Fiscal Advisory Board Members

Tom Pynaker, Chair*	P
Howard Mezera, Vice-Chair*	P
Calumet County	
Peter Stier	P
Mark Ott	P
Outagamie County	
Brad Gehring	P
Katrin Patience	P
Winnebago County	
Patty Francour	P
John Matz	P
Kenn Olson	P

FoxComm Staff Members	
Tony Lodel	E
Recording Secretary	
Melissa Buman	P
Guests	
See Sign In Sheet	

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 1:32 p.m.

2. Roll Call – Determine if a quorum of members is present: Quorum was met.

3. Consent Agenda Items: Mezera/ Stier made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Motion carried. The Consent Agenda included the following items:
    a. Approval of the Agenda

    b. Approval of the Minutes of the November 4, 2014 FAB Meeting.

2. Action Items:

    a. Review and take action on any items that have been removed from the Consent Agenda: N/A

3. Discussion Items:

    a. Partnership: Pynaker stated that the Executive Committee would need to meet within the next week to discuss the Brown County partnership. A meeting was scheduled for 1:30 p.m. on December 9 in Meeting Room #3 at Outagamie County.

    b. Presentation to Board by User Technical Committee: Mertins provided a presentation regarding the FoxComm Premier One project and explained the timeline and issues. After the presentation, Pynaker asked for comments. Matz questioned the server replacement and wondered whether FoxComm could obtain compensation for the three years that the servers were unable to be used.   Jobe brought up the issues with GIS and added that the whole foundation of the product was built on GIS, and that Motorola should be recognizing the ESRI issue and helping the counties get to the next level.   Behling added that the end of life for GIS would be 12/31/2015. The three counties were currently at version 10.10.2, and Motorola ran on 10.0, so an older version must be maintained, causing

additional work for staff. Francour questioned whether the ESRI software would be able to keep current on an IOS, and Behling replied that it had been fairly consistent with Microsoft's operating systems.   Reece stated that from an end user standpoint, he felt that communication needed to be improved overall.   Reece also provided examples of current user issues, including training, connectivity, and issues with upgrades.   He felt that improvements needed to be made in communications at all levels to help improve the product. He added that there were some helpful features in the P1 product. Flater voiced his concern regarding the upgrades and Motorola's stance that the system could be upgraded without interference to the users, but with each upgrade, there was always some type of issue or problem, such as crashing or slowness. He also added that the alerts were not working as they should be. This item was on the problem list, but to his knowledge, there had been no resolution yet.   Mertins added that during the upgrades, the system stayed live, but some of the services were lost. Query service was not available for several hours. Hietpas stated that staff members from the three counties were doing a lot of work, but Motorola staff members were not putting in much effort. Pynaker questioned whether there had been any increase in Motorola's attention to FoxComm. Mertins replied that Motorola had done quite a bit of work recently regarding the upgrades. He added, however, that there were some major issues such as queries coming back with the wrong date and information writing to the wrong incident, and these types of issues were unacceptable.   Reece brought up a communication example regarding an issue with Hiplink. He stated that Motorola had guaranteed a response in two weeks, and it was currently a month and a half later and still no response.   Jobe stated that at every conference call, issues were discussed and tickets were opened, and the answer at the next conference call was that Motorola was still working on them. Matz stated that at the last meeting, it had been discussed whether to remain on the product in the future. Some of the questions were whether FoxComm could stay on the platform while determining a new vendor, the costs, whether the current platform was stable enough to stay on it for a period of time, how long the RFP process would be, could any of the hardware that was already purchased be used in the future, should FoxComm try to recoup costs due to the issues, and whether it would even be possible to do so. Pynaker stated that Brown County had just gone through the RFP process, and the group discussed that this information might be public record. Olson questioned what the ramifications would be to switching vendors.   He stated that there had been very little positive feedback regarding Motorola. Pynaker added that the counties had not budgeted for a new system in 2015. Potter stated that Motorola's software was very configurable to customize to each county's needs, and she didn't know whether another product like this would be available. Hollmann stated that nothing had changed recently with Motorola. Dates had not been provided by Motorola and nothing had been shared with the Communications Workgroup. Matz stated that a list of all of the items that needed to be fixed should be created.   Potter replied that Motorola did have a spreadsheet of all of the open tickets and their status. She added

that the IT people might not understand all of the issues, but the Communications Center managers would. Mertins stated that the list was reviewed every week at the conference call, and the list could be shared with the Executive Committee. Hollmann stated that she wanted to be sure every telecommunicator had a say in what the issues were and what issues had been fixed with the upgrade. She suggested prioritizing what was felt to be the biggest issues and mark them as show stoppers that needed to be fixed immediately in order for trust to be built back up for Motorola. She also added that the majority of the telecommunicators still had faith in the product, and it did a lot of things that weren't possible before, such as AVL dispatching and auto-aid. Olson questioned what could be done to improve the communication. Pynaker stated that the Executive Committee would discuss FoxComm communication at the next meeting. Matz/Patience made a motion that we create a list of the top issues to be fixed, which Lodel will discuss with Motorola, and the Executive Committee will discuss further at the next meeting. Tom thanked the group for their comments.

4. <u>Reports</u>:

   a. <u>User Technical Committee Report (UTC Chair)</u>: Lodel was not present.

   b. <u>Management Information Coordinator's Report (Lodel)</u>: Lodel was not present.

   c. <u>FoxComm EOM Budget Status Report (Lodel)</u>: Lodel was not present.

5. <u>Determine the date/time/location of the next Fiscal Advisory Board Meeting</u>: January 6 at 1:30 p.m. at the Outagamie County Board Room.

6. <u>Adjourn</u>: Mezera/Stier made a motion to adjourn the meeting. <u>Motion carried</u>. The meeting adjourned at 2:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melissa Buman
Records Management/Administrative Services Supervisor
Outagamie County MIS Department