**NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING**
Pursuant to Iowa Code §21.4
**DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES**
**IOWACCESS ADVISORY COUNCIL**
Wednesday, January 7, 2009 1:00 PM – 4:30 PM
Hoover Building, Conference Rooms 329/330

1. Introductions, Approve Minutes
   *Richard Neri, Chair*

2. Iowa Interactive Project Update
   *Tracy Smith, Iowa Interactive*

3. IOWAccess Projects and Projections Spreadsheets/Monthly Report/Customer Surveys
   *Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager*

4. DPS Breath Alcohol Program Records Scope Analysis                         **$30,000**
   *James Bleskacek, DPS*

5. DNR Training Change Request                                               **$13,000**
   *Darrell Fremont, DAS-ITE*

6. IDVA Dynamic Forms – Planning and Execution                              **$89,700**
   *Kent Hartwig, IDVA*

7. ICAB ICAB Online                                                        **$250,000**
   *Dick Moore, ICAB*

8. DHR Weatherization Assistance Program                                     **$40,500**
   *Jim Newton, DHR*                                              ***includes $3,500 hosting***

9. DNR Special Events Planning & Execution                                 **$157,500**
   *Jeff Kopaska, DHR*

10. Policy Discussions: Closing Projects
    *Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager*

11. ITE Project Updates
    *Mark Uhrin, DAS-ITE*

12. Wrap Up And Adjourn
    *Richard Neri, Chair*

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

<span style="color:red">**D r a f t**</span>

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.

# IOWAccess Project Concept Paper

1. **Email completed copy to the IOWAccess Manager: malcolm.huston@iowa.gov .**
2. **Send signed hard copy to Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager, DAS-ITE, Hoover B Level, Des Moines, IA, 50319-0150.**
3. **Contact ITE or vendor to prepare for project.**

**Date: December 17, 2008**

**Project Name:  Breath Alcohol Program Records**

**Requesting Agency:  Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Investigation**

**Is this project in support of a program designated as an Iowa Great Place, pursuant to section 303.3c? No**

**Project Point(s)-of-Contact:  James Bleskacek, 515-725-1500**

**Project Sponsor:  James Bleskacek, 515-725-1500**

**Business Case Justification:  Provide on line access to Breathalyzer records**

**Expected Results in this Project:  The public may obtain all open records concerning the equipment and testing.**

**Recipients of this Service:  the general public, attorneys in particular.**

**Request** *(include dollar amount and description of what will be purchased - i.e. services, hardware, software)*:  **$30,000 which will provide for business analysis and initial planning.**

**Project Timeline**

| Phase | Start Month/Year | End Month/Year | Estimated Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Scope Analysis** | Jan/2009 | March/2009 | $30,000 |
| **Design** | March/2009 | July/2009 | Unknown |
| **Implementation** | Jul/2009 | Dec/2009 | Unknown |

**Resources Being Contributed** *(people or funds being contributed to the project by the sponsoring agency- include role/% of time or amount in dollars)*:  **Personnel to assist in the business analysis and design.**

# IOWAccess Advisory Council Scoring Factors

Each IOWAccess Advisory Council member assigns a 1 to 10 point value on the following factors to your project proposal. These scores, plus your presentation before the Council and various discussion points, form the basis for the Council's decision on your proposal. Address each factor below:

## 1. Statutory requirement or other mandate

Is the project required by law or regulation, or is it needed to comply with state IT standards? Does the project fulfill a new mandate or is it required by existing law? Is it required by IT standards or necessary to interface with existing application?

This project falls under existing laws, specifically the Freedom of Information Act. Under the Freedom of Information Act, the state is required to produce articles of evidence that may be used against an individual.

In the field of breath alcohol, these articles include; subject test data, instrument accuracy checks, maintenance records, etc. These are examples of items that the DCI wishes to make accessible to all Iowans through this project, making sure not to provide information such as names, driver's license numbers or any other information prohibited by law.

## 2. Other funding source(s)

What other funding sources have been investigated and what were the results? Have they been applied for? What is available? Have transaction or other customer fees been considered? Is there a return to the IOWAccess Revolving Fund through transaction fees? Highest ranking for seeking/receiving outside funding.

There are no transaction fees which may be obtained.

The DCI is in the process of converting over the current evidential breath instrument to a new model. This is being done with federal funds through the Governor's Traffic Safety Bureau.

Others options for making this information available are also being explored and considered. These options require manual input of the data and records and are time consuming and may waste resources currently available.

## 3. Improved citizen access to government information

How is citizen access to government enhanced? Greater convenience? Better reliability? Proportion of manual/in person effort being replaced/eliminated? Faster response time? Easier to use? More secure? The greater the degree of citizen access to information, the more points.

This project will greatly enhance the quick availability of information that is requested by many citizens, especially attorneys. There are currently 183 instruments statewide. There are 12,000 to 15,000 tests given annually.

The Division receives one to six discoveries weekly for information pertaining to the instruments themselves or the tests that were performed using the instruments. These discoveries must currently be obtained by a staff member.

This project will allow the public to obtain the information on line immediately and at their convenience.  After reviewing the information, they may then elect to print the information.  The information supplied will include accuracy reports, maintenance reports (often used in court) as well as information pertaining to a particular test.

This information is available currently to the citizens of Iowa, primarily through their attorney in a discovery request.  Our goal is for citizens and attorneys to have access to this information at their leisure and not have to go through the courts to obtain it.

## 4. Impact on citizens or the business they conduct with the governmental entity

What segment of the citizen population is affected?  Is this just a select group or the public as a whole? How does the proposed solution meet an identified need vs. a "nice to have"?  Is the primary beneficiary the citizen vs. does this enhance the entity's ability to serve the citizen? Highest ranking for most citizens served.

The entire citizen population is affected in one way or another by drunk driving but we anticipate most use will be gained by attorneys.

The information also could be useful for law enforcement departments in determining staffing requirements and breath testing inventory.

County attorneys and the Department of Transportation (DOT) may also find the information useful in determining the amount of drunk driving cases which take place in and around their communities.

Local media outlets could access the information to better inform the population of the dangers associated with drunk driving.

## 5. Enhanced access to government information/ greater interactivity

How does the project enhance citizen one-stop electronic access to government information and transactions or allow for greater interactivity? The most points for "beneficial" use of IT to revamp business processes. Highest for total replacement.  Average if adds new dimension to existing service.

At the present time, the citizen must request the information either by mailing a request or by telephone.  They must then wait for the staff to research the item, make copies of all documents and mail the documents.  The citizen may also elect to come to the main office and pick up the documents.  For individuals who live in Iowa, but not near the Des Moines area, this can be a very time consuming and expensive method for obtaining this information.  By accessing the information over the web, they are not burdened with having to travel to Ankeny to obtain the information.

This project will allow the citizen to obtain the information when needed immediately thereby eliminating the need to request the information and wait for its delivery.

## 6. Collaboration

Does your project provide an opportunity for another governmental entity to share the resources or benefits?  Can your project be used by another entity? The most points for projects benefiting multiple governmental entities or encouraging collaboration between entities.  (May be demonstrated by letters of commitment from other entities.)

All law enforcement agencies could also benefit by accessing the information online.  The Iowa Governor's Traffic Safety Bureau could also benefit by using the information to determine the success of sTEP programs and other OWI enforcement programs.

Media outlets would also have a source to compile statistical data on the amount of OWI cases.

The Department of Transportation would have a source for determining areas that require additional law enforcement presence when dealing with OWI offenders.

## 7. Chance for success
Describe why the project is well placed for success.  Realistic timeline? Previous success rate? Sufficient support staff?  Upper level management commitment? More points for projects with low technical and business risk and high chance of success.

The Division is currently in the process of obtaining new instruments.  This will allow us to begin the use of these instruments with on line access to their information.  It is the best time to begin this project as we will be starting with all new information.

There are other states or county agencies that already have similar programs to this in place.  One such agency, The Los Angeles County Sheriffs Office website has a link to access this information:

http://app1.lasd.org/alcohol/ssb_alcohol.cfm

## 8. Estimated financial cost/benefit
Provide a rough calculation of costs vs. benefits.  The higher the ratio of estimated benefit to the estimated cost, the more points.

Currently, it takes a staff member approximately 2 hours to obtain all the information needed for each request.   Based on DAS/ITE's current rates, we anticipate recovering the amount spent on this project within 78 months.  This is based on obtaining six discoveries weekly and the total project cost being $200,000.  The figure for the project is an extreme ball park figure as we do not know at this time what the cost might be.

## 9. Transparency
How does the project enhance open and transparent government for citizens? More points for project with high usability in allowing citizens to quickly reach information or services.

The project provides immediate access to information that is publicly available.  The information is already collected, but is not in a form that is accessible to the public without having to contact an attorney or subpoena the records through the courts.

## 10. Efficiency

Why is this project the "best" solution for the need? Are there alternatives and if so, why are they inadequate? More points for project that replaces outdated/legacy system or localized information access.

Manual processes require more time from staff members and are always open to human error. By allowing lawyers and the general public the tools by which to obtain their own information, this will free up time Criminalists and other staff members spend doing these requests.

