



DU PAGE COUNTY

421 N. COUNTY FARM ROAD
WHEATON, IL 60187
www.dupagecounty.gov

Police Records Management System Oversight Final Regular Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, September 11, 2024

2:00 PM

Room 3500B

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS
4. PUBLIC COMMENT
5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[24-2444](#)

Police Records Management System Oversight Committee - Special Call Meeting -
Wednesday, April 3, 2024

6. ACTION ITEMS

[24-2409](#)

Approval of FY2025 Budget

[24-2410](#)

Authorization for periodic transfer of funds from the Equipment Replacement Fund to the PRMS Operations Fund for payment of the previously approved DeltaWRX, LLC contract (PRMS-P-0001-24), to coincide with the completion of project phases as outlined in "Table 1. Professional Fees" of the contract.

10. OLD BUSINESS
11. NEW BUSINESS
12. ADJOURNMENT



Minutes

421 N. COUNTY FARM
ROAD
WHEATON, IL 60187
www.dupagecounty.gov

File #: 24-2444

Agenda Date: 9/11/2024

Agenda #: 5.A



DU PAGE COUNTY

421 N. COUNTY FARM ROAD
WHEATON, IL 60187
www.dupagecounty.gov

Police Records Management System Oversight Final Summary

Wednesday, April 3, 2024

2:00 PM

503 N. County Farm Road, Room
3-C-030, Wheaton, IL 60187

Special Call

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2:00 PM meeting was called to order by Chair Berlin at 2:00 PM.

2. **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT	Berlin, Conroy, Franz, Martynowicz, McPhearson, Mendrick, Sennett, and Zerwin
ABSENT	Ritz
REMOTE	Scalera

3. **CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS**

Chair Berlin welcomed everyone and offered a brief history of the DuJIS system. He emphasized the importance of working as a consortium. He then discussed the contract restatement approved in June 2022 that goes through June 2027 and the intergovernmental agreement, which expires April 30, 2024, but automatically renews for another year for those agencies who did not give notice by November of the previous year. He said Addison is the only agency to have given notice, which occurred in October 2021. Chair Berlin said he hopes to gain a consensus about how this group would like to move forward. In terms of the IGA, he said it is our hope that we can come to an agreement to get an IGA in place through June of 2027, when the contract expires.

4. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

5. **DISCUSSION**

Member McPhearson stated that one of the reasons we invited mayors, managers, and police chiefs was to get their input on the IGA consortium.

Chief Schar said he has more knowledge due to being on the executive committee, and he feels it is important for the consortium to stay together. He said, to date, there have been no significant issues with the system and any that have arisen have been addressed.

Chief Fleury said he has been through an RMS rollout before, which took about six years to work through issues, and there were still issues. He said he agrees that the consortium should stay together. He said while Axon does offer a lot of bells and whistles, we should wait to see if they deliver on the promises that were made. He said no system is without its issues.

Chair Berlin said it is prudent to look at all available systems to compare them and see what they offer. He said it takes time to move to a new system and get it up and running with all of the

integrations, particularly with 37-plus agencies. He said he does not see any system being up and running before 2027.

Chief Varva said he wants to make sure every agency understands what our goals are, such as remaining as a consortium. He said moving into silos would be a step in the wrong direction. He said there is no perfect system. He said Axon does not currently serve DuPage County's needs, though it may in another two to three years. He said he is unclear as to what the issues are with the Hexagon system because no major issues have been brought forward. He said the Hexagon system does what it is supposed to do.

Chief Pederson (FPDDC) noted that if other agencies choose to leave, it affects the user cost and cost to taxpayers. He said the County IT department has purchased a lot of hardware for this system as well.

