|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dana Ohanesian, Orange County | X | **Monique Blakely, Los Angeles County** | X |
| Susie Sullivan, Orange County | X | **Jaime Pailma, Los Angeles County** | X |
| Rosa Chavez, Orange County | X | **Val Wood, San Diego County** | X |
| Patrick Copland, Orange County | X | **Rolf Bishop, San Diego County** | X |
| Michele Martinez-Barrera, Riverside County | X | **Lucy Siebern, San Diego County** | X |
| Melissa Garcia, Riverside County | X |  |  |

1. The meeting started at 1:30 p.m. Roll call was taken by Patrick. Riverside County informed the group that Bruce Cristall has retired.
2. Patrick reviewed the agenda and moved on to the next agenda item, Open County Discussion.
3. There were no items for the open county discussion, so Patrick moved on to the next agenda item, Owners Meeting Tasks.
4. For Owners Meeting Tasks, Patrick started with an update for unannounced local inspections, stating that the contract is in place for local inspections in Utah by a company called Logan Computers. He said Logan Computers carried out the local inspection of CSC on November 28th and will be scheduling the local inspection for Simplifile next. SmartFix Computers in Maitland Florida. First American Maitland inspection in the next few months, followed by NTC in Palm Habor. Start working on local inspections in Minnesota for Indecomm and possible a location for ePN beyond the two locations they have in California. Follow inspection checklist. They do not fix deficiencies but instead just report to SECURE Support for resolution. First inspection is scheduled and all subsequent inspections are unannounced.

Patrick moved to the next topic, pricing options. He said there has been ongoing review of multiple components of the multi-county agreement, including the pricing options. Dana said that exhibits A and B are being sent out to Owner Counties for review by next week. Exhibit A is the Lead County responsibilities and exhibit B is the annual Owner costs.

Patrick said there was no update for the website agenda item and he continued to the next topic, disaster recovery. He reported that this project started with an initial meeting in June, 2017 followed by updating of diagrams in July by SECURE Support and final questions answered by SECURE Support in December. He said that Rolf has provided a draft of the report on the findings and recommendations for review. Rolf said that hopefully in the next few weeks we will be able to finalize the report. Patrick said that the final report will be provided to the Owner Assistants.

For SECURE Performance Analytics, Patrick said that after the first meeting with the contractor Spico Solutions in November, we have been making good progress on this project. Patrick showed an updated screen shot of dashboard and explained all of the components. He said all of the requested features are in place, but work still needs to be done on the finer features and functionality of the components. Since the key performance indicator dials had not been labeled yet, Rolf asked what they are intended to represent. Patrick responded that one is system pages per second and the other is longest database query time. Patrick said the green, yellow and red indicators can be subjective and that we are working with the developers to ensure that they actually reflect the current state in relationship to what the system is capable of. Patrick also reviewed the current and estimated costs of this project with the group using a spreadsheet that had been disseminated prior to the meeting. He explained that most of the labor thus far has been spent on establishing the necessary connections to graphically render the data in the SECURE County Admin website. He also explained that the tool used to collect that data for the SECURE County Admin website has a license limit that is preventing the availability of all some of the data from being used by the SECURE County Admin website. He said we are working on a plan to filter out unnecessary data to avoid having to pay the one time and recurring costs associated with increasing the license limit. Patrick gave credit to the SECURE software developers in LA County for presenting solutions to the major connectivity problems that were encountered and getting us to the point where we have a dashboard that we are expected to finalize by this summer.

1. Patrick continued to the G2G agenda item. He displayed lists of counties and their status with Franchise Tax Board (FTB) and Department of Child Support Services (DCSS). He stated that San Diego County will be doing lights out testing with FTB in May, that Marin County is expected to go live with DCSS on February 26th and that Sacramento County has asked to be placed last in the implementation schedule for both of these state submitters. He said they are live with CERTNA for both of these state submitters. He also mentioned that counties have approved of the plan for DCSS to send digital Release of Support Judgment documents for electronic recording and DCSS is working on providing an ETA for when this will happen.

Patrick provided updates to the implementation status for California Department of Taxes and Fees Administration (CDTFA) and Employment Development Department (EDD). He said CDTFA is testing with LA County and that they are still going through the approval process for signing the SECURE G2G MOU. He said that CDTFA has expressed interest in allowing for multi-document batches and accomodations for the adjustments process at some point in the future. For EDD, he said they are working on getting their software to the point where they can test with LA County and they are also going through the approval process for signing the SECURE G2G MOU.