Criminalists already get between 400-500 subpoenas per year and are required to certify 180 evidential breath instruments throughout the state while training approximately 6000 certified officers.  The state of Iowa currently employs two individuals to accomplish this task.

By allowing everyone access to this information, the Criminalists can focus on their primary duties to ensure the breath alcohol program runs as efficiently as possible.

# Acknowledgement of Conditions for
## Approval of IOWAccess Project

## Project Approval Conditions

IOWAccess Revolving Fund project approvals are based upon the application materials submitted to the IOWAccess Advisory Council and approved by the Director of DAS.  Recipients of IOWAccess projects are subject to the following  conditions.

- The Iowa Accountable Government Act, Iowa Code Chapter 8E
- Information technology standards and practices that that are applicable to "participating agencies", the Office of the Governor, and elective constitutional or statutory officers pursuant to Iowa Code Section 8A.206.
- Iowa Administrative Code Section 11-25(8A) - Information Technology Operational Standards.
- Policies and procedures of the IOWAccess Advisory Council and DAS as outlined in this acknowledgement or published on their websites.

## IOWAccess Project Policy Guides

The acceptance of an IOWAccess Project is based on the following:

- Sponsoring agency is responsible for the efficient and effective administration of IOWAccess Projects through the application of sound management practices.
- The IOWAccess Project Process is guidance only and describes a customary sequence used in software development.  As such, sponsoring agencies are not required to conform to the IOWAccess Project Process.
- Sponsoring agency assumes responsibility for using IOWAccess funds in a manner consistent with program objectives and the terms and conditions of the IOWAccess Project.
- Sponsoring agency will commit appropriate resources in a timely manner to the project to prevent undue delay in project completion.
- Sponsoring agency will be responsible for compliance with audit requirements.
- Approval of one phase of an IOWAccess project does not mean that other phases will be approved.  Each phase is subject to separate approval.

## Guidelines for Costs

### Allowable costs

To be allowable under IOWAccess Projects, costs must meet the following general criteria:

- Be necessary and reasonable for proper and efficient performance of IOWAccess Projects.
- Be authorized or not prohibited under State or local laws or regulations.

✓ Not be included as a cost or used to meet cost sharing or matching requirements of any other State or Federal Project in either the current or a prior period, except as specifically provided by State law or regulation.

Reasonable costs

A cost is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the cost.  In determining the reasonableness of a cost, consideration shall be given to:

- Whether the cost is of a type generally recognized as ordinary and necessary for the operation of the sponsoring agency or performance under the IOWAccess Project.
- Market prices for comparable goods or services.

# Composition of Cost

Typical costs chargeable to IOWAccess Projects are:

- Cost of materials acquired, consumed, or expended specifically for the purpose of those Projects.
- Equipment and other capital expenditures detailed in the application and previously approved as part of the Project.

Amounts not recoverable as costs under one State or Federal Project may not be shifted to another State or Federal Project, unless specifically authorized by State or Federal legislation or regulation.

# Availability of Funds

DAS Finance processes the disbursement of all funds for IOWAccess Projects. Qualifying expenditures for goods and services obtained from other than DAS-ITE or Iowa Interactive, LLC, must be paid by the sponsor and submitted to DAS for reimbursement.  In order to facilitate the timely processing of IOWAccess Project reimbursements, entities must use the following process:

- The request must be submitted by the sponsor in writing or through e-mail to the IOWAccess Manager.
- The request must include the following information:
    - ✓ Identification of the IOWAccess Project for which reimbursement is being sought,
    - ✓ The amount of reimbursement requested,
    - ✓ Period of time covered by request,
    - ✓ A comprehensive description of the items covered by the request, and
    - ✓ Copies of any supportive documentation (e.g. vendor invoices, documentation for completed work).
- The IOWAccess Manager will review the supporting financial information and evaluate it against the originally approved project.

- When satisfied that the request meets the stated requirements, the IOWAccess Manager will recommend the request for approval for payment and submit it to DAS Finance for processing.
- In no case will the total reimbursement for each phase exceed the approved amount of the Project phase.

The sponsor seeking reimbursement of expenses is responsible for retaining all necessary documentation pertaining to the relevance and results of the work performed and will provide such documentation upon request.  DAS Finance will refer the Auditor of State to the sponsor should there be any questions about the expenditures associated with the Project.

## Sponsor Monthly Status Reports

No later than the 21st day of each month the sponsoring agency shall submit a status report to the IOWAccess Manager if work is being performed by a developer *other than DAS-ITE or Iowa Interactive, LLC*.  This status report should include:

- A short narrative of the accomplishments for the month.
- Descriptions of any changes in tasks, resources, or issues materially affecting the project plan and, if necessary, a schedule with new target dates provided.

## Changes to a Project

All changes to the Project, or the proposal that resulted in the Project, must be reviewed by the IOWAccess Advisory Council. The Sponsor must be prepared to appear before the IOWAccess Advisory Council to answer questions and provide any clarifications necessary prior to any action by the Council regarding a change to the Project.  Reasons for requesting a change to the amount of the Project include, but are not limited to:

- Changes in the scope or objectives of the Project.
- Changes in the amount of project funding.
- Carryover of approved funding for a period of more than one year from the date of approval of the original funding.

All changes to an Project recommended by the IOWAccess Advisory Council must be subsequently approved by the Director of DAS.

## Project Disputes

Iowa Code 679A.19  DISPUTES BETWEEN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES.

"Any litigation between administrative departments, commissions or boards of the state government is prohibited.  All disputes between said governmental agencies shall be submitted to a board of arbitration of three members to be composed of two members to be appointed by the departments involved in the dispute and a third member to be appointed by the governor.  The decision of the board shall be final."

## Sponsor Acceptance

Signing below will signify that sponsor acknowledges and agrees to the IOWAccess project approval conditions as defined in this document.

| Sponsor Signature | IOWAccess Manager Signature |
|---|---|
| Date | Date |

**Project Name:**      **DNR Training**               **Change request**   **CR-003**

**Urgency:**           **HIGH**

**Project Sponsor:**   **Megan Wisecup – Dept. of Natural Resources**

**Originator:**        **Darrell Fremont – DAS_ITE**      **Requested by:**      **Megan Wisecup**

**Date requested:**    **01/07/2009**

## Justification

**Description of Change Requested:**      Additional Execution funds for ELSI Integration

**Reason for Change:**      The work by a 3rd Party was not included in prior funding requests. The work by Central Bank is needed to complete the data transfer to and from the licensing application and the DNR Training application.

**Proposed Approach to Resolve:**      Adjust Execution budget by $13,200.00

## Impact

**Impact on Scope:**      None, Intent of the project has always been to transfer training certification data needed prior to a customer obtaining a license

**Impact on Scope Risk:**      None

**Impact on Schedule:**      Project work on the ELSI integration is scheduled to begin in January and to be completed by March 2009

**Impact on Staffing Effort:**      None, this work to be completed by the 3rd party.

**Impact on Spending:**      Increase Execution funding by $13,200.00 to $293,200.00 (details for request attached)

## Approval

| Originator/Date | Project Leader/Date | Sponsor/Date | Customer/Date |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# Iowa Department of Natural Resources
## Hunting & Fishing Change Request

**Central Bank**
Jefferson City, MO

| | Change Request | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Client Name:** | Iowa Dept. of Natural Resources | ☐ **Fix** | ☒ **Enhancement** |
| **Submitted By:** | Rich Smith | **Date of Request:** | 10/28/2008 |
| **CTB Project Manager:** | Darrell Shanks | **Project #:** | 2008-09 |
| **ALS Project Manager:** | Joe Sitton | **Date Required:** | m/d/yyyy |

**Subject of Change:** DNR Training ELSI Integration

**Description of Proposed Change:** *Please describe all changes to business rules, POS application, administration screens, reports, technical systems and other areas that would be affected by this change. Where necessary, please list any additional staff contact information. Reminder: Your input directly affects the results of the requested changes. Please provide as many details and examples as possible.*

### Business Rules
*Please state any changes to current business processes or specific transaction requirements*

IDNR has developed an internal Hunter Safety Training program that they wish to integrate with the ELSI Customer file. They need to be able to search for existing customer records, create new customer records, and obtain an IDNR# to link the customers safety certifications with their ELSI Customer record.