Chief Youker asked any agencies who have been looking at Axon or other RMS systems what the driving force is behind it. He said the committee can address those issues and we can proceed as a consortium. Member Maranowicz said he respects everyone's opinion and work in this group. He said Addison gave notice of separation in October 2021 due to frustrations with the system. He said there is a cost factor and there will be integration issues. He said as village manager, he must look at the cost and what we are paying for. He said he spoke to agencies around the country and they loved Axon. He said we currently do not have a body camera integration, which is offered through Axon. He said it is about \$60,000 less per year plus integration costs. Member McPhearson commented that his team has worked around the clock to work through issues and better support all of the agencies across the board. He said there has been a huge difference in support and the application between 2021 and 2024. He said no matter how cost-effective Axon is, you will always get a better deal as a consortium. Member Maranowicz said he agrees. He said Axon may or may not be the best option, but the consortium can learn from Addison's experience. Julia Taglia with Addison said Lafayette, Indiana has been using Axon for over three years and it was functional and NIBRS compliant for two years. She said Axon has delivered on all of the promises they have made so far. Member Maranowicz agreed and said Axon's reputation was very appealing. Don Ehrenhaft said if the consortium stays together, they can learn from Addison's experience and perspective after some time on the new system.

Member Franz asked for a timeline for the OCR10 upgrade. Member McPhearson said we have started the implementation activities and are currently working on setting up the test environment so we can get agencies set up for testing. He said we want to give agencies currently on MFR/OCR an opportunity to test it so we can avoid patches later. He said we want to go slowly to make sure everything is working correctly. He said we are looking at a summer 2025 go-live, though they are looking at ways to shorten that time frame. Mr. Ehrenhaft provided examples of what work has been done so far. Chief Vavra said the delay was due to the chiefs and County IT team asking to slow down the process to make sure everything is done correctly.

Chief Johnson said the experience in Hanover Park has not been great overall with this system. He said the feedback he receives is that the system is not user-friendly. He said one particular point of frustration is that this system was supposed to reduce redundancies, but that never

happened. He said if they were able to see what the new upgrade is able to offer, that information would have been helpful, but at this point they are looking at Axon and other alternatives available. He said no decisions have been made. Member McPhearson asked that Chief Johnson share in writing specific issues they have encountered. He said he believes the new upgrade should offer resolutions for many issues agencies have encountered.

Member Franz suggested the County team set up a demo of the new release with Hexagon so agencies can compare to other alternatives. Member McPhearson said the team has demonstrations set up with both Hexagon and Axon. He said we are pushing for the consortium to stay together, and the entire group should look at different solutions available and make a decision together.

Chief Pappas said he understands everything Member McPhearson and Chief Vavra have done, but they have always had to push Hexagon to get things done, adding that it is a sub-par product.

Chief Dzugan said the current IGA includes an auto-increase that takes the agencies through April 2025 and a new IGA would go through 2027. He said what happens if other agencies move on and others stay in the consortium as far as cost. Chair Berlin said there would be some cost adjustments made if agencies left. He said there is money in the equipment replacement fund, which could be used to offset those costs. He said the restatement involved hardware costs, which have been paid for, and it is unclear what the financial obligations would be for those who stay or for those who leave. He said any agencies leaving would create a lot of problems, including having agencies on different systems and a lack in communication. Chief Dzugan asked if there would be information or evidence that the consortium looked at another product and determined the best way to proceed. Chair Berlin said we can start that process at any time. Member Maranowicz said if Addison can go live over the summer, the consortium can use them as a test case as to whether or not the system works well. Chair Berlin said we can see demos from multiple vendors of different systems and make an informed decision as a group. He reinforced that there is tremendous value in working as a consortium.

Member Fieldman agreed that there is value in working as a consortium. He said we have a seven-month period for agencies to decide to opt out, during which time it is important how we proceed. He said it is imperative that this group approach Hexagon with agencies' concerns and explore our options for termination of that contract prior to its expiration date or reducing the contract costs. He said while we appreciate the efforts to make sure the upgrade works, it is interesting that it launches after the termination of the current IGA. He said he would be nice to see how the upgrade works in the field before agencies have to make a decision whether to stay or leave. Member Fieldman said the per user cost in the next IGA should have a limit, and if the shared costs go over that, Hexagon should cut us a break or any of the agencies participating should step up and pay for it. He said without those protections, there is no reason for agencies not to leave.

Member Franz said if there are agencies seriously contemplating moving away from the consortium, we should ask them to provide a list of issues and give this team a chance to address and resolve them before they leave. Member Blumenthal said the new IGA includes language that offers us a chance to review the issues. Member Franz asked if this committee should ask IT

staff to put together a revised schedule for implementing the OCR upgrade. Mr. Ehrenhaft said he is comfortable doing that. He said an alternate approach would be to have end-users try it in the test environment. Member Fieldman asked how quickly the test environment could be launched. Mr. Ehrenhaft and Member McPhearson said it could be built within the month. Member McPhearson said the team is looking at starting a formal RFP soon to do our due diligence and see what else is available, noting that the process takes time, and we should have some answers by the spring of next year.

