AGENDA

» Data Center Consolidation Study
» CSMART Update
» Questions
Data Center Study Drivers

» Cost avoidance at Houston Emergency Center
» Space recapture at Municipal Courts – 1400 Lubbock
» Space recapture at Main Houston Public Library
» Cost avoidance at all 6 locations for power, computing equipment protection and cooling
» Operational efficiencies – 6 locations -> 2 locations
» Business continuity for computing asset failure
» Industry standards for computing asset protection and redundancy

“Providing Innovative Service Delivery Supporting Our Customer's Customers”
Data Center Consolidation Project

» What will we be asking for?
» What investment will we be requesting?
» Why we should we do this now?
» What is the benefit to the city to invest?
» What is the timeline to consolidate?
### Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module/Sub-Module</th>
<th>Projected Code Complete</th>
<th>% Built</th>
<th>% Built Change</th>
<th>% Built Trend</th>
<th>% Accepted</th>
<th>% Accepted Change</th>
<th>% Accepted Trend</th>
<th>Updated Baseline Dev Hours</th>
<th>Total Dev Remaining</th>
<th>Total Dev Burned To Date</th>
<th>Total Dev Earned To Date</th>
<th>Dev % Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication</td>
<td>R21</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,533</td>
<td>30,825</td>
<td>6,708</td>
<td>11,103</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Check/Checkout Procedures</td>
<td>R24</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Files and Refills</td>
<td>R29</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docket Management and Judgments</td>
<td>R31</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,991</td>
<td>7,028</td>
<td>5,963</td>
<td>7,145</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretrial Functions</td>
<td>R16</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Creation and QA</td>
<td>R30</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,054</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>8,072</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Creation</td>
<td>R30</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>R16</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-69%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-69%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Management</td>
<td>R29</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,496</td>
<td>3,624</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>3,617</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning</td>
<td>R29</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>R28</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>R28</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRO and Jail Functions</td>
<td>R24</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Function</td>
<td>R24</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Subpoena and Checkin</td>
<td>R24</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Hearings</td>
<td>R24</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-32%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-32%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant Verification</td>
<td>R16</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave/Life Events</td>
<td>R30</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Functions</td>
<td>R15</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-60%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-60%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queues</td>
<td>R30</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>R35</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,254</td>
<td>19,356</td>
<td>16,898</td>
<td>12,268</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advanced Search**
- R28: 57% -23% 57% -23% 543 513 26 513 96% 3

**Compliance Tracking**
- R23: 88% 0% 88% 0% 400 308 92 308 77% 0

**eQuery**
- R16: 67% 33% 67% 33% 6,156 6,132 24 6,132 100% 0

**Foundation Development**
- R35: 10% -34% 7% -22% 5,857 2,238 3,619 2,224 38% 0

**Interfaces**
- R29: 35% -4% 28% -1% 3,259 1,980 1,273 1,192 588 0% 0

**Master Data**
- R22: 18% -2% 15% -1% 3,879 395 3,484 0 335 7% 0

**Optimization**
- R31: 14% -19% 14% -19% 1,246 206 1,040 0 206 17% 0

**Projected Work Orders**
- R35: 0% 0% 0% 0% 5,200 0 5,200 0 0 100% 0

**Subs**
- R36: 0% 0% 0% 0% 1,182 0 1,182 0 0 100% 0

**Payments Bonding and Appeals**
- R32: 42% -35% 38% -23% 12,863 9,866 2,997 8,525 941 77% 16

**3rd Party Payment Interfaces**
- R23: 21% -16% 21% -16% 356 138 218 0 138 39% 0

**Motions Petitions and Submissions**
- R27: 18% -35% 18% -35% 1,113 411 702 411 0 37% 3

**Payment Adjustments**
- R28: 56% 17% 56% 17% 2,097 1,347 750 911 436 64% 0

**Payment Finance and Accounting**
- R32: 72% -3% 68% -3% 1,089 404 685 399 65 37% 1

**Payment Processing**
- R24: 62% -18% 38% -12% 5,709 5,632 77 5,359 273 99% 6

**Grand Total**
- R35: 43% 28% 37% -18% 75,782 45,740 30,042 44,053 1,687 60% 145 0

**Results shown reflect R21 accepted, and R22 development completed. Not yet accepted, R23 development scheduled to be completed January 11.**

---

“Providing Innovative Service Delivery Supporting Our Customer's Customers”
## Dashboard?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Metric Description</th>
<th>After R21 Development Complete</th>
<th>After R22 Development Complete</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Built</td>
<td>Based on a count of the number of items marked “built” after a release</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>The number of items in the denominator of the calculation has significantly increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Approved</td>
<td>Based on a count of the number of items marked “approved” after a release</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>The number of items in the denominator of the calculation has significantly increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev % Complete</td>
<td>Based on number of dev effort hours earned over the total baseline number of dev effort hours</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>The number of hours to be built has slightly increased for newly added items and per updated estimates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What makes this the right solution for the city?
What are users saying about the solution that they have seen thus far?
What have we done to confirm that we are heading down the correct path?
Why is our confidence level so high about this solution?
“CSMART has effectively captured the work flow processes of the courtroom and streamlined it into a system which efficiently assists the Judge in the execution of his/her duties. My favorite design features of the judicial functions in CSMART are: (1) that it highlights only the selections that apply to the particular offense which are consistent with the law; and (2) the drop down menu facilitates the processing of the action to be taken and the judgment that is entered. Plainly stated, the options available to the Judge are tailored to the offense. This design will reduce the amount of errors that Judges may commit due to clicking on the wrong box or typing in the wrong acronym and will ultimately decrease the overall waiting time for the citizen in the courtroom. I am extremely confident that CSMART will lead us into the next generation of court system management.”

Judge Maria Casanova, Associate Presiding Judge
(Judge Casanova has served as a Judge in the Municipal Courts for 20 years)
“As a SuperUser for CSMART, my job has been to test the system as it is being built in every level of development. Being on the bench for over 25 years I have been through the majority of our systems, from total paper processing, to RUMBA, and CourtView, each of which was designed to decrease the work load, allow easier processing of tickets and complaints, and citizens wait time in court. Those two systems proved to be very inadequate for a City the size of Houston. They were slow, cumbersome for the user to operate and took too many steps for the Judge to process a case. CSMART will be a dramatic improvement. Not only will it diminish the amount of time a Judge spends processing a case, but it will enable us move freely from one function to another without having to open up another session. CSMART is being designed with our volume in mind and I am looking forward to its completion and go live date.”

Judge Elaine Marshall, Administrative Judge
(Judge Marshall has served as a Judge in the Municipal Courts for 25 years)
“The CSMART Appellate Section provides a better in camera view of all documents filed and their dated points of entry in the system. In addition to compartmentalizing each of the different divisions that handle the process, it also decreases the amount of time for more rapid completion of the appellate steps. More than adequate prompts are also provided for judicial selections in each category.”

Judge Larry Rousseau, Municipal Court 15
(Judge Rousseau is a newly appointed Judge at the Municipal Courts. Prior to his appointment, he was a seasoned defense attorney who practiced primarily in the Municipal Courts)
CSMART Update

» What has been appropriated to date?
» What has been spent to date?
» What we will be asking for with respect to funding?
» When will we ask for it?
» What we are offering?
QUESTIONS?