

STATE OF TEXAS §

COUNTY OF HENDERSON §

BE IT REMEMBERED, that the Henderson County I.T. Committee met in Regular Session on July 20th, 2016 @ 1:30 P.M. in the Annex 2nd Floor Conference Room in Athens, Texas, with the following members present, to-wit:

- ANN MARIE LEE COUNTY AUDITOR, absent
- CLINT DAVIS COUNTY ATTORNEY
- BOTIE HILLHOUSE SHERIFF
- WADE MCKINNEY COMM. PCT. #2, CHAIRMAN
- SCOTT MCKEE DISTRICT ATTORNEY, absent
- MICHAEL BYNUM COUNTY TREASURER
- KEN GEESLIN COMM.PCT. #4
- MARY MARGARET WRIGHT COUNTY CLERK
- TOMMY BARNETT J.P. PCT. #5

And guests, Josh Brock, IT Administrator; Judge Pollock, J. P. #2; Diane Russ, County Attorney’s office; Chris Ricci, Greg Wallace Tyler Technologies, Erik Ernst, Tyler Technologies via phone; Susan Cochran, County Clerk’s office; Jane Crouch, Auditor’s Office; Betty Herriage, District Clerk’s office.

Transacted the following business, to-wit:

Chairman McKinney called the Meeting to order at 1:30 P.M.

1. Consider and Take Action to approve the Minutes of previous IT Committee Meeting

Motion made by Judge Barnett and seconded by Michael Bynum, to approve I. T. Minutes from previous meeting held July 6th, 2016. Item passes.

2. Consider and Take Action on issues related to Phase One of the Odyssey Project, Athens Campus.

E-filing – Susan – stated she had put in all of the different cases she needed to put in as far as civil and probates. They were submitted and were waiting on Derl to get back with Susan to find out why they weren’t going through. Susan would send Derl screen-shots of the codes. Derl would get back with her and let her know what she needed to do on her end to get them corrected. Susan would wait sometimes several days. Susan would ask Derl some question, like in one instance, that one was rejected by George Paltaes, Derl would say this is in TEST environment, don’t worry about it, just keep on TESTING. Susan didn’t know who George is, and why he would have the authority to reject one of her filings. Susan never got the answer as to why it was rejected to begin with. Wade – asked Susan if Derl communicates well. Susan – stated **NO** he does not. She feels belittled by the responses she gets from Derl. Susan - stated she may not be the best on the computer, but feels she can learn really well. Derl doesn’t make Susan feel comfortable in any way. The responses he gives back to Susan are very short and she doesn’t enjoy the process. Ken – stated you sent good exchanges back and forth with screen-shots and Derl’s responses all through the days after the 4th of July up to July 8th, 2016; Susan sent an email to Derl on July 11th, 2016 and didn’t hear back from him until this Monday July 18th, 2016. Ken – stated he went dark for a week. Derl got real active yesterday (July 19th, 2016) and today (July 20th, 2016). Susan – stated yesterday at 10 till 5:00 P. M. Derl finally responded and said he had gotten all the ones that Susan had done all the fixes on that she knew to do, at 10 till 5:00 P. M. yesterday (July 19th, 2016). Derl – stated he had gotten all of them in there and could continue to try input probates and ask if she had done all of them, and she had done all to her knowledge. Derl – asked at 9:05 A. M. (July 20th, 2016), if she had gone to TEST environment and checked everything out. Ken – stated do not ask for something you don’t deliver yourself. Derl wants Susan to be at his beck and call the customer, but he doesn’t reciprocate getting back with her in a timely manner. Wade – stated August 26th, 2015, we started hammering about e-filing. Angie inquired about e-filing and Erik’s response stating he was in contact with a team and is sure they will follow up with you. It has been almost a year ago. Greg – asked Evan if he was hearing the complaint. Evan – stated yes and was taking notes. Wade – is forwarding the email to Evan. Evan – wants to see where the ball got dropped so early on, and the fact it went all the way back to August 2015, and why was there such a long gap. Wade – asked Susan if this is throwing off the financials? Susan – stated she is waiting for the e-filing to be able to go directly into Odyssey so she could make the fees go up. Erik helped Susan with the fees to go up in