Member Scalera said the Village of Bloomingdale is committed to the consortium. He said although they have had some issues, they have not encountered significant issues, but they would be interested in exploring any alternatives to the system and whether they might be beneficial to the group.

Member Franz said he has heard some concerns about interfaces, and there are some interfaces that make sense for the entire consortium but others that do not, so those types of issues should be brought to this committee so they can be looked into. Member Sennett said it is important to remain in the consortium because the agencies are able to help the public by viewing data from other agencies.

Chief McLean said for Elmhurst, this is more a question of sticking with the consortium or not, which he feels is important to do. He said exploring other systems are better done together.

Chief Vavra said he has talked with a lot of agencies over the past few months who have expressed frustrations with misconceptions about County IT dictating how things are done. He said County IT always looks to agencies for direction and ask us what we want to do, which is very effective in getting things done. He said at the beginning of this project, that communication did not exist, but with Member McPhearson and Mr. Ehrenhaft, communication has greatly improved.

Chair Berlin said, in terms of direction, everyone would like a demo of OCR10 sooner than later, to start looking at other options available, and to bring Hexagon to the table to clear up any uncertainty. Member Blumenthal asked if it would be beneficial to draft a new IGA with these comments that clarifies everything to offer more certainty, and re-ratify it with the new end date of June 2027. Deputy Chief Vavra expressed his concern that we are relying on the current IGA to roll over to next year, so what would happen between now and November, as timing is an issue. Member Blumenthal said we could supersede what is currently in place. Chair Berlin asked if there is anyone who objects to that process or if we have a consensus to move forward. With no responses, Chair Berlin said there is a consensus to proceed.

- 5.A. [24-1106](#)
PRMS Consortium
- 5.B. [24-1107](#)
IGA Open Discussion
- 5.C. [24-1076](#)
New Funding Model Execution
- 5.D. [24-1077](#)
PRMS Teams Channel

Mr. Ehrenhaft said everyone on this call and their executive counterparts should have received an invitation to a Teams channel, which will serve as a repository for everyone to share.

6. OLD BUSINESS

No old business was discussed.

7. NEW BUSINESS

No new business was discussed.

8. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



Action Item

421 N. COUNTY FARM
ROAD
WHEATON, IL 60187
www.dupagecounty.gov

File #: 24-2409

Agenda Date: 9/11/2024

Agenda #:

PRMS Operations and System Costs Projections - FY 2025-FY 2027

Fund:	Description:	FY24 Budget	FY25 Budget	FY24-FY25 (+/-) \$	FY24-FY25 (+/-) %	FY26 Projection*	FY27 Projection*
ETSB-PRMS Ops (4000-5830)	Maintenance	642,364.00	645,815.21	3,451.21	0.54%	655,502.44	0.00
ETSB-PRMS Ops (4000-5830)	Order 6: Resident System Administrator Services	149,806.50	157,297.00	7,490.50	5.00%	165,162.00	0.00
ETSB-PRMS Ops (4000-5830)	Zendesk Licensing (6.5 agents)	7,139.80	7,139.80	0.00	0.00%	7,139.80	7,139.80
ETSB-PRMS Ops (4000-5830)	Additional Maintenance for MR and NV (100)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00
	Sub Total	799,310.30	810,252.01	10,941.71	1.37%	827,804.24	7,139.80
	Cost Per User	473.53	480.01	6.48	1.37%	490.41	4.23
ETSB-PRMS Ops (1000-1115)	Salary Expense	470,753.40	494,404.00	23,650.60	5.02%	509,236.12	524,513.20
ETSB-PRMS Ops (1000-1115)	Benefits	155,059.19	176,630.00	21,570.81	13.91%	181,928.90	187,386.77
ETSB-PRMS Ops (1000-1115)	DuJIS-PRMS Other Dept Costs	18,908.00	19,095.74	187.74	0.99%	19,668.61	20,258.67
	Sub Total	644,720.59	690,129.74	45,409.15	7.04%	724,636.23	732,158.64
	Cost Per User	381.94	408.84	26.90	7.04%	429.29	433.74
ETSB-Equip Repl (4000-5840)	Equipment Replacement	410,000.00	420,250.00	10,250.00	2.50%	430,756.25	441,525.16
	Total	1,054,720.59	1,110,379.74	55,659.15	5.28%	1,155,821.76	1,174,117.54
	Cost Per User	624.83	657.81			684.73	695.57
	TOTALS	1,847,246.03	1,920,631.75	73,385.72	3.97%	1,983,626.00	1,181,257.34
	Cost Per User	1,094.34	1,137.82	43.47	3.97%	1,175.13	699.80

