

DEPARTMENT: Data Processing BY: Richard Campbell PHONE: 742-6022

RECOMMENDED ACTION AND JUSTIFICATION: (Policy Item: Yes: ___ No: ___)
Send the attached letter to MHI Governments Systems informing them that the County intends to terminate it's relationship with said company due to the non-performance of its Court software package and further, that the County will review it's legal recourse relative to recoupment of the monies paid.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BOARD ACTIONS:

In 1989 the County purchased a Court software package from Mayoras & Hittle based on the recommendation of IBM. The package has never worked as advertised and it is felt that it never will.

LIST ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Continue relationship with MHI Governmental Systems and continue to pay support fees for a program that does not function as advertised.

COSTS: () Not Applicable
A. Budgeted current FY \$ _____
B. Total anticipated costs \$ _____
C. Required Add'l funding \$ _____
D. Source: _____

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:
List the attachments and number the pages consecutively:
Letter to MHI Governmental Sys.
M&H Chronology

SOURCE: () 4/5ths Vote Required
A. Internal transfers \$ _____
B. Unanticipated revenues \$ _____
C. Reserve for contingency \$ _____
D. Description: _____
Balance in Reserve for Contingencies, if approved: \$ _____

CLERK'S USE ONLY:
Res. No.: 92-118
Ord. No.: _____
Vote - Ayes: 4 Noes: _____
Absent: Radanovich Abstained: _____
knw Approved () Denied
() Minute Order Attached

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION:
This item on agenda as:
 Recommended
 Not Recommended
 For Policy Determination
 Submitted with Comment
 Returned for Further Action

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in this office.

Date: _____
ATTEST: MARGIE WILLIAMS
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
County of Mariposa, State of CA
By: _____
Deputy

Comment: _____
A.O. Initials: [Signature]

mailed 3/6/92

Mariposa County Board of Supervisors



JOHN W. McCAMMAN
Administrative Officer

MARGIE WILLIAMS
Clerk of the Board

P.O. Box 784
MARIPOSA, CALIFORNIA 95338
(209) 966-3222

- DISTRICT 1 ARTHUR G. BAGGETT, JR.
- DISTRICT 2 SALLY S. PUNTE
- DISTRICT 3 ERIC J. ERICKSON
- DISTRICT 4 GEORGE P. RADANOVICH
- DISTRICT 5 GERTRUDE R. TABER

MHI Governmental Systems LP
635 South Earl Avenue
P.O. Box 4849
Lafayette, IN 47903

March 3, 1992

Dear Sirs:

This letter is to inform you that the County of Mariposa has decided to terminate its relationship with your company. The County paid, in good faith, for a package of software that would allow an integrated Criminal Justice System. To date, the software has not performed as we were led to believe during the sales presentation.

Our software was to include:

- Electronic Docketing
- Clerk's Financial
- Probation Tracking
- District Attorney Management
- JAMS Interface for Law Enforcement
- Warrant Tracking

The software was to allow sharing of data between departments. As of now the only function we have been able to use has been Case Tracking and Filing in the Electronic Docketing portion of the software. None of the financial or receipting software has ever been usable on our system. Calendaring can't be used to our satisfaction. The Family Support functions have never worked. The interface to the Law Enforcement software does not exist, partly because the system has never been stable enough to write it. In short, the integration that was promised does not exist.

In addition to the problems listed above, there are more general complaints with the package. The software does not follow standard AS400 conventions either in the data base structure or the function keys and screen layouts. The menu structure is extremely confusing and does nothing to guide a user through the system. The documentation is poor with no

MHI Governmental Systems LP
March 3, 1992
Page 2

tutorial or system overview. There have been persistent security problems with the software in terms of user privileges. Even with the group user profile you have suggested we use, the software still requires a user to have menu authority which is unacceptable to us.

We have been waiting since our meeting in April of 1991 to have our problems resolved. Your company has claimed that you would upgrade our software to our satisfaction. You maintained that we would not be given the conversion procedure until all the problems had been rectified. On February 18, 1992, a date we notified your company of, we attempted to install the new package and run the conversion. The attempt failed because the conversion program used a different file definition than what is on our system. If the conversion program does not know the file formats, how can we trust the production code?


The County can only conclude, based on our experience, that even if we were to install the latest JAMS software and successfully do the conversion, that this would still not lead to a system that performed to our satisfaction based on our expectations at the time of purchase.

Our meeting in April, 1991, concluded with the understanding that we would pay any charges owed when we were satisfied with the software. Please be advised that we are not satisfied. This system was to be a showcase to other California courts. It will certainly stand as an example, but not the kind we had hoped for.

We are currently reviewing our legal recourse relative to recoupment of the monies already paid for a system which does not conform to our contractual agreement.

Very truly yours,

MARIPOSA COUNTY



Sally S. Punte
Chairperson, Board of Supervisors