

## IOWAccess Advisory Council

### Return on Investment (ROI) Program Funding Application

This template was built using the ITE ROI Submission Intranet application.  
**FINAL AUDIT REQUIRED:** The Enterprise Quality Assurance Office of the Information Technology Enterprise is required to perform post implementation outcome audits for all Pooled Technology funded projects and may perform audits on other projects.

#### This is an IOWAccess Revolving Fund Request.

Amount of funding requested:           Currently: \$75,000 for Implementation Phase

Anticipated total: \$115,000.00

### Section I: Proposal

<b>Date:</b>	August 15, 2007
<b>Agency Name:</b>	Department of Natural Resources
<b>Project Name:</b>	Boat Dock Registration
<b>Agency Manager:</b>	Lowell Joslin, Bureau Chief
<b>Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:</b>	(515) 281-5919, <a href="mailto:Lowell.Joslin@dnr.iowa.gov">Lowell.Joslin@dnr.iowa.gov</a>
<b>Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):</b>	Ken Herring, Conservation and Recreation Division Administrator
<b>IOWAccess Project Process Phase:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Scope Analysis <input type="checkbox"/> Design <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation

**A. Project Summary:** Describe the nature and use of the proposed project, including what is to be accomplished, how it will be accomplished, and what the costs and benefits will be.

The vision is to develop a web enabled system for ease of use by the customer to allow online application for the various classes of boat docks eliminating many of the manual processes and mass mailings.

The purpose is to allow for Class I, II, III and IV boat dock permits to be issued via an electronic method of delivery to the public and operate this permitting system in accordance with the dock rules as set forth in the Iowa Administrative Code. Class I and II dock permits are free of charge if the docks meet the requirements. However, all other classes require a permit fee and in some cases additional hoist fees (if applicable). Therefore, a mechanism for determining and collecting fees will be required. The DNR is interested in investigating the feasibility of allowing credit card payment of fees for registrations and subsequent dock permit renewals. The DNR wants to allow for credit card payments of dock permits.

The system needs to ensure that requirements for permit applications by dock owners are met in an automated fashion that prevents as many errors and duplication as possible. Diagrams outlining boat dock size, length, etc. are required to be submitted to the department. It will increase public access to improved permitting services for boat docks. Development of a Boat Dock Permit application submission system with edits will reduce or eliminate error and duplication. The proposed project will create a centralized repository for all boat dock permit information and will allow the public to access their account information. This database will streamline the way boat dock permits are submitted. This system will produce the necessary required reports in a very efficient and timely matter. In addition, the proposed project will be able to provide additional data to the department, legislature, media, and the public.

The resulting system will enable improved inspections of boat docks; allow administration of permits and required dock postings in a timely fashion. To facilitate investigations and enforcement, bar coding will be investigated as a technology that will enhance the inspector's ability to identify the owner of the dock and dock layout, history, etc. Currently, the State requires posting of the dock 911 address and allows the owner to remain anonymous to the casual viewer of the posting. Bar code scanners could be used to immediately identify the dock owner by accessing the system wirelessly. Saving the inspector time when he/she is not required to write down information and call it in or return to his/her computer to enter permit identification number.

The automated system will enable improvements and efficiencies for dock owners and the public. Within the DNR, Water Patrol Officers (summer positions), District Law Enforcement Supervisors, Park Rangers, and Conservation Officers will benefit as well as administrative staff. Each plays a role in the permit/registration requirements and automation will greatly enhance their individual processes. This includes automatic online submission of forms; automated renewal or waiver processes; online updates for transfer of docks; review of personal information and payment history; approval, revocation or denial of permits; report generation and search capabilities, etc.

The necessity to exchange or retrieve information with the DNR's existing Electronic Licensing System (ELSI) will be evaluated. Flexibility is being built into this system to allow Dock Management Area permits to be issued according to administrative rule.

**B. Strategic Plan:** How does the proposed project fit into the strategic plan of the requesting agency?

The mission for the Iowa Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) is: To conserve and enhance our natural resources in cooperation with individuals and organizations to improve the quality of life for Iowans and ensure a legacy for future generations.

It is the mission of the Law Enforcement Bureau to protect the State's natural resources, to provide public safety and to educate and serve the public. Law Enforcement staff enhance, promote, and protect the natural resources of this state through public relations, education, and law enforcement, thus ensuring for future generations the rights, privileges and benefits Iowan's and visitors to the State now enjoy.

This project will facilitate achievement of goals outlined in the Strategic plan. Those goals focus on Iowan's enjoying their natural resources and that Iowan's value, engage, participate and lead in Iowan's natural resources; Iowan's must have abundant, high quality opportunities for responsible use; and that Iowan's have a healthy and safe environment for recreation and living.

**C. Current Technology:** Provide a summary of the technology used by the current system. How does the proposed project impact the agency's technological direction? Are programming elements consistent with a Service Oriented

Architecture (SOA) approach? Are programming elements consistent with existing enterprise standards?

Currently boat dock permitting is primarily a manual process. Applications come into the DNR, they may be missing information or the information may be incorrect, which requires manual follow up by staff. The manual process results in delays for processing the permits, collection of fees, and doing inspections. District Office Secretaries have used Access databases to individually capture information for that specific district and do follow up. Note, there are six district office locations. However, Access programs do not enable efficient sharing of data across the State. In addition, inconsistent methods are in place in terms of the data collection and dissemination.

The impact of the proposed project on the agency's technological direction is that it falls in line with the strategy to improve public access via the Internet. Data from this system will be available to interface with other existing systems and automated reports will be available on demand. ITE is doing the programming and will be following established enterprise standards. ITE will be counted on to ensure programming elements are consistent with a Service Oriented Architecture approach.

#### **D. Statutory or Other Requirements**

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with a Federal law, rule, or order?

No or YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

##### **Explanation:**

YES...Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1889 (33 U.S.C. 403) states that a person will need a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for any structure or work that takes place in, under or over a navigable water or wetland adjacent to navigable waters of the United States. Navigable waters are defined as the Mississippi River, the Missouri River, the Des Moines River from the mouth to Fort Dodge, the first three (3) miles from the mouth of the Iowa River, and all Federal reservoirs and impoundments (Saylorville, Red Rock, Coralville, and Lake Rathbun). Dock permits are required by the Corps of Engineers and this permit system will greatly help in the administration of this permit program.

Is this project or expenditure required by state law, rule or order?

X YES (If "YES", cite the specific state law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

##### **Explanation:**

YES...authorizing sections of the Code of Iowa are Chapters 461A.4, 461A.11, 461A.18, 462A.27 and 462A.32. The following is an excerpt from Iowa Code Chapter 461A.4..."A person, association, or corporation shall not build or erect any pier, wharf, sluice, piling, wall, fence, obstruction, building, or erection of any kind upon or over any state-owned land or water under the jurisdiction of the commission, without first obtaining from the commission a written permit." Iowa Administrative Code 571-Chapter 16 further clarifies boat dock requirements and permits.

These are new revised dock rules that have been in effect since April 4, 2007. The process to improve these rules has taken approximately two (2) years.

The Natural Resource Commission (NRC) decided over two (2) years ago that dock rules needed to be reviewed and updated. Our staff began what turned into a two (2) year process working with the public, many public meetings, working with a citizen workgroup, and finally adopting new

rules. As a part of that process it was determined that all docks would need to be permitted. The Law Enforcement Bureau regulates all docks except for those found in Dock Management Areas and those docks are regulated by the Parks Bureau. Both bureaus are in the Conservation and Recreation division of the agency.

Classes of permits are designated as follows:

1. "Class I" permits authorize "standard" private docks. We believe that 75-80 % of docks would fall into this category.
2. "Class II" permits authorize docks that extend from shoreline property owned by the city or county.
3. "Class III" permits authorize "nonstandard" private docks. These docks do not meet the standard as set out for Class I permits and typically are longer, wider, have more slips, or need some type of exception from the norm.
4. A "Class IV" permits authorize commercial docks. A "commercial dock" means a dock used as part of a business, including a dock extending from residential property if one or more mooring spaces at the dock are rented for a fee. A dock maintenance fee charged by a property owners' association to its members is not a basis to classify a dock as commercial. This definition is not applicable to docks in dock management areas or concession operations administered by the department.
5. Dock management areas (DMAs) are areas designated by the department in the bed of a water body adjoining a state park, wildlife management area, or recreation area or adjoining a strip of land that was dedicated to the public and is subject to the jurisdiction of the department pursuant to Iowa Code section 461A.11, second unnumbered paragraph. In the case of DMAs the State of Iowa is the riparian or littoral property owner. DMAs allow the public to extend privately owned docks from public shoreline thus allowing greater access to that body of water. There are a limited number of DMAs located around the state.

The owner of a Class I (standard dock) shall have until July 1, 2008 to apply for or register their dock on an application form supplied by the Department. The applicant shall certify that the dock meets the criteria for a Class I permit and the department shall assign a permit number, which may be a series of numbers or letters, or a combination of numbers and letters. Class I dock permits may be issued for terms up to five years without a fee.

Class II permits shall include exceptions as needed to provide continuing authorization for docks and hoists that were lawfully installed and maintained before the effective date of certain requirements set forth in rule. Certain requirements are in place for the extension of docks from the water's edge. Class II dock permits shall be issued without fee for a term up to five years.

Class III and IV permits require the payment of a fee and must meet more stringent requirements as outlined in rule. Exceptions are allowed according to rule. The requirement for posting the registration is somewhat different than that of Class I and II registrations.

If the applicant for a Class III or IV permit is not the owner of the shoreline property from which the dock extends, the applicant shall identify the contractual relationship between the applicant and each property owner and shall submit as part of the application the written consent from each owner.

Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement?  
X YES (If "YES", explain.)

**Explanation:**

YES...this project will provide a comprehensive system by which the public can apply for and

receive a dock permit via the internet. By creating this system we will be able to do away with our individual paper systems that are currently kept by each District secretary. By improving this system, Officers will spend less time dealing with dock permits and can spend more time on the water providing enforcement patrols helping to keep our boating public safer. The implementation of these new dock rules will help to regulate, limit the size of docks, and limit the number of slips or hoists allowed on each dock. This helps control overcrowding on our already congested state waterways and water bodies. This new web based system will help us better manage dock permits.

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard?

YES (If "YES", cite the specific standard.)

**Explanation:**

Not Applicable.

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

If the answer to these criteria is "no," the point value is zero (0). Depending upon how directly a qualifying project or expenditure may relate to a particular requirement (federal mandate, state mandate, health-safety-security issue, or compliance with an enterprise technology standard), or satisfies more than one requirement (e.g. it is mandated by state and federal law and fulfills a health and safety mandate), 1-15 points awarded.



---

---

**E. Impact on Iowa's Citizens**

1. Project Participants - **List the project participants (i.e. single agency, multiple agencies, State government enterprise, citizens, associations, or businesses, other levels of government, etc.) and provide commentary concerning the nature of participant involvement. Be sure to specify who and how many direct users the system will impact. Also specify whether the system will be of use to other interested parties: who they may be, how many people are estimated, and how they will use the system.**

Interested Parties: Parties interested in this project include the following:

Dock and property owners—required by law to register (obtain a dock permit) and pay appropriate fees and to meet distance and size parameters outlined by law for their boat docks and slips. It is anticipated that 10,000 dock owners exist. Potential exits for numbers to increase as the DNR educates boat owners and owners of riparian or littoral property about the new dock rules and requirements. Some may not have been compliant in the past and with better education and enforcement of new rules we may see an increase in the number of dock owners.

U.S. Army Corp of Engineers and Cities and Counties—responsible for the management of docks on riparian lands under their jurisdiction

Boating public—those that are allowed an opportunity to have a dock located within a Dock Management Area (DMA). There are nineteen (19) DMAs located around the state serving approximately 500 citizens.

Department of Natural Resources (DNR), DNR Conservation and Recreation staff, Natural Resource Commission (NRC) and the public—responsible for natural resource preservation, establishment of administrative rules, enforcement activities, approval, denial, revocation of permits and administration of the policies and procedures.

Currently the DNR has information regarding the new dock rule, application forms, general information on its home page website. This project will allow for the public to not only obtain general dock and rule information, but will allow for a paperless system of applying for, approving, paying for, and receiving a dock permit.

Some of the Recipients of this Service:

Dock and property owners, U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Cities and Counties, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), DNR Conservation and Recreation staff, Natural Resource Commission (NRC) and the public.

**2. Service Improvements** - Summarize the extent to which the project or expenditure improves service to Iowa citizens or within State government. Included would be such items as improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, providing enhanced services, improving work processes, etc.

This project will provide enhanced services and reduce the government hassle for the boat dock owner. The current process is now more of a hassle for the public as it is not intuitive, nor does it prevent errors. Services to the public will be enhanced as a result of the re-engineering the system and changing it to meet customer and agency needs.

DNR law enforcement, parks, and administrative staff work processes will be improved including the inspection and approval processes. In addition to capturing more consistent data for the permits the data integrity should improve as a result of built in edits prior to the online acceptance of the applications. Data will be available for statistical analysis and will be available upon demand for interested parties.

Iowa's recreational users will use the system to apply for registrations required by law in an enhanced manner. They will be guided by the online system in terms of how to complete the applications and will receive confirmation of receipt. Once they have registered the system will create a profile for them and start tracking their information. The system should eventually allow notification of customers when it is time to renew their registrations. Preferably the notification will be computer generated to reduce manual effort. The system should also provide notification of law enforcement officers in the appropriate district office, when an investigation is required, when the investigation has been completed and approval of the application for registration is required.

**3. Citizen Impact** – Summarize how the project leads to a more informed citizenry, facilitates accountability, and encourages participatory democracy. If this is an extension of another project, what has been the adoption rate of Iowa's citizens or government employees with the preceding project?

DNR is proactively providing easier access to information to the public, regulated parties, and local emergency response officials. Public accountability will be enhanced as the boat dock data and forms will be available 24 x 7 for completion, submission and eventual review by Officers, Supervisors, and other administrative personnel. Automated documentation will be kept in a history for review and monitoring of changes.


The project will also provide the tools to make it easier for DNR personnel to perform their duties more efficiently, with better accuracy and quicker, better response to the public. Better accountability in the DNR will be achieved through reports that track performance measures required by law and those established by management for investigators and supervisory staff.


Citizens will be better informed through information provided via the system. They will be better informed because of information concerning the type of class permit they will apply for will be on the system.

**4. Public Health and/or Safety** – Explain requirements or impact on the health and safety of the public.

By having a system that will allow the public to view their own account information, including payment history you will have a much better informed public. A much better informed public feels more secure having access to that information and that adds to each persons mental health and wellbeing.

This new system will streamline an archaic method of issuing dock permits. In doing so, officers, supervisors, and administrative staff spend less time on the permit paperwork and process and can spend more time being productive with their respective duties. In the case of officers, they can spend more time on public safety and enforcement issues.

<p><b>[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]</b> <b>Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).</li><li>• Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).</li><li>• Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).</li></ul>	
--	---

<p><b>[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]</b> <b>Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Minimally improves customer service (0-3 points).</li><li>• Moderately improves customer service (4-6 points).</li><li>• Significantly improves customer service (7-10 points).</li></ul>	
---	---

**F. Process Reengineering**

Provide a pre-project or pre-expenditure (before implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens interact with the current system.

**Response:**

The old system is paper based system with fewer dock owners registering. The cost of staff time, materials, and mailings are significant. Once the paperwork arrives in the respective District

Office it requires the data to be manually entered. Reports are created manually resulting in delays. It takes several people to manually prepare and deliver statewide information now. With the old system we do not have any centralized database for this information and reports on a statewide basis are difficult to create.

Manual review and notification to the owner of issues with the application delay the final submission of applications. In turn, site visit investigations cannot occur as timely as they should. Therefore, final approval by district supervisors cannot be expedited.

The added requirements by rule make the current system inadequate. New forms have been developed and it will be critical that they are complete and accurate. In addition, the various fees must be submitted without error. The change in rules and new process now results in extra work for the DNR staff as more owners will be required to register and more inspections will have to take place.

Provide a post-project or post-expenditure (after implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens will interact with the proposed system. In particular, note if the project or expenditure makes use of information technology in reengineering traditional government processes.

**Response:**

In addition to the information provided previously regarding the outcome of re-engineering the following will result post-project.

The application form will be accompanied by accurate plans and drawings as specified on the form. The drawings shall accurately show the size and location of each boat hoist, slip, platform, catwalk, buoy, or other structure to be maintained in front of the shoreline property. Docks in front of non adjoining shoreline properties on the same water body owned by the same person or legal entity may be included in one application. A mechanism to enable web diagrams and paper submission of the diagrams may be implemented.

An application for renewal of a permit for an existing dock and hoists will specifically describe each requested modification. The applicant shall submit an administrative fee with the application. The completed application form and payment shall be submitted to the department's district law enforcement office in the district where the proposed dock is located. The application will be assigned to a conservation officer to investigate.

An approval and escalation work flow will be implemented because conservation officers are required to make a site visit to the docks prior to approving the application for registration. District supervisor approval is required for all dock applications and if the applications are rejected, there is an appeal process. This process must be documented and tracked.