*Assumes a fixed multiplier of 3% annually for personnel and other departmental costs.

PRMS Personnel and Administrative Costs

Owner	Account Codes	Description	FY 24	FY 25	FY 26 Projection*	FY 27 Projection*2
RMS	50000: REG SALARIES	REGULAR SALARIES - Head Count: 5	\$ 470,753.40	494,404.00	509,236.12	524,513.20
RMS	51000: Benefit Payments	Benefits	155,059.19	176,630.00	181,928.90	187,386.77
RMS	52100: DP EQUIP-SM VALUE	Computer Hardware - Staff	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,060.00	2,121.80
RMS	53020: IT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	Consultants	0.00	-	-	-
RMS	53806: Software Licenses	Software Licenses	300.00	300.00	309.00	318.27
RMS	53500: MILEAGE EXP	Mileage Expenses	250.00	250.00	250.00	250.00
RMS	53510: TRAVEL EXP	Travel Expenses for Vendor Conference	6,258.00	6,445.74	6,639.11	6,838.29
RMS	53600: DUES & MSHIP	Dues and Memberships	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
RMS	53610: INSTRUCTION & SCHOOLING	Staff Development	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00
Total			644,720.59	690,129.74	710,523.13	731,528.33

*Assumes a fixed multiplier of 3% annually for personnel and other departmental costs.

PRMS Equipment Replacement Fund FY25

Approximate Fund Balance:	\$ 1,384,785.00
Target Fund Balance:	\$3,000,000
Final Balance:	\$ 3,076,269.90
Difference from Target Balance:	\$ 76,269.90

Fiscal Year	ERF Balance	Refresh/RFP	Credits	ERF contribution	+/-	Totals
FY19	\$ -			\$ 600,000.00	\$ -	\$ 600,000.00
FY20	\$ 600,000.00			\$ 400,000.00	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000.00
FY21	\$ 1,000,000.00			\$ 400,000.00	\$ -	\$ 1,400,000.00
FY22	\$ 1,400,000.00	\$ (815,214.80)		\$ 400,000.00	\$ (815,214.80)	\$ 984,785.20
FY23	\$ 984,785.20			\$ 400,000.00	\$ -	\$ 1,384,785.20
FY24	\$ 1,384,785.20			\$ 410,000.00	\$ -	\$ 1,794,785.20
FY25	\$ 1,794,785.20	\$ (192,269.36)	\$ 181,222.65	\$ 420,250.00	\$ (11,046.71)	\$ 2,203,988.49
FY26	\$ 2,203,988.49			\$ 430,756.25	\$ -	\$ 2,634,744.74
FY27	\$ 2,634,744.74			\$ 441,525.16	\$ -	\$ 3,076,269.90

