it is co-located and out-of-state; and that it is basically configured for two different modes, “disaster situation recovery” and “sunny day event recovery.” In response to queries by Mr. Burke, discussion ensued regarding potential vulnerabilities in the system; whereupon, Mr. Burke requested that a similar disaster recovery and business continuity presentation be provided at a CJIS Policy Board meeting; and Mr. Alexander agreed that BTS would tailor a presentation to address specific CJIS needs; and that it would be offered in two phases, pre-JUSTICE implementation and post-JUSTICE implementation, and brief discussion ensued.

CURRENT/FUTURE MAINFRAME CAPACITY

Mr. Alexander indicated that Mr. Burke had requested that a presentation be provided regarding current and future mainframe capacity; whereupon, Thomas L. Fredrick, Senior Manager, BTS, indicated that prior to discussing issues regarding the mainframe capacity, he would provide background information concerning the mainframe strategy of BTS. Mr. Fredrick indicated that the BTS Board had approved the strategy of freezing any new development on the mainframe; that its focus would be supporting the production environment; that it would keep service levels up and running until the OPUS and JUSTICE projects are complete; and that it would not invest in any upgrades, with the only exception being mandates.

Mr. Fredrick presented information regarding the planned removal of software applications such as Legacy and GEAC from the mainframe, indicating that as applications are retired or moved to other locations, capacity on the mainframe would increase; and that there would be negative impacts associated with deviating from the strategy, including performance issues and increased expansion costs. Mr. Fredrick related that the mainframe was designed for level utilization; that performance issues have been noticed relating to implementation of the GT software; and that statistical information has shown that specific transactions have contributed to higher peaks, higher average demand, and longer wait times; whereupon, he indicated that in an effort to address the issue, BTS will assess the GT application and determine whether the software can be redeveloped, reconfigured, or more finely tuned; that BTS is looking at the possibilities of re-hosting the application, offloading it to another platform, or running the

service at a different time during the day; and that a consultant from GT will be brought in to help pinpoint the issue.

Concluding his presentation, Mr. Fredrick discussed the importance of no new development being added to the mainframe, and indicated that meetings have been scheduled to address how to keep moving forward and not impact the production environment.

Mr. Burke thanked Mr. Frederick for the informative report and expressed his appreciation regarding assistance provided to the Clerk's Office in meeting the growing demand for online access for court information by the general public and the legal community. Responding to queries by Mr. Burke and Chief Judge McGrady, Mr. Alexander presented information regarding the timeframe for removing Civil records from the mainframe, relating that as records are transferred to the JUSTICE system, mainframe space will increase; that transaction volume taxes the system more than the amount of data; that when JUSTICE is fully up and running there will be no system constraints; and that the mainframe will eventually be retired.

ENTERPRISE LICENSES AND MAINTENANCE CONSOLIDATION

Mr. Alexander indicated that at the last meeting and at the request of Mr. Dillinger, the Board approved the removal of the Enterprise Licensing Maintenance Fund from the BTS base operating budget; and that BTS was asked to identify the items currently in individual budgets that would be appropriate for transfer into the protected Enterprise Fund funded by the County. He related that oblique aerial photography, street-level images, office licenses for the State Attorney and the Public Defender, the Enterprise Geographic Information System, and certain virus and backup software are some of the items that would probably be moved into the Enterprise License and Maintenance Fund; whereupon, noting that the Enterprise Fund currently contains \$5 million to \$6 million, he asked that the matter be carried as an action item, with periodic reports, and no objections were noted.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:27 P.M.