**See attached document for more information.**

### POS Application
*Please state any changes to POS applications such as new data prompts, changes in process flow, or changes in wording.*

### Administration Screens
*Please state any changes to the Administration Screens such as new screens required, new data prompts or new field locations.*

### Reports
*Please state any changes in reporting requirements such as new reports or changes to existing reports. Please provide as much detail as possible about the information to include in the reporting requirements.*

### Internet Application
*Please state any internet processing changes required.*

### Telephone Application
*Please state any telephone processing changes required.*

### Network Communication Systems

Date Modified: March 20, 2003

*Please state any technical changes required such as changes in networking (LAN / WAN) required.*

## Data Import
*Please state any data import functions required including file specifications and file sender if known.*

## Data Export
*Please state any data export functions required including file specifications and file destinations if known.*

## Security
*Please state any other required changes in security access.*

## Batch Processing
*Please state any batch processing changes required.*

## Other
*Please state any other required changes.*

## Documentation Updates

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☒ | Design Document / Business Rules | ☒ | Update Admin. Help Screens |
| ☒ | User Guide – POS | ☒ | User Guide – Admin |
| ☒ | Change Order Filing | | |
| | | | |

## Preliminary Estimate

**Preliminary Estimated Hours:**
*(This is only an estimated number of hours and is subject to review prior to final acceptance.)*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **ALS Estimated Hours:** | 0 | | |
| **CTB Estimated Hours:** | 80 | | |

**Preliminary Estimated Cost:** *(This in only an estimated cost and is subject to review prior to final acceptance.)*

| | PROJECT # | HOURS | RATE | COST |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ALS** | | 0 | $150.00 | $0.00 |
| **CTB** | | 80 | $165.00 | $13,200.00 |
| | | | **TOTAL COST** | **$13,200.00** |

**NOTE:**
*Enter estimated hours, tab or click in Hours, Cost, and Total Cost fields. F9 to calculate each field.*

*CTB and CTS management approval is required for all preliminary estimates in excess of $5,000.00.*
*This estimate is valid for 90 days. After 90 days, Central Bank reserves the right to issue a new cost estimate.*

**Preliminary Client Acceptance**          **Date:**

| Change Order Documentation |
|---|
| **CTB Notes / Issues / Questions** |
| **This would be charged at the new contracted rate of $165.00/hr**<br><br>**Kevin's Estimate:**<br>**I think we will have about 80 hours.  10 hours documentation.  70 hours coding.  This may be a framework thing also.**<br><br>**What other documentation do you need for this?  I know I didn't want to save anything out to Jira because you may 'alter' the final price.**<br><br>**1.       The update customer method may need to change to handle only having the updated fields coming in the request.**<br>**2.       We would also have some searches to do.**<br><br>**I think this should be pretty close for this.** |
| **CTS Notes / Issues / Questions** |
| |
| **ALS Notes / Issues / Questions** |
| |

| Final Estimate | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Final Estimated Hours:** *(This is only an estimated number of hours and could vary by plus or minus 20%.)* | | | | | **NOTE:** |
| ALS Estimated Hours: | 0 | | | | *Enter estimated hours, tab or click in Hours, Cost, and Total Cost fields.* |
| CTB Estimated Hours: | 0 | | | | |
| **Final Estimated Cost:** *(This is only an estimated cost and could vary by plus or minus 20%.)* | | | | | |
| | **PROJECT #** | **HOURS** | **RATE** | **COST** | |
| **ALS** | | 0 | $150.00 | $0.00 | *F9 to calculate each field.* |
| **CTB** | | 0 | $150.00 | $0.00 | |
| | | | **TOTAL COST** | **$0.00** | |
| *CTB and CTS management approval is required for all preliminary estimates in excess of $5,000.00.*<br>*This estimate is valid for 90 days.  After 90 days, Central Bank reserves the right to issue a new cost estimate.* | | | | | |
| **CTS Management Approval:** | | | **Date:** | | |
| **CTB Management Approval:** | | | **Date:** | | |
| **Final Client Acceptance** | | | **Date:** | | |

## NOTE:   Estimates are valid for 90 days from the date of request

# IOWAccess Advisory Council

## IOWAccess Revolving Fund Project Application

**Proposing agencies should complete and submit Parts I, II and III to request <u>Design</u> approval, then complete and submit Parts IV and V to request <u>Implementation</u> approval.**

## Part I - Project Information

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date:** | **December 29, 2008** |
| **Agency Name:** | **Department of Veterans Affairs** |
| **Project Name:** | **Dynamic Forms Project** |
| **Agency Manager:** | **Kent Hartwig** |
| **Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:** | **515-242-0031 Kent.Hartwig@iowa.gov** |
| **Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):** | **Patrick Palmersheim** |
| ***Initial* Total for Design:** | **$89,700** |
| ***Initial* Total for Implementation:** | **$** |
| ***Initial* Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:** | **$** |
| **Project Timeline: *(estimate start and end dates for project spending)*** | **Design Start Date: 1/09**<br><br>**Design End Date: 3/09**<br><br>**Implementation Start Date:**<br><br>**Implementation End Date:** |
| ***Revised* Total for Design and Implementation:** | **$** |
| ***Revised* Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:** | **$** |

# Part II - Project Overview

## 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.

Response:  The main purpose of this project is for DAS-ITE to add the capability for our veterans to be able to apply online at the IDVA website for:

1. The Veterans Trust Fund
2. Veterans Commemorative Property transactions
3. County Grant Program
4. Vietnam Bonus Program
5. War Orphan Tuition Assistance
6. Injured Veteran Grant Program
7. All other application for benefits and service currently made to the IDVA

This will be accomplished by adding the forms to the existing IDVA website as interactive forms so that counties and veterans may fill them out online and submit them without printing and mailing.  This will greatly improve the way veterans are able to apply to the IDVA for benefits and services by allowing the veteran to apply for a benefit at any time.

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

Response: IDVA's mission statement is "To enable management, staff, and our customers to accomplish their objectives by working cooperatively with them. To seek to constantly improve resources to serve Iowa veterans, their dependents and survivors, in securing benefits provided by federal and state laws."

This project dovetails with the department's mission by providing veterans with another option in accessing benefits through the state.  Also, it allows the department to improve services to veterans by streamlining applications into a database upon arrival and decreasing processing time for application received online.

## 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?

Response:  Currently, a veteran can go to the existing website and print off a hard copy of several of the applications, complete the application by hand and mail it in.  There is currently no system that allows for a Veteran to enter any information on line.  DAS-ITE will use existing enterprise standards to complete the project.

## D. Statutory or Other Requirements

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

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

   Response:  No, this expenditure is not required by Federal law, rule, or order.

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

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

**Response:** No, this expenditure is not required by state law or rule.

3. **Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement?**

   ☐   YES (If "YES", explain.)

   **Response:** No, this expenditure does not meet a health, safety or security requirement.

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

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

   **Response:** No, this expenditure is not necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard.

---

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

   **Response:** The participants of this project will be the IDVA and the veterans who apply for benefits.  It is estimated there may be as many as 750 veterans who will use the online capability on an annual basis.

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.

   **Response:** Veterans are an increasingly technologically savvy citizenry.  Printing out a form and completing it by hand is error-prone, cumbersome and frustrating.  Especially to those who are dealing with a combat related illness.  Online forms present an opportunity for the veteran and their spouse to complete the form and present it to the department in a manner that they are most comfortable with.

   Furthermore, online submittal will speed the processing time by getting the application to the department immediately instead of through the mail.  It will help to reduce human error in processing through handwriting interpretation and will provide more clarity to the program administer at the department.  Applications will be immediately placed into a database which will eliminate a portion of the department processing, speeding up the delivery of the benefit for the applicant.

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?

**Response:** This project provides an immediate connection to the Iowa Department of Veterans Affairs. By providing the option to complete applications online, a veteran has immediate satisfaction that they have submitted the form and it has been received.   This provides an added layer of accountability to the department to ensure the applicant is notified of the receipt of the form and that processing timeframes will be followed.  Staff members who administer programs have been involved in the development of this project and are fully prepared to adopt the use of online forms.

As an extension of the previous IDVA website design, there is anecdotal information indicating that the information provided on the site is 100% improved and is a valuable resource to veterans in this state. In fact, other states have informed the department that they are utilizing the site as a portal to federal information and they are planning to pattern their site after ours.  This project is an extension of Phase I to help veterans who feel more comfortable utilizing technology for their benefits.

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

 **Response:**  In extending the usability of our Phase I effort, this project will provide veterans with timely and reliable access to the services and resources that can assist them in their transition to civilian life as well as providing assistance for health and family issues.

---

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

- Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).

- Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).

- Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).

---

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**
**Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- Minimally improves customer service (0-3 points).

- Moderately improves customer service (4-6 points).

- Significantly improves customer service (7-10 points).

## F. Scope

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

   ☐   YES (If "YES", explain.)    X  NO,

   **Response:** No

   **2.   Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?**
   **X** YES (If "YES", explain.)

**Response:** Yes – The IDVA website was completely renovated in the first phase and DAS-ITE is adding the capability of submitting an application on-line rather than printing the application off, completing and sending it in via the mail in the second phase.

---

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

## G. Source of Funds

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

**Response:** Once completed, updates and changes will be made by the department and all associated costs will be absorbed by IDVA.  However, the department does not have the funds to pay for the design and implementation of the project and cannot absorb the cost at this time.

---

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

# Part III – Design Proposal

## Amount of Design Funding Requested: $89,700.00

## A. Process Reengineering

**1.**   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:** Currently, a veteran can go to the IDVA website, click on the application in which the veteran is interested, print off the application, complete the application and mail it into the IDVA.  The application is received at the IDVA offices where numerous fields of information from the application are entered into the appropriate spreadsheet by an IDVA resource.

**2.**   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:**  With the implementation of the capability to complete an application on-line, the veteran will fill in the required fields on the application and submit the application to the IDVA.  The following applications will be available for submission online:

1. Iowa Injured Veteran Grant Application

2. War Orphan Educational aid application

3. Iowa Veterans Trust Fund Assistance Application

4. Iowa Veterans Trust Fund Family Support Group or Children's Programs application

5. Iowa Veterans Trust Fund Honor Guard reimbursement application

6. Operation Recognition – Honorary High School Diploma application

Upon receipt, the submitted data for all applications will be saved to a new database.  The Vietnam Conflict Veterans Bonus program is being used as a pilot for full electronic handling.  The program administrator will use the database to maintain and process the application through the use of administrative screens.

For all other program applications a data file containing the application information will be emailed to one or more IDVA resources.  The appropriate IDVA resource will be able to transfer the data from the data file into the appropriate spreadsheet used for processing applications for that program.

A timeline for moving to fully on-line applications for the other programs have not yet been established, but the software is being designed with that goal in mind.

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**
**Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- <u>Minimal</u> use of information technology to reengineer government processes (0-3 points).

- <u>Moderate</u> use of information technology to reengineer government processes (4-6 points).

- <u>Significant</u> use of information technology to reengineer government processes (7-10).

## B. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Design phase of the project.  Include such items as **start date, projected end date**, planning, and database design.  Also include the parties responsible for each item.

Scope          -          Completed          -          IDVA and DAS-ITE

Planning/design funding request

January, 2009          IDVA

Planning/design     January, 2009 -          IDVA and DAS-ITE

Implementation funding request

May, 2009          IDVA

Implementation     May, 2009          IDVA and DAS-ITE

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

## C.  Spending Plan

**Explain how the funds will be allocated.**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Work on mock up screens | - | 360 hours - 30 screens X 12 hours per screen |
| Creation of test plan | - | 25 hours |
| Completion of requirements | - | 5 hours |
| Creation - detailed design document | - | 240 hours - 30 screens X 8 hours per screen |
| Data model | - | 20 hours |
| Project manager duties | - | 50 hours |
| Unknowns | - | <u>70 hours</u> |
| Total hours | - | 770 hours |

## D. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

**Respond to the following and transfer data to the Design Financial Benefit Worksheet, # 5 below and the Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet, # IV E3, as necessary:**

1. **One Year 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 One Year Pre-Project Cost:**

   Because the department will still maintain the processes needed to accept paper forms, we anticipate little actual reduction in department operational costs.

   **Quantify One Year Pre-Project Cost:**

| | State Total |
|---|---|
| **FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):** | $0 |
| **Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):** | $0 |
| **Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):** | $0 |
| **Total One Year Pre-Project Cost:** | $0 |

**One Year 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 One Year Post-Project Cost:**

Because the department will still maintain the processes needed to accept paper forms, we anticipate little actual reduction in department operational costs.

2. **Quantify One Year Post-Project Cost:**

| | State Total |
|---|---|
| **FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):** | $0 |
| **Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):** | $0 |
| **Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):** | $0 |
| **Total One Year Post-Project Cost:** | $0 |

3. **One Year Citizen Benefit** - Quantify t**he estimated one year value of the p**roje**ct to Iowa citizens. This includes th**e "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:**

Applications take approximately one hour to complete thoroughly.  Online forms will save the citizen time in completing the application and in returning the forms.

| Transaction Savings | |
|---|---|
| Number of annual online transactions: | 2000 |
| Hours saved/transaction: | .5 |
| Number of Citizens affected: | 750 |
| Value of Citizen Hour | $10 |
| Total Transaction Savings: | $3750 |
| Other Savings (Describe) | $0 |
| Total  One Year Citizen Benefit : | $3750 |

4. **Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance -** Quantify the estimated one year 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

**Response:**

Failure to complete this project will result in the department continuing to utilize a solely paper-based process and perpetuating the inefficiency associated with it.

5. **Design Financial Benefit Worksheet**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1): | $0 | |
| B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2): | $0 | |
| C. State Government Benefit (= A-B): | | $ 0 |
| D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3): | | $3750 |
| E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4): | | $0 |
| F. Total Design Benefit (C+D+E) | $3750 | |
| G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C): | $89700 | |
| Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) = | 0.041 | |
| Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100 | -95.81 | |

6. **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:**

By adding the capability for our veterans to apply on-line to the IDVA will greatly improve customer service for our veterans.  This allows a veteran the opportunity to apply for a benefit whenever it is convenient for them and in a format that they are more at ease with.

---

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

# Part IV – Implementation Funding

## Amount of Implementation Funding Requested: $

## Amount of Hosting Requested: $

*Note: Projects developed by DAS-ITE allow first year of hosting charges*

## A. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Implementation phase of the project.  Include such items as **start date,** coding, testing, deployment, conversion, parallel installation, and **projected date of final release**.  Also include the parties responsible for each item.

**Response:**

---

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

## B.  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.

|  | Current FY | | Current FY +1 | | Current FY +2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Cost($) | % Total Cost | Cost($) | % Total Cost | Cost($) | % Total Cost |
| **State General Fund** | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |
| **Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund** | $0 | 0% | $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% |
| **Total Project Cost** | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |
| **Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total** | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |

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

## C. Project Budget Table

It is necessary to <u>estimate and assign</u> a useful life figure to <u>each</u> 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.

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

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

| 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 | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Software | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Hardware | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Training | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Facilities | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Professional Services | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| ITE Services | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Supplies, Maint., etc. | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Other | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Totals | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |

## D. Spending plan

**Explain how the funds will be allocated.**

## E. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

**Respond to the following and transfer data to the Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet, #3 below, as necessary:**

1. **Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance –** Quantify the estimated annual <u>non-operations</u> 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.

**Response:**

2. **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:**

3. **Implementation Financial Benefit Worksheet**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1): | $ | |
| B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2): | $ | |
| C. State Government Benefit (= A-B): | | $ |
| D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3): | | $ |
| E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4): | | $ |
| F. Total Design Benefit (C+D+E) | $ | |
| G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C): | $ | |
| Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) = | | |
| Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100 | | |

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

# Part V – Auditable Outcome Measures

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

1. **Improved customer service**

   **Response:**

2. **Citizen impact**

   **Response:**

3. **Cost Savings**

   **Response:**

4. **Project reengineering**

   **Response:**

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

   **Response:**

6. **Tangible/Intangible benefits**

   **Response:**

# *Evaluation Summary*
## *[This section to be completed by application evaluator.]*

## Design Phase:

**Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

**Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

**Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

**Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

**Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)**

**Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

**Design Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

**Design Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

**TOTAL DESIGN EVALUATION (90 Points Maximum)**

## Implementation Phase:

**Implementation Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

**Implementation Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

**Implementation Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

**TOTAL IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION (35 Points Maximum)**

# IOWAccess Council
## Execution Phase Funding Request
January 7, 2009

**Amount Requested:** $250,000.00 – Phase 2
Total Execution Phase 1 and 2 - $495,000.00
**Project Name:**    ICAB online - 10222
**Project Sponsor:**  Richard Moore – Iowa Child Advocacy Board
**Project Manager:**  Darrell Fremont – DAS-ITE

## Project Summary
The ultimate result of this project is expected to be improved safety and permanency outcomes for abused and neglected children being served by Iowa's child welfare system. Project-specific expected result is the development and implementation of Iowa Child Advocacy Online. Operational improvement results are expected to include:

- a general public accessible website that promotes public awareness of child advocacy issues and includes a volunteer recruitment application and training functions
- a secure website accessible to ICAB staff, volunteers, DHS, Court and other officials designed to facilitate a variety of information exchanges to reduce reliance on paper-based information exchanges and retention practices
- the establishment of a centralized ICAB program operations data system that allows real time updating and accessing by all local offices
- business logic to control the security, storage, backup, and flow of data between office staff, volunteers and the general public
- ICAB capacity to facilitate and participate in future service oriented architecture initiatives and other multi-agency efforts to enhance the coordination and usefulness of data systems with connections to Iowa's child welfare system.

The Phase 2 funding request will complete the project after extensive work defining needed reports, mapping current databases for migration into a central database and integrating the functionality of a central document management system into the application.

**Execution Phase Two Activities and Deliverables include:**

**Update design and code 60 defined Reports:  950 hours**
Code reports using SQL 2005 Reporting Services
Code Report Parameters on multiple views

**Additional Application programming**: **400 hours**
Modify and adjust views/commands to customer's business requirements

**Laserfiche [Document Management] web service: 100 hours**
Add the functionality to place, index, sort, order and retrieve scanned and created document files within the customer's document management system through the application.

