

WRIGHT COUNTY TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE MINUTES

01/10/2018

THESE MINUTES ARE IN DRAFT FORMAT AND REQUIRE APPROVAL BY THE COUNTY BOARD

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioner Mark Daleiden, Commissioner Darek Vetsch, Adam Tagarro, Lee Kelly, Christine Partlow, Todd Hoffman, Tanya West, Bob Hiivala, Virgil Hawkins

OTHERS PRESENT: Olga Strobel, Cheri Nelson, ConnieMae Cooper, Britta Holland, Scott Weiland, Brian Asleson, Sue Vergin, Lindsey Meyer, Jen Rasset

1. Office 365 Status

Presented by Adam Tagarro

The Office 365 rollout is on track. The IT Department as a whole has migrated IT staff email to O365. As planned other departments are being tested for rollout as well. Current testing issues have been Planning & Zoning's CityView not working well with O365. Court Services has had various issues as well. The IT Department is actively working on solutions. The O365 Governance committee has met with a specific topic being license usage of G1 or G3 for staff. Hiivala brought up the Board's recent move on opioid litigation, if it would impact O365 at all. Nelsons stated that it is still being looked into but that overall it will not be a large factor. Technical Liaisons within each department have been very helpful in continuing to ensure the progress of O365, as they are the frontline for their departments testing how the rollout may affect the rest of their teams. O365 continues to be a major project for the IT department and rollout is on schedule.

Action: Informational update only

2. ERP Follow-up

Presented by Adam Tagarro

With direction from the committee & board, Kelly has scheduled a four day Informational Planning Workshop with InfoTech. This workshop will come with minimal additional cost to the county, as it is included in IT's 2018 InfoTech Membership. Commissioner Vetsch and Daleiden equally expressed concern for what the end goal of the Workshop would be, noting they think it is valuable but want to ensure it is worthwhile. Tagarro stated that InfoTech has very specific goals to provide a quality deliverable of a roadmap of what we need to do to move forward with an ERP. They will evaluate, utilizing on premise discovery combined with current research done by staff, what we have, what we need, and what we want. Tagarro stated that InfoTech may not be the vendor of choice to manage the ERP project, but this process will provide the

starting point needed. In discussion on the costs of the actual project management, Hoffman stated that the cost of planning the rollout of Zuercher was about \$60,000 and the implementation was between \$15,000 and \$20,000. That the prices given by InfoTech were similar to this in reference to the overall project management costs for an ERP. The workshop itself will be Feb. 5th thru the 8th with the goal of a small group of key players working on the deliverables. More communication will come on the meeting in future weeks.

Action: Kelly, Hiivala, and Tagarro will continue to plan the InfoTech Meeting for the week of February 5th

3. Project Portfolio

Presented by Britta Holland

Tagarro introduced the committee to the Project Portfolio Manager, Britta Holland. Holland presented the committee an overview of the current IT Project Portfolio. The 2018 goal of the IT Department concerning Project Management is to align IT Department goals and work with County goals and work. Another key goal is to ensure that the skillsets of the IT team are accurately matched to the project being worked on, that the right person is working on the right project at the right time. Long term goals are to develop capacity planning capabilities to provide stakeholders with accurate estimates. Commissioner Daleiden stated that having a true grasp on capacity will allow the County to know if outside resources are needed to complete a certain project, or if it can be handled with available staff in house. Hoffman noted that in relation to case load management the Sheriff's department has found that completing a certain amount of smaller ones helps to devote time to larger cases. Standardization of the project process is also a goal that will allow IT to provide an accurate status of the project, is it on hold, has it morphed into something else, to really provide a true reflection of where it is at. Hoffman questioned if part of this would be a timeframe, for example 30 days, for a new proposal to be reviewed. Tagarro stated that each request is different so there is not a set time limit for the project process. Holland proposed the Technology Committee conduct a Project Prioritization exercise with a small amount (up to 7) of Enterprise projects. Enterprise projects being those that affect many departments. A future goal being to bring different departmental projects to the committee to decide which has priority over another in relation to the impact on the county as a whole. Nelson noted this will give the IT Department a plan for usage of "project time". Holland added that often there is hand-off time with a project, where one staff member has completed their step and further action is held until another staff member completes a step. There is always a project to work on in-between, but the exercise will provide a clear vision for which should be the next priority for that staff member. The Technology committee is being asked to aid in providing that clear vision to staff of what priority the next project should be. For the 24th exercise the IT team will score a small set of top Enterprise projects and present them to the committee to review. Tagarro stressed that the score is a starting point, that it is not an end all be all for prioritization by staff, that the discussion and guidance of the committee will provide the map staff are looking for.

Action: Conduct Project Prioritization Exercise at Jan. 24th Technology Committee meeting.

4. Zuercher

Presented by Deputy Todd Hoffman

A status update of the notification by Zuercher that three local PD departments will need to be added to the County network. Hoffman stated that an initial meeting was held with stakeholders, but not all of the questions raised were answered. Nelson stated that from her discussions with Zuercher that their view is of the process being simplistic in nature, when in reality it likely will not be. Many technical questions have not yet been answered. The committee discussion revolved around the financial impact to the county that this addition will have. That if there needs to be a memo of understanding of financial obligation created it should be done. Tagarro questioned how other communities are handling the process financially and technically. He again noted that this is a good partnership to create with our communities but he is also cautious in assigning resources to a project that we didn't start. Commissioner Vetsch stressed that the information be discovered and provided sooner than later to provide stakeholders time to plan. Commissioner Daleiden asked about Zuercher's perceived timeline in reference to how the project would affect other projects. Nelson stated that her interpretation was that Zuercher was on a fast track to implement this change. In response to the general discussion Strobel indicated that it would be prudent to call this project a project, assign a BA, and start the discovery process to answer needed questions. She also noted, which agreed with previous positive responses, that this initiative really was part of the Law Legal initiative taking place with the sharing of data. But that it does need project management. Hoffman stated he will submit the project request form.

Action: Hoffman will submit a project request form, to which IT will assign a BA and begin the process of managing the project. Include the Zuercher update in the next Technology meeting, Jan. 24th.

5. Additional topics for next meeting

- OnBase Standardization
- Zuercher update
- Project Prioritization Exercise

Action: Informational