Technology Advanced Planning Review



DepartmentFiscal Year (?)District Attorney's Office2024-2025

Project/Solution Title

New Criminal Case Management System(CMS)

Problem Statement

Please use this space to describe the problem(s) that this solution/system will solve.

Our current criminal CMS (CRIMES) is archaic and has to run in IE mode to work. Additionally, it is not able to handle the new Race Blind Charging mandate, which requires us to redact out certain information from any police reports we review. We are currently using an outside service perform the redaction.

Proposed solution

Please describe the system/solution that you intend to purchase to solve the problem described above.

Our original vendor choice was Journal Technologies, because they are the vendors for the Lake Co. Supreme Courts' CMS and it would make integration with the Courts easier. However, because their initial as well as ongoing costs were exorbitant, and they were not able to provide a contract with a piggyback clause, and a slow response of their sales people, we looked to Prosecutor by Karpel (PbK) by Karpel Solutions. Their criminal CMS is already installed in at least 30 other CA District Attorney Offices. They were also able to provide a contract with piggyback language so that an RPP is not necessary. Lastly, their cost is much lower, while providing a stronger program.

Document Upload (?)

Optionally, you can upload any documents that may be relevant

One time costs Cost to acquire and implement the solution. Maintenance/subscription costs

\$133,315.00

\$66,750.00

Impact on other departments?

Vendor Selection Completed

Will the implementation or ongoing usage of this system/solution involve or impact any other departments or agencies?

YES

 $\bigcirc \ \mathsf{NO}$

Impact Narrative

Please describe the departments that this project could impact or involve and describe what the impact may be.

PbK will be able to provide a portal for staff at other law enforcement agencies to be able to check on the status of their case, which Deputy DA is handling the case, and for disposition information. This will be much more efficient for all parties involved.

| What procurement/analysis steps have you taken so far? $\stackrel{\star}{\cdot}$ | |
|--|--|
| Check all that apply. | |
| Nothing done yet. Just an idea at this point. | |
| ☐ Talked to one vendor | |
| ▼ Talked to several vendors | |
| ✓ Had demonstrations with vendor(s) | |
| RFP in process | |
| RFP complete | |

| □ Purchase already made□ Other | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Submitted by | e-mail |
| Doris Lankford | Doris.Lankford@lakecountyca.gov |
| Initial Review | |
| Initial Review Comments * | |
| Discussed with TGC and we do not see a reason to convene TGC meeting for this purchase at this time. For my part, I do have concerns about the various requirements (especially the proprietary remote access) that the vendor has, but I will work through these with Doris. | |