**ITE Functional Testing: 400 hours**
complete test plan and test scripts
run test scripts, report errors, document releases

**Change Control: 300 hours**
Budget allowance to complete minor changes to application from customer testing

**Tab B Return on Investment Program Funding Application for FY 09**

**Contact Information:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Date: | July 9, 2008 |
| Agency Name: | Iowa Child Advocacy Board/DIA |
| Project Name: | Modernizing Child Advocacy |
| Agency Manager: | Richard Moore |
| Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail: | Ext. 2-6392 / rmoore@dia.state.ia.us |
| Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee): | Richard Moore |

**Amount of Funding Requested:** $ 245,000.00 Phase 1

**Section I:  Project Description: Describe the project and how the project will to be accomplished. Explain technology that will be used and how this works within your agency's technology architecture and adheres to enterprise wide standards. Describe the investments to be made in infrastructure and services. Explain how the project will fit into your agency and state strategic plan, IT strategic and tactical plan, Governor's leadership agenda, and if appropriate, how the project relates to enterprise wide or multiple agencies' initiatives (*Please limit explanation to 500 words- You may supplement* with any tables or data that will assist in understanding project)**

**Objective 1:** Provide potential and active ICAB volunteers and ICAB staff with web-based information and resources that increase their awareness of child advocacy issues and that facilitate their advocacy work activities and interactions with each other.  **Objective 2:** Provide for electronic sending and receiving of reports and other information, much of which are now being copied, packaged and sent through ground-based mail services to and from the state office, satellite offices and program volunteers; and extend e-access to ICAB case-level reports and other documents to DHS, Judicial Branch and others (that currently receive such through ground-based mail) according to their capacities and business rules.  **Objective 3:** Make more efficient use of ICAB state office IT staff now having to travel to satellite offices to collect data files and trouble-shoot workstation and database-related issues that could be accomplished remotely with an improved IT environment. **Objective 4:**  Establish an ICAB IT environment that allows for participation in future service oriented architecture initiatives and other multi-agency efforts to enhance the coordination and usefulness of data systems with connections to Iowa's child welfare system.

To prepare this proposal, an in-house assessment was conducted of ICAB's IT security, equipment and services; program operations and needs; currently occurring information exchanges with other agencies; and, state and federal requirements for ICAB's development and use of program-related databases.

Consideration also was given to other state offices' IT and program planning initiatives to identify opportunities for improvements to procedures through which ICAB now submits and receives data and reports to and from them.

Judicial Branch IT and Court Improvement Project staff and DHS personnel would be consulted throughout the project to determine how their current and planned efforts could be assisted with new types of information from the enhanced capacities of ICAB's CASA program and Foster Care Registry databases. During the implementation of this project, longer-range multi-agency child welfare-related data coordination plans also would be developed.

## Section II:  Expected Results

**Describe the benefits to be achieved including impact on citizens, other agencies and department staffs. Include estimates where possible of the number of users and how these users will participate in project development and benefit from its availability.**

More effective targeting of ICAB resources to direct customer services is expected through reduced paperwork-handling duties of direct service staff.  In SFY2006, over 3,700 children were served by ICAB programs that involve 20 local program coordinators and over 900 certified volunteers.

Longer-range expected benefits include improved child welfare system planning and monitoring through the availability of better information from ICAB programs and from multi-agency data coordination activities. It is hoped that increased efficiencies or improved case processing by the Courts and DHS will be possible through ICAB efforts to partner with them on child welfare data coordination efforts.  Annually, many thousands of children and families experience the child welfare system and DHS, alone, annually invests over $800,000,000 in services to children and families in Iowa.

ICAB program coordinators, volunteers and other interested parties will be consulted throughout the project to help make the ICAB IT enhancements responsive to their immediate and anticipated data and multi-agency data coordination needs.

**Describe how project assists agency in meeting any mandates, compliance with technology standards or health, safety or security requirements**

This project will result in a more secure ICAB IT environment to ensure compliance with state and federal confidentiality policies related to the child welfare and child abuse information collected and maintained by ICAB.

I.C. Section 237.17 requires ICAB to establish a registry of the placements of all children receiving foster care.  Included in this law are requirements for DHS to provide ICAB with notices, case plans and case plan revisions regarding all such

child placements.  Current levels of compliance with this law are unsatisfactory. The current ICAB IT environment is not resourced to take advantage of current and emerging technology that could be used to solve this problem and, in turn, improve ICAB's ability to comply with I.C. Section 237.18 requirements for the preparation of various reports, evaluations and recommendations.  Implementing this project will establish an ICAB IT environment that is capable of new data coordination initiatives with DHS and the Courts designed to achieve compliance with these state laws.

**Describe how processes within your agency will be affected by the completion of the project. What changes will occur in organization structure, systems, or processes.**

Annually, over 5,000 written, multi-page reports are prepared, copied and mailed by ICAB to Court and DHS officials.  A much larger number of documents are mailed from ICAB to volunteers to support their case-level work.  Beginning during the implementation year of this project, these ground-mailings will begin being transitioned to electronic mailings.  Succeeding years will continue this transitioning of how ICAB sends information internally and to others. The ICAB administrator will work with DHS and others to request and facilitate plans for their electronic submission of data to ICAB.  As such plans are developed, originating data sources and database management procedures will be examined to identify opportunities for service oriented architecture-based data exchanges.

This project would reduce the need for ICAB staff to travel to satellite offices to collect data files and trouble-shoot workstation and database-related issues. Time saved would be redirected to quality assurance activities, development of IT-related staff training resources, database management and data coordination assignments. Any satellite office staff time saved will be redirected to direct service improvement activities.

*(Please limit explanation to 500 words. You may supplement with any tables or data that will assist in understanding the benefits)*

**Section III:  Financial Analysis**

**1.   Complete table one as outlined in enclosure one to indicate the estimated costs for acquisition/development and ongoing costs for up to five years where applicable. Indicate approximate share of project that will be funded from various funding sources table two to enclosure one.**

Although not indicated in the attached "Table One," ICAB staff time will be invested in the implementation of this project.  Time of the ICAB administrator and one IT position will be redirected to manage and carryout the activities described above. During the design phase of this project, cost-benefit decisions will be made to determine the use of optional combinations of in-house DIA and ICAB staff and services and/or SLA's with DAS/ITE and/or contract vendors to carry out various

initial and ongoing aspects of this project and its resulting IT environment. Such decisions will impact on the scope and nature of the ICAB staff time investment.

There will be recurring/ongoing monthly costs in '09 through '12 associated with the increased number and capacity of DSL lines and software licensing. It is projected that such costs will be offset through reduced state office travel and overtime costs and through reductions in copying and postage expenses of ICAB reports and other information as transitions from ground-mail to electronic distribution are completed.

**2. Estimated cost reductions to agency from project. Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process after project implementation. Describe all cost reductions and how those reductions will be achieved including personnel reductions or deferred hiring, table three of enclosure one.**

It is estimated that reduction of expenses in certain ICAB general fund budget categories (travel, overtime salary and postage) will occur following the implementation of the improved ICAB IT environment (2009-2012: $28,000/yr. estimate). Further, it is assumed that, beginning in 2010, the enhanced IT environment and the resulting reduced paper-handling will facilitate additional cost reductions through not filling one support staff position and reconfiguring the assignments and job classes of several other positions following projected staff attrition (2010-2012: $45,000/yr. estimate). The cost reductions made possible through the proposed IT initiative will allow for enhancements to ICAB core services.

**3. Other Benefits. Explain other cost reductions or intangible benefits to customers as defined in section II, these expenses may be of a personal or business nature. Discuss Risks of not proceeding with project including loss of other funds, avoidance of penalties or consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards.**

One of the returns on the investment for this project is the ability of the enhanced ICAB IT environment to streamline office procedures related to the copying and packaging of hard copy reports and documents. Reducing staff time spent on such activities will allow staff to spend more time on case-level work; volunteer recruitment, training and oversight; and preparations of reports to the Court, DHS and other officials. The thousands of children affected by ICAB services will benefit.

This project would establish a more robust ICAB IT environment so it can provide more helpful information about its own programs and Iowa's foster care population to DHS, the Courts, the Governor, the General Assembly and others; and so it can help facilitate and participate in multi-agency efforts to enhance the coordination and usefulness of data systems with connections to Iowa's child welfare system. Another, perhaps farther-reaching return from the requested investment will be the

improvements and better-informed case-level and system-wide decisions that can be made with an increase in the availability and usefulness of information about the processes and outcomes of Iowa's child welfare system – a system that involves hundreds of federal, state and local officials; thousands of children and families; and, hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

*(Please limit explanation to 500 words. You may supplement with any tables or data that will assist in understanding the benefits of project)*

## 4. Calculate estimated Return On Investment (ROI), table four enclosure one: (displayed below & submitted as separate Excel spreadsheet)

## Enclosure One, Financial Analysis Spreadsheet to Return on Investment (ROI) Program Funding Application

**Agency Name: ICAB**
**Application Name: Modernizing Child Welfare**

### Table One:  Estimated Project Cost

|  | FY08 | FY09 | FY10 | FY11 | FY12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Development and Implementation Costs | $140,480 | $245,000 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Recurring Costs |  | $3,500 | $3,500 | $3,500 | $3,500 |
| Total Costs | $140,480 | $248,500 | $3,500 | $3,500 | $3,500 |

### Table Two: Percentage of Costs From

|  | FY08 | FY09 | FY10 | FY11 | FY12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| General Fund |  |  | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Federal or other funding (IOWAccess Council) | 100% | 100% |  |  |  |
| Pooled Technology Fund |  |  |  |  |  |

### Table Three:  Projected Reduction in Expense

|  | FY08 | FY09 | FY10 | FY11 | FY12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| For Requesting Agency | $0 | $28,000 | $73,000 | $73,000 | $73,000 |
| For Other State Agencies | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| TOTAL Cost Reductions | $0 | $28,000 | $73,000 | $73,000 | $73,000 |

### Table Four: Calculated Estimated Return on Investment

|  | FY08 | FY09 | FY10 | FY11 | FY12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total projected cost from table one | $140,480 | $245,000 | $3,500 | $3,500 | $3,500 |
| Total projected cost reductions from table three | $0 | $28,000 | $73,000 | $73,000 | $73,000 |
| Projected Net Benefit to the State of Iowa | $0 | $0 | $69,500 | $69,500 | $69,500 |

## Section IV:  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:** satisfaction/usefulness of enhanced ICAB IT capacity as measured through surveys and interviews with volunteers, local office staff and other officials involved with Iowa's child welfare system
2. **Citizen impact:** % child welfare cases receiving ICAB reviews and CASA services as measured through reports from DHS and ICAB data systems; % ICAB case recommendations accepted through DHS/Court  case planning decisions as measured with reports generated from enhanced ICAB databases; % increase in volunteer applications processed

3. **Cost Savings:** ICAB budget tracked by budget category to determine ongoing impact of enhanced IT environment on various ICAB business processes and operational expenses
4. **Project reengineering:** specific project milestones (e.g. RFA's issued, bids accepted, equipment installed and databases migrated as scheduled, % reports available electronically, etc.) to be established and tracked upon project funding approval
5. **Source of funds (Budget %):** N/A
6. **Tangible/Intangible benefits:** % multi-agency child welfare system data coordination initiatives implemented as planned as measured by ICAB documentation; impact measures of multi-agency child welfare system data coordination initiatives to be determined as initiatives are planned and agreed to by involved parties

**Enclosure One – Financial Analysis**

# IOWAccess Advisory Council

---

## IOWAccess Revolving Fund Project Application

**Proposing agencies should complete and submit Parts I, II and III to request <u>Planning</u> approval, then complete and submit Parts IV and V to request <u>Execution</u> approval.**

## Part I - Project Information

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date:** | January 7, 2009 |
| **Agency Name:** | Iowa Child Advocacy Board/DIA |
| **Project Name:** | ICABonline: Modernizing Child Advocacy |
| **Agency Manager:** | Richard Moore |
| **Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:** | Ext. 2-6392 / rmoore@dia.state.ia.us |
| **Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):** | Richard Moore |
| *Initial* **Total for Planning:** | $ 120,780 |
| *Initial* **Total for Execution:** | $ 495,000 |
| *Initial* **Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:** | $ 615,780 |
| **Project Timeline:** *(estimate start and end dates for project spending)* | **Planning Start Date:**<br><br>**Planning End Date:**<br><br>**Execution Start Date:**<br><br>**Execution End Date: 08/01/2009** |
| *Revised* **Total for Planning and Execution:** | $ |
| *Revised* **Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:** | $ |

# Part II - Project Overview

**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.

 Response:

**Objective 1:** Provide potential and active ICAB volunteers and ICAB staff with web-based information and resources that increase their awareness of child advocacy issues and that facilitate their advocacy work activities and interactions with each other.

**Objective 2:** Provide for electronic sending and receiving of reports and other information, much of which are now being copied, packaged and sent through ground-based mail services to and from the state office, satellite offices and program volunteers; and extend e-access to ICAB case-level reports and other documents to DHS, Judicial Branch and others (that currently receive such through ground-based mail) according to their capacities and business rules.

**Objective 3:** Make more efficient use of ICAB state office IT staff now having to travel to satellite offices to collect data files and trouble-shoot workstation and database-related issues that could be accomplished remotely with an improved IT environment.

**Objective 4:** Establish an ICAB IT environment that allows for participation in future service oriented architecture initiatives and other multi-agency efforts to enhance the coordination and usefulness of data systems with connections to Iowa's child welfare system.

To prepare this proposal, an in-house assessment was conducted of ICAB's IT security, equipment and services; program operations and needs; currently occurring information exchanges with other agencies; and, state and federal requirements for ICAB's development and use of program-related databases.  Consideration also was given to other state offices' IT and program planning initiatives to identify opportunities for improvements to procedures through which ICAB now submits and receives data and reports to and from them.

Judicial Branch IT and Court Improvement Project staff and DHS personnel would be consulted throughout the project to determine how their current and planned efforts could be assisted with new types of information from the enhanced capacities of ICAB's CASA program and Foster Care Registry databases. During the implementation of this project, longer-range multi-agency child welfare-related data coordination plans also would be developed.

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

   **Response:**

More effective targeting of ICAB resources to direct customer services is expected through reduced paperwork-handling duties of direct service staff.  In SFY2006, over 3,700 children were served by ICAB programs that involve 20 local program coordinators and over 900 certified volunteers.

Longer-range expected benefits include improved child welfare system planning and monitoring through the availability of better information from ICAB programs and from multi-agency data coordination activities. It is hoped that increased efficiencies or improved case processing by the Courts and DHS will be possible through ICAB efforts to partner with them on child welfare data coordination efforts.  Annually, many thousands of children and families experience the child welfare system and DHS, alone, annually invests over $800,000,000 in services to children and families in Iowa.

ICAB program coordinators, volunteers and other interested parties will be consulted throughout the project to help make the ICAB IT enhancements responsive to their immediate and anticipated data and multi-agency data coordination needs.

## 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?

**Response:**

Each office utilizes Access databases, COMET for the CASA program and REGISTRY for the FCRB program. There are 23 offices and coordination of data has been an issue. Developing performance reports has been problematic.  Information distribution to volunteers, courts and DHS has all been paper based. This project will enable ICAB to become paper-less.

## D.  Statutory or Other Requirements

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

☐  **YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)**
Response:

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

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

Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement?

☑  **YES (If "YES", explain.)**
Response:
This project will result in a more secure ICAB IT environment to ensure compliance with state and federal confidentiality policies related to the child welfare and child abuse information collected and maintained by ICAB.

I.C. Section 237.17 requires ICAB to establish a registry of the placements of all children receiving foster care.  Included in this law are requirements for DHS to provide ICAB with notices, case plans and case plan revisions regarding all such child placements.  Current levels of compliance with this law are unsatisfactory. The current ICAB IT environment is not resourced to take advantage of current and emerging technology that could be used to solve this problem and, in turn, improve ICAB's ability to comply with I.C. Section 237.18 requirements for the preparation of various reports, evaluations and recommendations.  Implementing this project will establish an ICAB IT environment that is capable of new data coordination initiatives with DHS and the Courts designed to achieve compliance with these state laws.

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

☐  YES (If "YES", cite the specific standard.)
**Response:**

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

Response:

This project would establish a more robust ICAB IT environment so it can provide more helpful information about its own programs and Iowa's foster care population to DHS, the Courts, the Governor, the General Assembly and others; and so it can help facilitate and participate in multi-agency efforts to enhance the coordination and usefulness of data systems with connections to Iowa's child welfare system. Another, perhaps farther-reaching return from the requested investment will be the improvements and better-informed case-level and system-wide decisions that can be made with an increase in the availability and usefulness of information about the processes and outcomes of Iowa's child welfare system – a system that involves hundreds of federal, state and local officials; thousands of children and families; and, hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

**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.

Response:

Annually, over 5,000 written, multi-page reports are prepared, copied and mailed by ICAB to Court and DHS officials. A much larger number of documents are mailed from ICAB to volunteers to support their case-level work. Beginning during the implementation year of this project, these ground-mailings will begin being transitioned to electronic mailings. Succeeding years will continue this transitioning of how ICAB sends information internally and to others. The ICAB administrator will work with DHS and others to request and facilitate plans for their electronic submission of data to ICAB. As such plans are developed, originating data sources and database management procedures will be examined to identify opportunities for service oriented architecture-based data exchanges.

This project would reduce the need for ICAB staff to travel to satellite offices to collect data files and trouble-shoot workstation and database-related issues. Time saved would be redirected to quality assurance activities, development of IT-related staff training resources, database

management and data coordination assignments.  Any satellite office staff time saved will be redirected to direct service improvement activities.

**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?

**Response:**

One of the returns on the investment for this project is the ability of the enhanced ICAB IT environment to streamline office procedures related to the copying and packaging of hard copy reports and documents.  Reducing staff time spent on such activities will allow staff to spend more time on case-level work; volunteer recruitment, training and oversight; and preparations of reports to the Court, DHS and other officials.  The thousands of children affected by ICAB services will benefit.

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

Response:

This project will result in a more secure ICAB IT environment to ensure compliance with state and federal confidentiality policies related to the child welfare and child abuse information collected and maintained by ICAB.

I.C. Section 237.17 requires ICAB to establish a registry of the placements of all children receiving foster care.  Included in this law are requirements for DHS to provide ICAB with notices, case plans and case plan revisions regarding all such child placements.  Current levels of compliance with this law are unsatisfactory. The current ICAB IT environment is not resourced to take advantage of current and emerging technology that could be used to solve this problem and, in turn, improve ICAB's ability to comply with I.C. Section 237.18 requirements for the preparation of various reports, evaluations and recommendations.  Implementing this project will establish an ICAB IT environment that is capable of new data coordination initiatives with DHS and the Courts designed to achieve compliance with these state laws.

---

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

- Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).

- Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).

- Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**
**Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- Minimally improves customer service (0-3 points).

- Moderately improves customer service (4-6 points).

- Significantly improves customer service (7-10 points).

## F. Scope

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

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

**Response:**

**Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?**

☐ YES (If "YES", explain.)

**Response:**

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**
**Scope 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 Execution and termination of the project / expenditure would waste previously invested resources.

## G. Source of Funds

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

**Response:**

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

# Part III – Planning Proposal

## Amount of Planning Funding Requested: $

## A. Process Reengineering

Provide a *pre-project or pre-expenditure* (before Execution) 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:**

Provide a *post-project or post-expenditure* (after Execution) 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:**

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

## B. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Planning phase of the project.  Include such items as **start date, projected end date**, planning, and database Planning.  Also include the parties responsible for each item.

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

## C.  Spending plan

**Explain how the funds will be allocated.**

## D. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

**Respond to the following and transfer data to the Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet, # 5 below and the Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet, # IV E3, as necessary:**

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


**Quantify One Year Pre-Project Cost:**

|  | State Total |
|---|---|
| **FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):** | $ |
| **Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):** | $ |
| **Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):** | $ |
| **Total One Year Pre-Project Cost:** | $ |


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


**Quantify One Year Post-Project Cost:**

|  | State Total |
|---|---|
| **FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):** | $ |
| **Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):** | $ |
| **Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):** | $ |
| **Total One Year Post-Project Cost:** | $ |


**3. One Year Citizen Benefit** - Quantify the estimated one year 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:**

| Transaction Savings | |
|---|---|
| **Number of annual online transactions:** | 9000 |
| **Hours saved/transaction:** | 5 |
| **Number of Citizens affected: [direct citizen volunteer users of the system]** | 1500 |
| **Value of Citizen Hour** | $10.00 |
| **Total Transaction Savings:** | $75,000.00 |
| **Other Savings (Describe)** | $ |
| **Total  One Year Citizen Benefit :** | $75,000.00 |

**4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance -** Quantify the estimated one year 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

> **Response:**

**5**. **Planning Phase Cost Calculation**
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, etc., during the **Planning Phase**.

| | Current FY | | Current FY +1 | | Current FY +2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Cost($) | % Total Cost | Cost($) | % Total Cost | Cost($) | % Total Cost |
| **State General Fund** | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |
| **Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund** | $0 | 0% | $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% |
| **Total Project Cost** | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |
| **Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total** | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |

**6. Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):** | $ | |
| **B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):** | $ | |
| **C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):** | | $ |
| **D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):** | | $ |
| **E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):** | | $ |
| **F. Total Planning Benefit (C+D+E)** | $ | |
| **G.  Planning Phase Cost Calculation (Section III D5):** | $ | |
| **Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =** | | |
| **Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100** | | |

**6.**

**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:**

---

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

# Part IV – Execution Funding

## Amount of Execution Funding Requested: $250,000.00

## Amount of Hosting Requested: $0

*Note: Projects developed by DAS-ITE allow first year of hosting charges*

## A. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Execution phase of the project.  Include such items as **start date,** coding, testing, deployment, conversion, parallel installation, and **projected date of final release**.  Also include the parties responsible for each item.

**Response:**
**Start Date: 01/05/2009**
**complete coding for first release: 04/03/2009**
**test releases: 03/02 – 06/01/2009**
**migrate data from local offices: 03/15 – 05/01/2009 – ITE and ICAB**
**validate migrated data: 05/01 – 06/30/2009**
**complete coding of reports: 07/15/2009**
**test reports: 06/15 – 07/30/2009**
**Projected date of final release: 08/07/2009**

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

## B.  Execution 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, etc., during the **Execution Phase**.

| | Current FY | | Current FY +1 | | Current FY +2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Cost($) | % Total Cost | Cost($) | % Total Cost | Cost($) | % Total Cost |
| State General Fund | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |
| Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund | $245000 | 0% | $250000 | 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% |
| Total Project Cost | $245000 | 0% | $250000 | 0% | $0 | 0% |
| Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |

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

## C. 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.

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

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

| 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 | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Software | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Hardware | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Training | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Facilities | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Professional Services | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| ITE Services | $495000 | 10 | 100% | $3500 | 100% | $ |
| Supplies, Maint., etc. | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Other | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Totals | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |

## D. Spending plan

**Explain how the funds will be allocated.**

## E. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

**Respond to the following and transfer data to the Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet, #3 below, as necessary:**

**1. 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.

**Response:**

**2. 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:**

**3**. **Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet** – Copy items A through F from Part III (Planning Phase), Section III D6; item G is from Section IV C, above.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1): | $101,000 | |
| B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2): | $28,000 | |
| C. State Government Benefit (= A-B): | | $73,000 |
| D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3): | | $75,000 |
| E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4): | | $28,000 |
| F. Total Planning Benefit (C+D+E) | $176,000 | |
| G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C): | $53,000 | |
| Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) = | 3.3 | |
| Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100 | 24.8 | |

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

# *Evaluation Summary*
## *[This section to be completed by application evaluator.]*

## Planning Phase:

Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)

Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

Planning Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

Planning Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

TOTAL PLANNING EVALUATION (90 Points Maximum)

## Execution Phase:

Execution Timeline Evaluation (10Points Maximum)

Execution Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

Execution Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

TOTAL EXECUTION EVALUATION (35 Points Maximum)

## Part V – Auditable Outcome Measures

**For each of the following categories, <u>list the auditable metrics for success</u> after Execution and <u>identify how they will be measured.</u>**

1. Improved customer service

     **Response:** satisfaction/usefulness of enhanced ICAB IT capacity as measured through surveys and interviews with volunteers, local office staff and other officials involved with Iowa's child welfare system

2. Citizen impact

 **Response:** % child welfare cases receiving ICAB reviews and CASA services as measured through reports from DHS and ICAB data systems; % ICAB case recommendations accepted through DHS/Court  case planning decisions as measured with reports generated from enhanced ICAB databases; % increase in volunteer applications processed

3. Cost Savings

 **Response:** ICAB budget tracked by budget category to determine ongoing impact of enhanced IT environment on various ICAB business processes and operational expenses

4. Project reengineering

 **Response:** specific project milestones (e.g. RFA's issued, bids accepted, equipment installed and databases migrated as scheduled, % reports available electronically, etc.) to be established and tracked upon project funding approval

5. Source of funds (Budget %)

     **Response: NA**

6. Tangible/Intangible benefits

1.   Response: % multi-agency child welfare system data coordination initiatives implemented as planned as measured by ICAB documentation; impact measures of multi-agency child welfare system data coordination initiatives to be determined as initiatives are planned and agreed to by involved parties

## IOWAccess Revolving Fund Project Application

**Request for Funding to complete Execution Phase; no funding required for Scope Analysis or Planning Phases**

## Part I - Project Information

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date:** | **December 31, 2008** |
| **Agency Name:** | **Department of Human Rights** |
| **Project Name:** | **Weatherization Assistance Program** |
| **Agency Manager:** | **Jim Newton** |
| **Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:** | **(515) 242-6314 / JIM.NEWTON@iowa.gov** |
| **Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):** | **Jim Newton** |
| ***Initial* Total for Planning:** | **$ N/A** |
| ***Initial* Total for Execution:** | **$ N/A** |
| ***Initial* Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:** | **$34,000 Planning/Execution Phase** <br> **$6,500 Hosting** |
| **Project Timeline: *(estimate start and end dates for project spending)*** | **Project Start Date:  Jun 08** <br> **Expected Project Completion Date:  Mar 09** |
| ***Revised* Total for Planning and Execution:** | **$** |
| ***Revised* Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:** | **$** |

# Part II - Project Overview

**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.

   **Response:**

The Department of Human Rights (DHR) is asking the IOWAccess Advisory Council to fund 25% or $34,000 for the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) software development project plus the first year's hosting costs of $6,500.  With this funding, IOWAccess will help add functionality to enhance the WAP process; provide reporting abilities to improve management of the program by the agencies in the field and the central DHR office; and help offset the risks associated with custom built software development projects. DHR is funding 75% or $80,000 of the project.

The initiation of this project started in June 2008.  Development for the project started in September and the new application is planned to be implemented in March, 2009 before the next program year starts on April 1, 2009.

The mission of the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) is to "reduce energy costs for low-income families, particularly for the elderly, people with disabilities, and children, by improving the energy efficiency of their homes while ensuring their health and safety."

DHR's WAP software development project will replace an existing, out-of-date MS Access system with a web based software application and centralized SQL Server database.  The new system will improve accessibility to weatherization information, increase the productivity of local organizations throughout the state that provide weatherization assistance, and enhance the overall effectiveness of the program.

The Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) was created in 1976 to assist low-income families who lacked resources to invest in energy efficiency. The WAP is operated in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Native American tribes.  Funds are used to improve the energy efficiency of low-income homes using the most advanced technologies and testing protocols available in the housing industry. The energy conservation resulting from the efforts of state and local agencies helps our country reduce its dependence on foreign oil and decrease the cost of energy for families in need while improving the health and safety of their homes.