PRMS Agency Cost Projections - FY 2025 - FY 2027

Total User Count: 1688

Agency ID	Agency Name	Users (1/01/24)	PRMS Ops (4000-5830)	PRMS Reserve (4000-5840)	FY25 Total Agency Cost:	FY26 Total Agency Cost:	*FY27 Total Agency Cost:
		Cost per user:	\$473.53	\$624.83	\$1,137.82	\$1,175.13	\$699.80
30	ADDISON PD	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
50	BENSENVILLE PD	41	\$19,414.53	\$25,618.21	\$46,650.42	\$48,180.49	\$28,691.68
60	BLOOMINGDALE PD	60	\$28,411.50	\$37,490.07	\$68,268.90	\$70,508.03	\$41,987.82
70	BURR RIDGE PD	33	\$15,626.33	\$20,619.54	\$37,547.90	\$38,779.42	\$23,093.30
80	CLARENDON HILLS PD	17	\$8,049.93	\$10,622.19	\$19,342.86	\$19,977.28	\$11,896.55
90	CAROL STREAM PD	83	\$39,302.58	\$51,861.26	\$94,438.65	\$97,536.11	\$58,083.15
100	DARIEN PD	50	\$23,676.25	\$31,241.72	\$56,890.75	\$58,756.69	\$34,989.85
110	DOWNERS GROVE PD	82	\$38,829.05	\$51,236.43	\$93,300.83	\$96,360.98	\$57,383.35
120	ELMHURST PD	96	\$45,458.41	\$59,984.11	\$109,230.24	\$112,812.85	\$67,180.51
130	DPC FOREST PRES PD	25	\$11,838.13	\$15,620.86	\$28,445.38	\$29,378.35	\$17,494.93
140	GLEN ELLYN PD	57	\$26,990.93	\$35,615.56	\$64,855.46	\$66,982.63	\$39,888.43
150	GLENDALE HEIGHTS PD	75	\$35,514.38	\$46,862.59	\$85,336.13	\$88,135.04	\$52,484.78
160	HINSDALE PD	30	\$14,205.75	\$18,745.03	\$34,134.45	\$35,254.02	\$20,993.91
170	HANOVER PARK PD	93	\$44,037.83	\$58,109.61	\$105,816.80	\$109,287.45	\$65,081.12
180	ITASCA PD	26	\$12,311.65	\$16,245.70	\$29,583.19	\$30,553.48	\$18,194.72
190	LISLE PD	44	\$20,835.10	\$27,492.72	\$50,063.86	\$51,705.89	\$30,791.07
200	LOMBARD PD	87	\$41,196.68	\$54,360.60	\$98,989.91	\$102,236.65	\$60,882.34
210	OAK BROOK PD	58	\$27,464.45	\$36,240.40	\$65,993.27	\$68,157.77	\$40,588.23
220	OAK BROOK TERRACE PD	23	\$10,891.08	\$14,371.19	\$26,169.75	\$27,028.08	\$16,095.33
230	ROSELLE PD	45	\$21,308.63	\$28,117.55	\$51,201.68	\$52,881.02	\$31,490.87
240	VILLA PARK PD	57	\$26,990.93	\$35,615.56	\$64,855.46	\$66,982.63	\$39,888.43
250	WEST CHICAGO PD	52	\$24,623.30	\$32,491.39	\$59,166.38	\$61,106.96	\$36,389.44
260	WOOD DALE PD	47	\$22,255.68	\$29,367.22	\$53,477.31	\$55,231.29	\$32,890.46
270	WINFIELD PD	20	\$9,470.50	\$12,496.69	\$22,756.30	\$23,502.68	\$13,995.94
280	WHEATON PD	97	\$45,931.93	\$60,608.94	\$110,368.06	\$113,987.99	\$67,880.31
290	WILLOWBROOK PD	28	\$13,258.70	\$17,495.37	\$31,858.82	\$32,903.75	\$19,594.32
300	WOODRIDGE PD	59	\$27,937.98	\$36,865.23	\$67,131.09	\$69,332.90	\$41,288.02
310	WARRENVILLE PD	37	\$17,520.43	\$23,118.88	\$42,099.16	\$43,479.95	\$25,892.49
320	WESTMONT PD	53	\$25,096.83	\$33,116.23	\$60,304.20	\$62,282.10	\$37,089.24
330	MERIT	6	\$2,841.15	\$3,749.01	\$6,826.89	\$7,050.80	\$4,198.78
340	DUPAGE COUNTY SHERIFF	193	\$91,390.34	\$120,593.05	\$219,598.30	\$226,800.84	\$135,060.82
350	DUPAGE COUNTY STATE'S ATTY	14	\$6,629.35	\$8,747.68	\$15,929.41	\$16,451.87	\$9,797.16
		TOTALS	\$799,310.30	\$1,054,720.59	\$1,920,631.75	\$1,983,626.00	\$1,181,257.34

*Cost reduction after several contract obligations end in 2026



Action Item

421 N. COUNTY FARM
ROAD
WHEATON, IL 60187
www.dupagecounty.gov

File #: 24-2410

Agenda Date: 9/11/2024

Agenda #:
