IOWAccess Advisory Council
Meeting Minutes of November 12, 2008, 1:00 PM
Hoover Building, Level A, Conference Room 5

D r a f t

Present: Kathleen Richardson, Barbara Corson, Sheila Castaneda, Tom Gronstal, Dick
                   Neri, Terri Selberg*, Glen Dickinson, Randy Nyberg, Kelly Hayworth*, Dan
                   McGinn*

Absent: Terrence Neuzil, Beth Baldwin, Vicki Lensing, Lawrence Lentz, Carmine Boal,
                   Dawn Ainger, Ron Wieck, Jeff Danielson

Guests: Kathleen Sparks, Tracy Smith, Wayne Middleton, Scott LeBlanc, Rick Rosenow
                   (all from Iowa Interactive), Mark Uhrin, Malcolm Huston, John Gillispie, Darrell
                   Fremont, Diane Van Zante, Amelia Adkins (all from ITE), JoAnn Naples,
                   Michael Anderson, Jeff Kopaska, Lowell Joslin, and Roger Jacob (all from DNR)

                   * By phone

Council Chair, Dick Neri, opened the meeting at 1:05 p.m. and noted that a quorum of members
was present.

1.   Introductions, Approve Minutes, 2009 Meeting Dates – Dick Neri, Chair.
     The Council has a new member, Randy Nyberg. Mr. Nyberg works for Principal Financial in
     the technology department where he is responsible for distributed infrastructure, including
     eBusiness. All council members introduced themselves. We received word that Larry Lentz
     has tendered his resignation from the Council, effective immediately.

     Sheila Castaneda moved approval of the September 10, 2008 meeting minutes; Barb Corson
     seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, unanimously approving the minutes as
     written.

     Proposed meeting dates for 2009 are January 7, March 11, May 13, July 8, September 9, and
     November 11. Sheila Castaneda moved acceptance of the 2009 meeting dates with the
     exception of November 11 (Veterans Day) and suggested November 4 as an alternative.
     Barb Corson seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; the meeting dates were
     unanimously approved. Malcolm Huston will distribute the meeting dates and locations,
     once finalized.

2.   Iowa Interactive Project Update – Tracy Smith, Iowa Interactive.
     Three new project managers have joined Iowa Interactive -- Kathleen Sparks, Rick Rosenow,
     and Scott LeBlanc. Tracy passed around copies of a brochure from NIC (the National
     Information Consortium which is Iowa Interactive's parent company) highlighting programs
     in other states that are available to Iowa. In September, the DNR cabins and campgrounds
     site continued to see growth in online reservations and a decrease in call center reservations.
     In July, legislation was enacted that impacted the sale of drivers' record abstracts: 1) single

use clause (requires that a single driver's license be used for a single purpose), and 2) sale of non-certified records is no longer permitted. In October, drivers' license lookup was 39% ahead of the same time last year. Two projects went live in recent months, the Rebuild Iowa Office in September and the SOS Real-time Election Results in November. The new State of Iowa website is progressing, but does not have a tentative "go live" date yet.

3. IOWAccess Projects and Projections Spreadsheet/Monthly Report – Malcolm Huston. These projections are based on rough estimates provided by the project managers. Execution funds appear to be substantial over the next six to twelve months. Potential projects (those that are before you today) have also been included. This financial summary does reflect receipt of the one million dollar annual appropriation. Based upon fully funding all projections and potential projects, the fund should not dip below zero. Approximately $90,000 in previously approved, but unused funds is being added back for use elsewhere. Taking into account the million dollar appropriation just received, the unobligated balance in September was negative $638,000. Available cash is about $200,000.

How much do we get from the sale of drivers' license records each month? In September, revenue was $280,000 before expenses. About half of that amount goes to Iowa Interactive, the other half goes to IOWAccess. There is about $2.7 million (roughly $450,000 per meeting) in income that the Council oversees and allocates each year. Why is the fund currently $600,000 in the red? Because the funds were overcommitted. The Council decided to over commit based on the idea that not all obligations would be submitted for reimbursement at the same time. The fund has never actually run out of money. Does the $600,000 deficit include today's projects? No. For projects that have already begun, we try to factor in subsequent phases that have not yet been approved by the Council. The Council asked that the financials/spreadsheets be included in the material that is posted on the website.

Ratings and Rankings – Malcolm has been using a survey instrument to gather feedback on the current approach for reviewing projects. He received a variety of comments. One option is to score each of the proposals each time they submit a funding request. There were some concerns about scoring without the benefit of the sponsor's oral presentation. Randy Nyberg suggested that the executive sponsor, project manager, and project lead collectively submit a rank and then allow the Council to offer an opinion.

What is the purpose of ranking? Is it part of the Director's decision-making process in determining approval? How quickly does the Director make a decision about approval? Director Anderson usually reviewed the recommendation and took action in one day.

Kelly Hayworth disconnected from the meeting (time noted as 1:55 p.m.).

A couple of factors led to this idea. Because the Council seemed to be running short of funds, there was a need to evaluate multiple projects that might be vying for a limited amount of funding. There was also a desire to utilize a more consistent decision-making process that would stand up to scrutiny.

Council member comments:
- When money is tight, it is difficult to determine whether a current funding request is more or less important than one that might be submitted in the future.
- Should ITE staff make the initial recommendation to the Council? That is the procedure used by the Board of Regents; Staff writes a recommendation on each request because they tend to have more background knowledge.
- Maybe the Council should vote after all of the projects have been presented rather than after each oral presentation. That would be particularly useful if there are more projects than funds available.

Outcome:
For the present time, allow use of the ranking tool and provide a spreadsheet that shows individual responses to each question without supplying the ranker's name. That information can be supplied to members at the meeting and will be used as the basis for discussion.

4. DNR Water Use Database – Request for Scope Analysis Funding ($20,000) – Mike Anderson, DNR.
Per the Code of Iowa, The Department of Natural Resources is charged with overseeing Iowa's current water priority allocation system. Their mission is to protect public health and welfare. DNR has the responsibility to aquire and make available to the public information about Iowa's water quality and water quantity. This project is intended to help DNR capture, access, and integrate data from disparate files. It will improve internal and external decision making and reduce errors. Stakeholders specifically asked for a better way to access, extract, analyze, and share data using web enabled technology.

There are 3500 permit holders. Issuance of a ten year permit requires a monthly report of water usage to the DNR. Compliance and conflict resolution also fall under the DNR's purview. Beginning in July, the DNR is legislatively mandated to collect fees; they expect to generate $500,000 in fees per year. Natural Resources is supplementing the scope analysis phase with $40,000 of its own money.

DNR has also submitted a request for $225,000 from the Pooled Technology fund for the backend of this project, however will not know the outcome of that request until late in the 2009 legislative session.

Council member comments:
- There is an interface to citizens, but the project basically streamlines the backend and that is not the intent of IOWAccess funding.
- There appears to be more benefit to the agency than the State. A large portion of this request may not align with the IOWAccess mission, but with running the DNR.
- Could the Council fund only the portion that aligns with its mission?
- Typically, when the Council starts funding a project, it funds the succeeding phases as well.
- There is very little money available in any department's budget for development of new programs. So, the Council is faced with deciding which new programs it should support.

Tom Gronstal moved approval of scope analysis funding; Kathleen Richardson seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken and recorded as follows:

Ayes – Terri Selberg, Dan McGinn, Tom Gronstal, Kathleen Richardson
Nays – Sheila Castaneda, Glen Dickinson, Dick Neri, Barb Corson, Randy Nyberg
Abstentions – None

The motion was denied. Participants in the meeting were give a short break (time noted as 3:07 p.m.).

5. DNR Nursery Sales – Request for Planning and Execution Funding ($150,000) – Roger Jacob, DNR.
   The scope analysis phase of this project is complete. The State Nursery in Ames grows three million seedlings annually for conservation purposes. Most orders are taken by phone, but there are some e-mail orders. The current system is 30 years old and relies on a database that contains all of the information (keeps track of orders, what to send when, whether it is paid, etc.), but no information is held over from one year to the next, there is no communication between the shipping department and the front office, and all payments are entered manually. Advantages of the new system: postage and mailing costs would be drastically reduced and people could more easily check the status of their order/inventory. $150,000 might be a high estimate; it is hard to say.

   Discussion:
   - This seems to be a shopping cart process; $177,000 is a large amount for that type of system.
   - It is not just a shopping cart, but includes related components as well.
   - Could we purchase another entity's system that is already in place?
   - DNR contacted the state of Missouri; they will give us their system for free, but they will not support it. It is in an Access database and DNR does not have staff that is able to support it. Missouri's system is also not a web-based system, so does not do everything that the Iowa DNR had envisioned.
   - It seems that DNR is asking the Council to fund both the front and back ends and neither is really citizen centric.
   - It appears that DNR does not plan to issue an RFP until after the Council's next meeting.
   - DNR does not want ITE or Iowa Interactive to perform the work, but plans instead to engage a consultant. Although Director Anderson expressed concern about the amount of funding DNR has received, DNR is the only entity seeking funds today and should not be penalized for doing so.
   - Since RFP responses are not due until after the next Council meeting, DNR could come back and report on the cost of the separate components.

   Glen Dickinson left the meeting (time noted as 3:32 p.m.). ITE verified that there was still a quorum of members in attendance.

   - Haven't we already developed a product that maintains inventory?
   - No, the shopping cart for the State Store does not have an inventory component.

- The State of Virginia has a shopping cart and the Virginia nurseries were one of the first to use it.
- DNR did talk to Virginia authorities and it appears that theirs is only the shopping aspect, not the back end.
- Iowa Interactive conducted a demo of the Virginia system to JoAnn Naples of DNR.

Sheila Castaneda suggested tabling action on the request to the next meeting which would give DNR the opportunity to visit with the Virginia authorities a bit more and to explore with Iowa Interactive the addition of a back end component to the existing product.

Sheila made a formal motion to table the item to a future meeting to allow all parties to look at existing options, explore expansion of current systems, and to permit DNR to amend their current proposal. Randy Nyberg seconded the motion to table. An oral vote was taken; there was unanimous agreement.

6. DNR Special Events Scope Analysis – Request for Scope Analysis Funding ($20,000) – Jeff Kopaska, DNR.
DNR offers the use of state properties for special events -- ATV events, boating events, fishing tournaments, etc. The current process is to contact DNR for a permit at least 30 days prior to the event. There are several different approvals that must be granted. At present, this is a paper process and not very efficient. Each bureau currently has its own form (there is not a standardized form), there is no comprehensive tracking or coordinated notification of events. DNR wants to have a one stop shop for all events -- a streamlined application, online public events notification, and coordination of events information between state and federal agencies. This project was initially tabled in July and is being resubmitted now. DNR plans to get a business analyst to spearhead the scope analysis and requirements, but will contribute staff time to work with the business analyst. Recipients of this service will be the general public, recreational users, businesses, organizations, contestants, the U.S. Coast Guard, Corps. of Engineers, and the federal government.

Has anyone considered a partnership with a private entity? For example, could you partner with a fishing retailer in exchange for some advertising?
DNR is very cautious about the appearance of promoting one entity over another, therefore does not have any advertising on its website.

Will there be a user's fee?
Yes, DNR intends to start charging a $25 fee for fishing tournaments. Potential user fees for other events under the DNR's authority are not yet known.

The campground reservation system does have a transaction fee associated with it. The IOWAccess Advisory Council makes recommendations to the Technology Governance Board about transaction fees, so that might be an option for this project as well. Iowa Interactive completed all of the work on the cabin and campground reservation system and as a result, gets a $1.00 transaction fee on each reservation. Could the special events application be a component of the cabin and campground reservation system? DNR responded that it might be a possibility.

How is the determination made whether Iowa Interactive completes a project or someone else does so? Tracy Smith explained there is no requirement for an agency to utilize Iowa Interactive. The agency, Iowa Interactive, and ITE mutually agree on how to move forward. Part of the decision is also dependant upon resources and the timeline.

Randy Nyberg moved approval of funding for scope analysis and asked DNR to come back with competitive bids; Terri Selberg seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken and recorded as follows:

Nays: None.
Abstentions: Sheila Castaneda.
Ayes: All others.

The motion carried.

7. DNR Boat Dock Registration – Implementation Change Request ($35,100) – Darrell Fremont, ITE.
   The boat dock application is complete, however could be improved upon with additional modifications, such as being able to add multiple documents to the same permit. Barb Corson moved approval of the funding; Sheila Castaneda seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; all members voted to approve.

8. DNR Boat Dock Registration – First Year Hosting ($3,726) – Darrell Fremont, ITE.
   The application is ready for public use. It has been customary in the past to fund the first year hosting fees. Due to Payment Card Industry (PCI) compliance rules, the database and application do not sit on the same server, so there are two charges. Barb Corson moved approval; Randy Nyberg seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; all members voted to approve.

9. Policy Discussions: Closing Projects – Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager.
   Currently, there is no process to close a project for lack of activity. Such a policy would have to be established by administrative rule, but would first require Council approval. One tactic would be to contact the agency and seek permission to close the project. Lack of response over a three month time period would be construed as automatic grounds for closing the project.

   What efforts are we making to solicit projects from agencies?
   Because of the Council's present financial state, ITE is not actively soliciting new projects. Under normal circumstances, Malcolm reviews applications in use by other entities/states and tries to determine if they would be feasible here.

10. ITE Project Updates – Mark Uhrin, ITE.
    The School Alerts program continues to grow. There are currently 209 school districts enrolled. Three TV stations in the Cedar Rapids area have also enrolled. The Department of Management has asked us to publicize and refer possible projects to the Iowa Innovations

Fund; it is a loan program, not a grant. The only project sitting idle at this time is the Sex Offender revision; we are waiting on their vendor.

11. Wrap Up and Adjourn – Dick Neri, Chair.
Dick mentioned that he would like to know if agencies are pursuing projects through Iowa Interactive and if not, what explanation they have for not doing so. Iowa Interactive cannot always provide what an agency needs, but frequently can leverage systems that have already been developed here or in other NIC states.

Tracy Smith offered a point of clarification. Iowa Interactive did not pull any staff off of an existing project in order to complete the Rebuild Iowa Office site or the election project. Work on those two projects did not affect the timeline for any agency projects.

JoAnn Naples inquired if the Council had made any decision about reviewing projects every three to six months rather than at each meeting. The Council discussed that option at one point, but did not take any formal action to adopt that policy.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.