May. Due to e-filing not being able to move forward like it is suppose to the fees are messed up, and we are collecting \$287.00 and set to collect \$324.00 so we are really getting \$287.00 and it shows \$37.00 due and hasn't gone in to adjust the amount, not thinking it was affecting Jane's state reports. Chris – asked Evan what are we doing going forward this needed to be done yesterday? Evan – stated this needs to be pushed to PROD as soon as they are comfortable with the TESTING. Jane – stated they have worked on this through TEST. What is going to happen when we go into PROD and everything that was corrected is it going to affect everything? Are we going to have to start all over with TESTING again? Evan – stated the issues that we had in TEST will exist in PROD. They are making the changes simultaneously in PROD. Greg – stated you are in the process of adding codes for Henderson County, so you will run this by Henderson County for their approval? Evan – stated the big thing the run into integration is usually around fee schedules and how they are configured. Evan – stated they won't move anything into PROD until it has been approved by Henderson County. Ken – asked what is the time frame on this? Evan – stated it all depends on how testing goes. He hopes to have Henderson County live with e-filing the beginning of August or the middle of August at the latest. As far as configuration Henderson County is ready for PROD. Wade – asked how is Tyler going to help Henderson County move forward? Evan – stated they can provide a testing plan if Henderson County can hit the mile stones with our testing, pass the fee schedules and make sure they can transfer to Odyssey. Evan – stated that they can start having touch-point calls and go over any kind of issues we may be having. Susan – stated she would like the touch-point calls. Wade – asked Susan if there were multiple attempts to talk with Derl. Susan – stated yes. Susan had talked with Derl maybe twice back in 2015. Evan – will make sure Derl will be on the call with them as well. Susan – asked if Derl was able to do anything about the Sheriff's fees that have never been in our e-filing system? Citation by mail would work just fine. Issue citation by certified mail, Evan stated they got Sheriff's service and Sheriff's service writ created. Sheriff's service is set for \$85.00 and Sheriff's service writ is set for \$150.00. Susan – stated this is correct. Evan – stated we need an issue by citation by certified mail for \$85.00. Susan – stated that is correct. Evan – stated this will be added. Wade – stated to Evan he would be setting weekly calls. Evan – stated he would send an email on what times worked best for the offices. Ken – stated all these issues regarding e-filing are you having issues with Odyssey 2014? We are on Odyssey 2013 and Erik was pushing us to upgrade to Odyssey 2014 in August – September time frame of this year. Once we get all these issues resolved and Evan stated he thought we could go to PROD by mid-August and everything does work. His concern is we get everything working and we upgrade to Odyssey 2014, the committee needs to know how many issues we are going to be facing with the upgrade. Evan – stated from an e-filing stand point he hasn't been aware of any issues coming up integrating with Odyssey. Ken – stated to Evan about the calls with Susan and Angie. You anticipate a couple of weeks that everything will be done. Evan – stated that is what he is hoping for. Ken – stated our I. T. meeting is in two weeks, can we anticipate you (Evan) being on the call with us? Evan – stated he can be on the call for the I. T. meeting on August 3rd.

Greg – stated he needed to get with Wade and Ken on staffing that was requested.

Chris – stated he had some action items of Judge Pollock's referencing to tickets. Chris will call the JP office directly. Chris will be watching for tickets from the JP offices. Ken – asked Chris to reach out to Judge Pollock and the other JP offices to see if they are having any issues. Chris – stated he would reach out to Judge Pollock. This whole process is about partnering together to make it better for the county.

Wade – stated when Erik was here we would get a break-down on our financials, our intent was to be under budget. That has dropped and has gone completely away. Greg – stated he would work with Erik and get the budget to us.

e-Discovery – Diane stated they have been trying to help the DA's office with e-Discovery, the first contact with Tyler was back in June. Wade – asked Evan if he had anything to do with e-Discovery? Evan – stated this isn't part of his expertise. Wade – put a hold on e-Discovery. Erik – stated he is getting a call set-up with Diane about e-Discovery.

3. Consider and Take Action on issues related to Phase Two of the Odyssey Project, Justices of the Peace.

Judge Barnett – stated things are better, Eric Garcia has been wonderful getting things fixed when they have contacted him and was able to get things fixed. Judge Barnett – stated during the conversion we do a lot of Tyler Technology's work; stating we do Fee Codes every day. There is confusion on how the codes are listed and the clerks spend time looking up statutes. It takes a lot of time out of the day looking for codes and fees, the clerks have to do all that. Jennifer is on the phone with Jane asking questions. Wade – stated it doesn't just affect the JP's offices it also affects the Auditor's office as well when there is an issue. Jane – stated she is trying to do the state fee quarterly report and the OMNI fee, failure to appear fee, there is only one, a \$20.00 toward the whole quarter. It is picking the wrong fee code, and Jane found out that the other fee code they can't switch it, so it has to be done manually. Jane now has to run the report and calculate it by hand and add it manually into the report. Jane – stated she guessed she will have to do that from now on; it's just another one of the things we keep finding wrong with the JP package. Erik – stated the OMNI fee wasn't split in the source data. Jane – stated that was true, she had a spread sheet when she got all the information, I got how much they collected from OMNI and when it got to the spread sheet, she knew to split it out. Not realizing that when it was set up it was going to affect us like that. It is going to take a while before all the fees and before the actual JP OMNI fee codes goes away; and the new OMNI fee codes are set up and the map to the quarterly report. Wade – asked how many cases does this apply to? Erik – stated 4,213. Wade – stated a lot we are going to have to manually add into the report. Judge Pollock - stated he has a hard time with all the manual things that the JP offices have to do to this computerized coded program that coders created and they can't change things that are incorrect. He doesn't understand why they can't write a code to correct the things that are incorrect. We should not have to manually insert data and figures when we have to run a report. When we run a report it should grab the correct data put where it is supposed to go and print a report that is correct. It is beyond his comprehension how these coders can create something but they can't fix it if it is incorrect. Erik – stated going forward it

will be correct going forward. If they have a data set that we convert that is not in that format and split it out they are essentially creating data. This is different than the conversion. Judge Pollock – stated he doesn't manipulate data. Wade – stated there are many other counties on Odyssey JP's they have converted before no matter that it was in the data or not. There is an OMNI fee. Judge Pollock – stated there is an OMNI fee and it depends on how that fee was used in your previous system. Not all system uses the data the same way. Jane – stated you can split a fee at 90% and 10 % but, you can't split a dollar? Josh – stated yes it can be split with a fee schedule. We have to set those; we chose to set by dollar amount and not to use percentages. Jane – asked consolidated court cost, does it split if for us? We have consolidated court cost for the county and consolidated court cost for the state. Jane – stated we manipulated the data on those. It would have been the same thing as the JP OMNI fee. Wade – asked Erik what is difference in splitting off OMNI and consolidated court fees? Erik – stated he couldn't answer that on the call he would have to look at the fee schedule and source data. Wade – asked Erik why you can split the consolidated court costs and not the OMNI? Erik – stated he has that as an action item. Wade – stated Judge Pollock they made a call into Tyler to get some assistance and was told it couldn't be done, but someone else called and said it could be done. Judge Pollock – stated it was an issue right after the conversion; he had submitted a ticket through the portal and was told by the person that worked the ticket it would be an enhancement. It had to do with the payment plans, if the date that was due, if it landed on a holiday or weekend, in NetData it would make it to the following business day. His clerk would have to go in and manually change the day. When he submitted the issue, he was told by the support person working the ticket it would require an enhancement to change that; the following week Eric Garcia was doing the training and the issue was brought up and Eric went and corrected the issue, it didn't require an enhancement. Eric Garcia did some changes throughout the week while he was here training. Chris Ricci – stated he is the person everyone needs to come to him for issues like that; he has to know what is going on. Ken – asked Judge Pollock to go back about codes being wrong, is this just relating to OMNI? Judge Pollock – stated no. Ken – stated the path we went down was all related to OMNI. Ken – asked Judge Pollock to address the other codes that are wrong. Judge Pollock – stated he doesn't have any specifics, but he was making a general statement. We have to insert it manually. He finds it difficult to understand that the clerks are having to manually change their cases and doesn't understand why it couldn't be done through coding. Ken – asked if it's the wrong code that was assigned to the case? Judge Pollock – stated he doesn't have any specifics, all he could tell is the coders, the actual programming of the codes; offense codes are an issue, name of officers, wrong charges that were converted from simple assault and it was converted over to assault with a motor vehicle. They were told there were only nine instances like this and the clerks found other instances of the same thing that were not found by Tyler. So there are more of the same type issues in the conversion that hasn't been found. This affects defendant's lives, if the charge was simple assault, and it converted to assault with a motor vehicle; they are not being able to get jobs; when they do background checks the information is wrong due to the charge on their record that was converted incorrectly. Chris – asked Judge Pollock if there was something that Odyssey couldn't do with a code; at that time did someone put in a ticket? Judge Pollock – stated yes he told someone to send in a ticket, and it was on the list. Chris – stated he is trying to establish when there is an issue please turn in a ticket; if it's a priority and there is no work around and affects the business in the JP office, send Chris an email with the ticket number, Chris can get that assigned for it to be fixed quicker. Chris – stated how to classify an issue; system down is a (1); no readily available work around is a(2) I need this taken care of. Jane – asked how long do we wait for a response on an issue? Chris – stated there should be a response within an hour. Ken – asked Judge Pollock if you are looking at something in Odyssey and it is coded incorrectly; what should have been simple assault, instead it was assault with a motor vehicle, you went back into NetData and it was simple assault. Can we determine what was extracted out of NetData by Bill Wilder, the extraction put in the wrong field imported into Odyssey. Judge Pollock – stated this is still a problem listed by the clerks. Judge Pollock – stated when he was on the conference call last Wednesday (July 13, 2016) he was told he was going to be giving access to be able to see all tickets with JP #2. Chris – stated he would take care of that for Judge Pollock, and would have it done by the end of the day (July 20, 2016). Ken – you do understand the issue he is driving here? Chris – stated yes. Erik – stated this is a code mapping issue. Ken – the question he was trying to get to the bottom of is Judge Pollock said in the beginning he was getting pushed back from Tyler this was going to be programming changes that was going to be required and Judge Pollock couldn't understand why this couldn't be unscrewed since it was screwed up in the beginning. Ken – stated it doesn't appear to be any issue with programming it was a conversion issue that wasn't totally resolved before Erik left Henderson County. Erik – stated Henderson County still has conversion issues; the issue list they have most of these are conversion issues that have to do with code mapping. Ken – stated he knew that these issues were code mapping issues, and when we converted Phase I, Tyler was here for months and when we did the conversion to the JP's you were here measured in days. It appears you abandoned the ship before all the conversion issues were taken care of. The issues list was small in the beginning, but continued to grow after a couple weeks into the go-live process. Judge Pollock – stated here is an example of something he doesn't believe is a conversion issue; we have payment plans; if a payment plan goes over 30 days there is a \$25.00 fee that is added to total. If we put someone on a payment plan it's adding the \$25.00 automatically and is not waiting to see if goes over a 30 day period, they have to manually take the \$25.00 fee out. His clerk was told there is no way to change that issue. Judge Pollock – stated it doesn't seem to him that would be a difficult task to correct. Chris – stated he would check into to that issue and take care of the problem. Erik – stated it is a configuration item. Judge Pollock – stated it is the manual things they have to do, making them work harder having to correct issues manually. This is not efficient. Wade – stated the point is we had someone on site for a year during Phase I to assist us. Wade quoted a JP "This is fine and good through Phase I when we get to Phase II they will drop us and the JP's will be hung out to dry". The I. T. committee assured the Justices that they wouldn't be hung out to dry. Wade – stated the I. T. committee would be with them throughout the process, but Tyler Technologies hasn't stayed with the JP's. Wade – stated we need someone on-site to finish what was started, for a solid year during Phase I we had someone on-site. Greg – asked when you want someone on-site to finish, when we get through these issues there are going to be more issues over time. We can't have a person dedicated to this account all the time. Wade – stated we want someone one (1) day a week for two (2) months. Ken – stated he thinks we need someone on-site two (2) days a week for 90 days and wouldn't be too much to ask for; this not anywhere close to the Phase I support. You (Tyler) have the opportunity to learn something encapsulated into single individual that can converse with the team, after we made the decision to go with Odyssey you have really done NetData