Although there is a paper trail of history as to previous registrations, the DNR will start fresh with new registrations so there will be no conversion requirements. The current process is to track all bodies of water requiring extra work to maintain. The system will track only bodies of water for the exceptions or requirements of certain permits as outlined in rule. A new registration numbering system will be used.

It is the responsibility of the entity owning or managing the dock to display the boat dock permit at the dock in a prescribed fashion. The DNR wants to investigate the feasibility of allowing the printing of the dock permit from the owner's own PC. However, rule does prescribe that the permit number is now posted by the dock owner. In the future, the department will be exploring



the use of bar code scanners to read the dock permit information. The system must be designed so that it can be easily modified for additional enhancements in the future.

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- Minimal use of information technology to reengineer government processes (0-3 points).
- Moderate use of information technology to reengineer government processes (4-6 points).
- Significant use of information technology to reengineer government processes (7-10).



## **G. Timeline**

Provide a projected timeline for this project. Include such items as **start date**, planning, database design, coding, implementation, testing, conversion, parallel installation, and date of final release. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

### **Scope Analysis Phase: 03/08/2007 – 09/05/2007 (IDNR/DAS-(ITE))**

1. Interim Temporary data gathering application
2. Use Case/Process Flows
3. ROI
4. Basic Design
5. Design Phase cost estimate

### **Database Design Phase: 09/12/2007 – 10/26/2007 (IDNR/DAS-ITE)**

1. Mock ups
2. Data Model
3. Data Migration Plan
4. Requirements
5. Test Plan
6. Implementation Phase cost estimate

### **Implementation Phase: 11/11/2007 – 02/04/2008 (IDNR/DAS-ITE)**

1. Application Coding
2. Database setup
3. Data migration

4. System testing
5. Customer Application acceptance testing
6. Migrate to Production – “Go Live”

Note: Projected timeline for Design and Implementation should be treated as Goals. Projected timeline could be expanded or compacted as warranted by IDNR and DAS-ITE.

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).

**H. Funding Requirements**

On a fiscal year basis, enter the estimated cost by funding source: Be sure to include developmental costs and ongoing costs, such as those for hosting the site, maintenance, upgrades.

	FY08		FY09		FY10	
	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost
State General Fund	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund	\$115,000	100%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Federal Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Local Gov. Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Grant or Private Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Other Funds (Specify)	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Non-Pooled Tech. Total	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- The funding request contains questionable items (0-3 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with few questionable items (4-6 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).

## I. Scope

Is this project the first part of a future, larger project?

- YES (If "YES", explain.)     **NO**, it is a stand-alone project.

### Explanation:

Although this is intended to be a stand alone project, the project design must enable interoperability with other systems. For example it could be linked to the ELSI (Electronic Licensing System) system and later interact with the TraCS (Traffic and Criminal Software System). TraCS is a National Model used by multiple law enforcement agencies in 17 different states and two Canadian provinces. It was developed to enable local, state/provincial, and federal entities to improve their transportation, homeland security, and public safety infrastructures by sharing resources, establishing best practices and providing tools by which information is quickly, accurately and efficiently collected, and is subsequently used for analysis, reporting, public and private dissemination, and data-driven decision-making. We're also looking at bar code technology for use in identifying dock information.

Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?


- YES (If "YES", explain.)

### Explanation:

This project will re-engineer an old application/permit process so that it better meets the needs of the customer, the agency, is more flexible, and uses current technology.

### [This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

#### **Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- This is the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure or project / expenditure duration is one year (0-5 points)
- The project / expenditure is of a multi-year nature and each annual component produces a definable and stand-alone outcome, result or product (2-8 points). 
- This is beyond the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure (6-10 points)

The last part of this criteria involves rating the extent to which a project or expenditure is at an advanced stage of implementation and termination of the project / expenditure would waste previously invested resources.

---

## J. Source of Funds

On a fiscal year basis, how much of the total project cost (\$ amount and %) would be absorbed by your agency from non-Pooled Technology and/or IOWAccess funds? If desired, provide additional comment / response below.


**Response:**

Maintenance cost will be absorbed through general funds and DNR already is purchasing these services so there will be no additional maintenance costs.