Patrick said that EDD has expressed that they want to send their Acknowledgement of Satisfaction of Judgement documents as digital instead of digitized. He said that all counties were asked if they would accept these digital documents from EDD and the counties that replied said they would not be allowed by law to accept these documents as digital because they require notary acknowledgements. He said that EDD will be considering changes to legislation to allow them to send digital Acknowledgement of Satisfaction of Judgement documents to counties for recording electronically. He also mentioned that EDD wants to establish separate billing for these documents, which would require multiple EDD company accounts in SECURE. He said there was a similar situation where FTB was asking each county to establish a separate billing account to handle non-resident documents. Jaime asked Patrick what the solution was for FTB. He said FTB’s only requirement was that non-resident document fees could be easily identified by them. He said counties started identifying non-resident documents in their invoices and FTB no longer needed two billable accounts per county. Jaime encouraged Patrick to follow this same approach so see if we can get them to reconsider. Melissa said this could add complications to their lights out process and she would like to see EDD reconsider the establishment of two accounts per county. Patrick said he would continue discussion on this issue after EDD goes live with LA County. He also reminded the group that we will have to wait until legislation is in place to allow EDD to send these documents as digital.

Val asked why EDD could not send these documents with electronic notarization. She also asked if any county would reject an electronic acknowledgement from a government agency. Jaime said she believes the problem is the notarization of the facsimile signature on the document. Val said if EDD can acknowledge an electronic signature, then San Diego County would accept the document from them. Val said that EDD might have difficulty finding an electronic notary in California and she emailed Bill Anderson at National Notary Association to find out how many electronic notaries there are in California. She said she would share Bill’s response with the group. She also found on the California Secretary of State website that California notaries public are authorized under current law to perform electronic notarizations as long as all the requirements for a traditional paper-based notarial act are met. Jaime said that last June, Sacramento, Santa Barbara and LA County shared their county council opinions that they should not accept electronically notarized paper documents from EDD based on government code 27201b. Patrick said it sounds like more input is needed and that he is open to coordinating a separate meeting if that is what the Owner Assistants want him to do.

1. Patrick reviewed upcoming meetings:
	1. SECURE Owners Meeting – March 1st at 1:30 p.m.
	2. SECURE County Meeting in late spring

Michele said that Riverside County would be able to host a SECURE County meeting in late spring. Patrick said he would work with Riverside County to coordinate the meeting.

1. Patrick moved on to the last agenda item, Other Items, and asked if Jaime would like to speak on CEQA filings. Jaime agreed. She said that during the kickoff meeting with City of Manhattan Beach, the possibility of delivering California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) filings through SECURE G2G was brought up. She said since the SECURE G2G portal is not subject to ERDS regulations, CEQA and other filings could be submitted to counties through the system. Val and Monique said this sounds like a good idea. Patrick and Jaime said they would keep the group informed as they moved forward with exploring this new feature for SECURE G2G.

Patrick moved on to the next item, software development. He said SECURE version 3.9 development is finished and the User Acceptance Testing (UAT) environment will be made available to counties to test this new version on Tuesday, February 6th. He said release notes will be provided to counties prior to Tuesday and that the changes in this version of SECURE should not break any county back end system. He said that after counties have completed their testing, version 3.9 will be deployed to the Production environment and the current target date for this is February 23rd. Patrick said SECURE version 3.10 is being targeted for June and will include SECURE Performance Analytics.

Patrick thanked the SECURE software developers in LA County for helping to establish the new test environment that was used to prepare the version 3.9 software prior to installation into the UAT environment. He said this made the SECURE installation and testing process smoother and quicker than it has ever been.

Patrick moved on to the next item, the county adjustments feature. He said the adjustments feature was made available to counties back in June with SECURE version 3.8. He said LA County has been ready to implement for about 4 months, but they are waiting for agents who write their own software to test the new feature. SECURE Support is coordinating the testing and expects the testing to begin on February 7th. He said that after agent testing is completed, LA County will be able to go live with the adjustments feature and other counties are looking at this feature as well. He said that the newest version of the host program developed by Sacramento County already supports the new SECURE adjustments feature. Patrick offered to help San Diego County obtain this new host program version.

Patrick moved on to the last item, open county discussion, and asked if there is anything else that that Owner Assistants would like to discuss. Val asked when invoices will be going out. Patrick said he would check on that and get back to her.

Patrick thanked everyone for attending. The meeting ended at 2:26 p.m.