before, and the conversion we did in Phase I was Tyler product known as AbleTerm to Odyssey. NetData wasn't as common and this is what we are seeing here are coding issues with the conversion, and are not going to see issues in the first two (2) weeks of using Odyssey. Judge Pollock is making a very strong point, if his team hooks up with the wrong Tyler person their going to say, I think this is a modification, add on and this is not the case. If we have someone on-site for two (2) days a week and work with the JP Offices, because there are five (5) locations. Even if someone is here two days a week they are not going to be in Judge Pollock's office for two days a week. They will have to spend time at every JP office. Greg – stated let's say we have 17 issues and they address those issues, and someone dedicated to address those issues and they finish with the 17 issues and another issue doesn't arise for a week; Tyler can't have a person here dedicated to Henderson County. Ken – stated that being the case you would have to ask the committee to be released, if all the issues are resolved. We make a quick survey within a few hours, and when Comm. McKinney, Comm. Geeslin or the I. T. Committee gets the green light from the JP's you are free to go; we are not at that point right now. Greg – stated he wanted to take an assessment after the meeting. Judge Barnett – asked Jane about the receipts not showing up and we were \$100.00, it was a currency issue. Jane – stated they ran May report and receipt #3 and #5 didn't show up on the receipt journal because they were truancy cases, so they are not a public record. For them to know that there is a receipt and the Auditor's office can't see the truancy receipts. Jane ran a till balance report and it did show up on the till balance report. There are two numbers now one report shows the truancy receipts and the other report doesn't show truancy receipts. Which total is right? How do we know how much money to put in the bank? Chris – stated one is a receipt journal and the other one is till balance. They need to look at the definition of both reports. If it's a discrepancy with the two numbers same information, same case, he would have a financial person look at this issue. He needs all this data. Erik – stated it could be security on this issue. Chris – stated he would put this on his list and have someone look at this issue with the receipt journal and till balance. Erik – stated there is still an issue pending with the OCA reports, that needs to be finished before we run OCA reports; Eric Garcia is working with the JP office's to get this issue resolved. They are waiting for some review to be completed. Erik – stated this is near completion pending a couple of the issues on the list completed. Judge Pollock – stated his understanding you should be able to print envelopes. The clerks stated you go to forms, that brings up a list and it goes into word and click on the envelope and it doesn't bring up the field. Chris – stated that is configuration and he will take care of the issue. Wade – stated we only had on-site support for three weeks, after you convert 14 years of data out a system Tyler has never converted. Chris – stated Tyler is still here for Henderson County. Wade – asked Josh if there were any tickets submitted from the JP staff? Josh – stated yes. Judge Pollock – stated just recently one of his clerks was able to gain access to the portal. Judge Barnett – stated the clerks have to get comfortable with the new system and know something is wrong before they can send the issue through the portal. Ken – stated in defense of the JP clerks, they used to have someone they could call about issues. In Phase I the clerks had someone to call about AbleTerm issues; it was Josh, he was putting the ticket in the portal. Once the issues were fixed, they were yelling at Josh about all the tickets being open, and not anyone called Josh saying their issue was corrected. Judge Pollock – stated as outdated as NetData was the clerks could call someone and talk to someone to take care of the issues. Tyler doesn't have a clerk for the clerks to talk to about issues; they are computer people, customer support people, that don't understand the court system. Chris – stated he apologized about the portal that wasn't communicated by Tyler during the initial transition; he is here for the JP's if there is any questions on how to put in a ticket. He will walk them through the process. As far as whom we have on the other end; financial ASR is Sherry Ragland worked as a JP clerk for Bowie County. Tyler does have employees that have worked in county government that can help the clerks on a clerk's level. Chris – gave his number with his extension to the JP offices, if there are any questions; this should have been done during the initial transition and he is here for the clerks to call. Jane – asked if we could request for someone they have worked with before? Chris – stated you can do that, but he wouldn't promise you would be able to get the same person due to their work load assignments. Chris - stated Evan has a hard stop @ 3:00 he is speaking on an e-file issue. Wade – stated we have these meetings that are two and three hours long and E-filing is another big issue we need to talk about, we have been waiting on e-file for 15 months. Judge Pollock – stated offense code for fail to slow or move over for stationary vehicle this wasn't in there; case # 494954, this has been fixed but still can't download the case, they will escalate the ticket. Erik – asked if the code was in Odyssey? Judge Pollock – stated it was not in Odyssey, for that particular offense there wasn't a code. Erik – stated Diane Russ and the Sheriff's Office is maintaining the offense codes, if there is one missing you can call or email them and they can enter the code. Josh – stated they added the code today (July 20, 2016) at 9:45 A.M. for fail to slow or move over for stationary vehicle. Erik – stated the issues list there are several issues related to case statuses, stat closures that need to be corrected. Eric Garcia has been working on these issues. Most of the issues are closed; one issue is row # 4 on the list. Email to the offices on 6/28 and 7/13 requesting input, they haven't heard back from JP #1 and #2 they are waiting on JP's 3-5 before it goes to PROD. Erik – will send out an email to the other JP's to get back with Tyler. Wade – stated for Eric to copy the I. T. Committee on the email sent out to the JP's. Jane – stated we had civil cases that needed to be criminal cases, she and Erik had talked about this, and she has had a ticket on this since June 8th, 2016. There are 25 cases on the list to be corrected. One case for JP #5 and one for JP #4 and the rest is for JP #2. Jane feels JP #2 may have done something different than the other clerks for it to show up like this. It looked like the cases were already closed. Why did this come up? Here we are July 20th, 2016, this started June 8th, 2016, and the communication to her was yesterday July 19th, 2016. It took more time to send the emails; do you know what to do? Jane called Jennifer and asks her if Tyler ever sent the list of the 25 cases? Jennifer – stated no. Jane was communicating with Eric Garcia about this issue. Erik – stated this came up when we were running financials. When you would run a criminal case category, the balance wouldn't show up. It was looking for a criminal case and it was a civil case. Chris – stated with an issue like this call him. Wade – asked Chris anytime we run into an issue like this he is the one to call? Chris – stated yes call him. Erik – stated he has a break-out on the OMNI fees and consolidated court costs and why that is different, and will make sure he gets a follow-up email out to everyone when he gets the information.

4. Consider and Discuss IT Director Report

Nothing to report.

5. **Motion made by Clint Davis and seconded by Sheriff Hillhouse to adjourn the meeting @ 3:19 P.M. Voted unanimously by those present.**

Read and Approved:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Sanders", is written over a horizontal line.

County Judge, Richard Sanders

(For Filing Purposes Only)

NOTE: Any actions taken by the Henderson County I.T. Committee at this Special Meeting shall be non-binding recommendations. Any such recommendations shall subsequently, be presented to the Henderson County Commissioners' Court for the Court to consider and take action on behalf of Henderson County.