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**

**Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)**

- 0% (0 points)
- 1%-12% (1 point)
- 13%-25% (2 points)
- 25%-38% (3 points)
- 39%-50% (4 points)
- Over 50% (5 points)



## **Section II: Financial Analysis**

### **A. Project Budget Table**

It is necessary to estimate and assign a useful life figure to each cost identified in the project budget. Useful life is the amount of time that project related equipment, products, or services are utilized before they are updated or replaced. In general, the useful life of hardware is three (3) years and the useful life of software is four (4) years. Depending upon the nature of the expense, the useful life for other project costs will vary between one (1) and four (4) years. On an exception basis, the useful life of individual project elements or the project as a whole may exceed four (4) years. Additionally, the ROI calculation must include all new annual ongoing costs that are project related.

The Total Annual Prorated Cost (State Share) will be calculated based on the following equation:

$$\left[ \left( \frac{\text{Budget Amount}}{\text{Useful Life}} \right) \times \% \text{ State Share} \right] + (\text{Annual Ongoing Cost} \times \% \text{ State Share}) = \text{Annual Prorated Cost}$$

Budget Line Items	Budget Amount (1st Year Cost)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1st Year)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff	\$97,400	2	100%	\$48,700	100	\$97,400
Software	100,000	4	0%	0	0%	0
Hardware						
Training						
Facilities						
Professional Services						
ITD Services						
Supplies, Maint, etc.	\$24,000	2	100%	\$12,000	100%	\$24,000
Other						
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$221,400</b>			<b>\$60,700</b>		<b>\$121,400</b>

## B. Spending plan

### Explain how the funds will be allocated.

Funds will be allocated 100% first year from IOWAccess and 100% thereafter, by DNR.

## C. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

### Respond to the following and transfer data to the ROI Financial Worksheet as necessary:

**1. Annual Pre-Project Cost** - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process prior to project implementation.

#### Describe Annual Pre-Project Cost:

Changing rules require permits for all docks, rather than allowing exceptions by rule. This new requirement will add to the existing workload of DNR Conservation and Recreation staff (Conservation Officers, Park Rangers, District Supervisors, District Secretaries and other Administrative staff) in counties, district offices, and the central office. Officers and Rangers will now be required to do more inspections and to approve more applications/permits.

In addition to the expense for resources to process the applications, there will be an increase in paper handling costs if the system is not automated. No additional funding has been established to staff this process, nor was money allocated to fund application development.

The printing and distribution of paper forms for the application process will be an additional expense. The public and DNR can benefit from an automated method of submission and tracking of their applications and permits.

#### Quantify Annual Pre-Project Cost:

	<b>State Total</b>
<b>FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):</b>	\$97,400.00
<b>Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):</b>	\$23,515.00
<b>Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs &amp; support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):</b>	\$0.00
<b>Total Annual Pre-Project Cost:</b>	\$120,915.00

**2. Annual Post-Project Cost** - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process after project implementation.

**Describe Annual Post-Project Cost:**

Dollars will be saved if the DNR is not required to do mass mailings to dock owners. Once the database is fully implemented, it is estimated that money could be saved annually when paper documents are eliminated or reduced. Savings can be realized from reduced follow-up telephone calls and problems encountered by the district office staff in the processing of applications and administration of permits because of errors or not having the database information available.

Automated notification to the law enforcement officers for investigations will enable more timely response in the application process. Automated notification of the District Supervisors will assist supervisors with their performance monitoring, staffing requirements and workload balancing, in addition to enabling more timely response to permit approval. Posting of permits on all docks will enable the Conservation Officers greater authority in managing docks. Automation is intended to reduce the costs.

This new system will also yield reports that would not have been possible with the old permit system. This system will allow each dock owner to view and change (if needed) their own account information and will allow for credit card payment of dock fees.

**Quantify Annual Post-Project Cost:**

	<b>State Total</b>
<b>FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):</b>	\$48,700.00
<b>Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):</b>	\$11,757.50

<b>Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs &amp; support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):</b>	\$0.00
<b>Total Annual Post-Project Cost:</b>	\$60,457.50

**3. Citizen Benefit** - Quantify the estimated annual value of the project to Iowa citizens. This includes the "hard cost" value of avoiding expenses ("hidden taxes") related to conducting business with State government. These expenses may be of a personal or business nature. They could be related to transportation, the time expended on the manual processing of governmental paperwork such as licenses or applications, taking time off work, mailing, or other similar expenses. As a "rule of thumb," use a value of \$10 per hour for citizen time.

Describe savings justification:

Currently the application and approval process are very time consuming, requiring diagramming and approvals by conservation officers and supervisors. With the new web based system in place the amount of effort expended applying on line should drastically be reduced. With an electronic approval system, the supervisor and officer's online approval will eliminate the time delay currently experienced by using the US Postal Service process. The system will have certain built in edits to eliminate errors and allow for a smoother application process.

<b>Transaction Savings</b>	
Number of annual online transactions:	10,000
Hours saved/transaction:	0.75
Number of Citizens affected:	10,000
Value of Citizen Hour	\$10/hour
Total Transaction Savings:	\$75,000
Other Savings (Describe)	
<b>Total Savings:</b>	<b>\$75,000</b>

**4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance** - Quantify the estimated annual non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc.

<b>Return On Investment (ROI): ((C-D) / Requested Project Funds) * 100 =</b>	
A. Total Annual Pre-Project cost (State Share from Section II C1):	\$120,915.00
B. Total Annual Post-Project cost (State Share from Section II C2):	\$60,457.50
State Government Benefit (= A-B):	\$60,457.50
Annual Benefit Summary:	
State Government Benefit:	\$60,457.50
Citizen Benefit:	\$75,000.00
Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit:	7,500
C. Total Annual Project Benefit:	\$142,957.50
D. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table):	\$121,400
<b>Benefit / Cost Ratio: (C/D) =</b>	1.1776
<b>Return On Investment (ROI): ((C-D) / Requested Project Funds) * 100 =</b>	<b>19</b>

**4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance**

**Response:**

If DNR can reduce the amount of time spent on the dock permitting system, Conservation Officers will have more time that can be spent on patrol and that benefits the state of Iowa by having a safer public and providing for greater protection of our natural resources. If Officers spend more time on navigational patrol efforts, then more time will be coded towards our federal U.S. Coast Guard grants and more federal dollars can be requested allowing fewer state dollars to be used.

This new system will allow the agency to utilize a credit card type payment system and that will allow the public greater flexibility when it comes to making payments. It may also eliminate the current need for staff to personally follow-up sometimes three and four times when attempting collection of dock fees.

**5. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable** - List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

**Response:**

The development of this new system will allow the public, legislators, the media, and the agency access to statewide dock information that had previously been unavailable. It will also help in obtaining greater compliance with our dock administrative rules.

This new system will provide the public with an easier way to apply for a dock permit, by doing it “on-line” and will make renewals much easier, especially if no changes are made to a person’s current dock permit. The public will spend less time applying for or renewing their dock permits and that will allow them more time to spend on other activities. The department will spend less time on dock permits and have more information readily available for those that need it.



**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**  
**Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



---

## Appendix A. Auditable Outcome Measures

For each of the following categories, list the auditable metrics for success after implementation and identify how they will be measured.

### 1. Improved customer service

Metric: 75% of public respond positively to survey.

How: Collect comments from the public via staff and web-site

### 2. Citizen impact

Metric: At present DNR does not know how many docks and owners are in compliance, because we do not permit ALL docks. This new system will allow us to better track compliance by having more accurate dock permit information available.

How: Fewer dock permit violations (fewer persons out of compliance).

### 3. Cost Savings

Metric: Maintain budget expenditures savings month by month.

How: Compare average monthly costs to actual costs.

### 4. Project reengineering

Metric: New web based system will improve access and quality of data while shortening the time it takes to process applications/permits and do investigations.

How: Inspections increase and are conducted in less time.

### 5. Source of funds (Budget %)

Metric: Program funds continue to be maintained at same level or above.

How: Use our accounting staff to help measure time spent on U.S. Coast Guard Grant funding that support a large share of the Program. The potential exists for less state dollars to be used overall allowing the agency to leverage more federal dollars.

## **6. Tangible/Intangible benefits**

### Metrics:

- Improved permit application process via the Internet allowing for a 24-7 availability.
- Streamlined data management processes.
- Reduced number of phone calls to district offices.
- Reduction in number of paper records to be handled and stored.
- Improved data integrity as a result of built in system edits.
- No doubt DNR will be able to use the savings to improve delivery of other services to the public.

### How:

- Greater public satisfaction can be measured with surveys.
- Greater compliance with program can be measured by looking at violations over time.
- Time saved by staff when we have fewer follow-up calls and less time is spent on the processing of permits.
- Agency could see an increase in other program areas if less time is spent on the dock permitting system.