In the State of Iowa, the Department of Human Rights administers the program and oversees nearly 20 non-profit agencies that provide Weatherization services in the state. The current DHR process, which uses MS Access, requires that files must be modified for and by each agency then emailed back and forth between the agency and DHR.  This process is difficult as well as costly to manage and maintain.  This process creates multiple versions of the same database; therefore, DHR's copy may not have the most accurate data because it is out of sync with the individual databases at each non-profit organization.

In addition, the files that are emailed back and forth contain confidential data about each applicant seeking weatherization for their home. This project will implement appropriate security to allow each agency to access only the information they are authorization to obtain and help prevent unauthorized parties from obtaining confidential and personal information.

The goal of this project is to provide functionality and features that are comparable with the existing system and improve the process where possible.  The technical architecture of the new system eliminates the need to email flies with confidential data between agencies throughout the state and DHR.

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

### Response:

One of the major programs of DHR is the Weatherization Assistance Program. DHR is looking for ways that the department and the non-profit community organizations can become more efficient and more effective providing service to low income families.  There is a potential that federal funding will be increased in the future so more families can benefit from this program. Increased funding will not only provide weatherization to more families but will also employee more people.   DHR is preparing for a substantial increase in the size of the WAP program. This new software system is very important to help DHR and each non-profit organization to manage the process for a greater volume of homes to be weatherized each year.

## 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?

### Response:

The current technology is out-of-date MS Access that must be manually manipulated by DHR with copies emailed to each community organization for additional updates that are emailed back to DHR.

This project will replace MS Access with web based technology and a centralized, secured database for access from the Internet.  This technology is a much preferred method of communications, consistent with existing enterprise standards, and greatly enhances the security to protect confidential data about individuals.

In addition, the project uses components of a newer software development approach called Agile Methodology that was formalized by the software industry in 2001.  This methodology is being adopted by many organizations as a replacement or modification to the traditional waterfall method.  Agile techniques fit very well for projects that replace existing systems like the DOM Property Valuation Submissions (PVS) project funding by IOWAccess in 2007.  Agile is an excellent choice for projects were the business processes are well understood and documented.   A modified Agile approach is currently being used for a few projects as it is being implemented in ITE where appropriate.

Agile includes a project management process that encourages frequent inspection and adaptation; and encourages team work, self-organization, and accountability. There are many specific agile development methods. Most promote development iterations plus teamwork and collaboration among all team members including customers who are actively engaged on the project team.

Agile chooses to do things in small increments with minimal planning, rather than long-term planning. Iterations are short time frames (known as "timeboxes") which typically last from one to four weeks. Each iteration is worked on by a team through a full software development cycle, including planning, requirements analysis, design, coding, unit testing, and acceptance testing when a working product is demonstrated to stakeholders. This helps to minimize the overall risk, and allows the project to adapt to changes more quickly.

Documentation is produced as required by stakeholders. An iteration may not add enough functionality to warrant releasing the product to market, but the goal is to have an available release (with minimal bugs) at the end of each iteration. Multiple iterations may be required to release a product or new features.

Since the WAP project is replacing an existing system, the business processes are well understood and the business logic is documented in the current application. Instead of using the waterfall approach of phases that include Initiation, Scope Analysis, Design/Planning, and Execution, the project team (AEGS & DHR) listed all the business functions in priority order and began working on the functions in order -- developing requirements, design, and new functions during each two week timebox. This approach reduced the effort and cost of comprehensive documentation in the form of UML use case diagrams and allowed the project team to collapse the project into one phase delivering inspectable, customer testable functionality the end of each timebox.

One disadvantage of using this approach is that without detailed scope analysis, design and planning phases the project cost estimates are less accurate. Using a Agile approach, the functionality is prioritized so the project sponsor can make a choice when the funding/budget is depleted – 1) accept the application as completed and release the software for use; or 2) seek additional funding to implement the functionality that is not complete.

## D.  Statutory or Other Requirements

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

☐   YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)
**Response:**
N/A

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

☐   YES (If "YES", cite the specific state law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)
**Response:**
 N/A

**Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement?**

☐     YES (If "YES", explain.)

**Response:**

N/A

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

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

**Response:**

N/A

---

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

**Response:**

Direct users of the system are persons from 18 nonprofit agencies and the Department of Human Rights.  Non – direct users of the system who will also benefit include all the low income families that receive weatherization assistance and all the contractors that provide weatherization services.  On average, 80,000 Iowans apply for weatherization assistance each year.  Funding is available to provide weatherization for approximately 2,000 annually.

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.

**Response:**

Nationally, low income families save an average of $413 in reduced first-year energy costs, at current prices.  Weatherization measures reduce national energy demand by the equivalent of

18 million barrels of oil per year. Weatherization saves an average of 32% in gas space heating. Reducing energy demand decreases the environmental impacts of energy production.

In addition, Weatherization creates non-energy benefits, including increased property value, reduced incidence of fire, reduced utility arrearages and bad debt, federal taxes generated from employment, income generated from indirect employment, avoided costs of unemployment benefits, and reduced pollution. Benefits that are more difficult to quantify include improved health and safety conditions, increased comfort for occupants, a reduction in homelessness and mobility, and extended lifetime of affordable housing.

This project will enable to DHR and Agencies throughout the state improve the flow of information and communication. DHR and these community organizations will be able to provide better services for low income families who receive weatherization and the network of local Weatherization providers. The list of eligible clients will be available sooner so homes can be weatherized sooner than with the existing process.

**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?

**Response:**

The Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) is a federal grant program established to help reduce the heating and cooling costs for low income persons, particularly the elderly, disabled, and children, by improving the energy efficiency of their homes.

Besides the obvious benefit of conserving energy, the Iowa WAP also provides other benefits to Iowa and its residents. The program results in millions of dollars of additional value added to the Iowa economy.

The WAP has developed from a program that stressed low cost, temporary measures installed by volunteers, to a program that uses trained crews and contractors to install permanent cost effective measures that address both the building shell and the heating and cooling systems in the dwelling.

This project will modernize the software application used to manage the communications, information flow, and data needed to select 2,000 weatherization clients from 80,000 applications, inform the agencies who is eligibly and manage the process for providing weatherization services.

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

The Iowa Weatherization program mitigates certain health and safety problems in the client's homes, maintains affordable housing for low-income persons, reduces utility averages, and reduces environmental pollution.

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

- Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).

- Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).

- Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]
**Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- Minimally improves customer service (0-3 points).

- Moderately improves customer service (4-6 points).

- Significantly improves customer service (7-10 points).

## F. Scope

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

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

   **Response:** It is a stand-alone project

**Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?**

☐ YES (If "YES", explain.)

   **Response:** No

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]
**Scope 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 Execution and termination of the project / expenditure would waste previously invested resources.

## G. Source of Funds

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

**Response:**

DHR is asking IOWAccess to fund 25% or $34,000 of the project plus the first year's hosting costs of $6,500.  DHR is funding 75% or $80,000 of the project.

---

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**
<u>**Funds Evaluation**</u> **(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)

# Part III – Planning & Execution Proposal

## Amount of Funding Requested: $34,000

## Amount of Hosting Requested: $6,400

## A. Process Reengineering

Provide a *pre-project or pre-expenditure* (before Execution) 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 current process requires that data from the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) is uploaded into an MS Access database to determine who from this group is eligible for weatherization and to communicate this information to 18 local community action agencies.  The LIHEAP data contains personal information for about 80,000 Iowans.  This information includes social security number, names, addresses, and energy usage.

This information is reviewed and divided into 18 groups that match the 18 agencies. Then 18 duplicate MS Access database files are emailed to each of the 18 agencies with the specific information for Iowans that live in the agencies' respective areas.  Each of the 18 database copies is modified and updated by each agency and emailed back to DHR.

Email is simply not a secure way to send confidential data. Emails are discoverable and readable. Emails can be lost, accidently deleted, and easily forwarded.  Data inside an email is difficult to protest once the email leaves the State's network.

Manually processing the data, preparing 18 different databases with only authorized data, updating the database by each agency, and emailing these database files back and forth requires 1100 hours by personnel in DHR and the 18 agencies each year.

Provide a *post-project or post-expenditure* (after Execution) 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:**

Once the new system is implemented, the data will be uploaded into a centralized and secure SQL Server database protected inside the state network that requires access by using Enterprise Authentication and Authorization (ENT A&A) service through the new application. Direct access to the database will not be allowed.

DHR and the 18 local agencies will only be able to access the data by using their A&A credentials in a Web Browser with SSL security and encryption. In addition, the SSN will not be viewable by any user.  The SSN is part of the information from LIHEAP and will be included in the new SQL database to keep track of individuals by the system but only the system and

selected trusted system administrators in ITE will have access.  No user of the system can view or retrieve any SSN.

---

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**
**Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- <u>Minimal</u> use of information technology to reengineer government processes (0-3 points).

- <u>Moderate</u> use of information technology to reengineer government processes (4-6 points).

- <u>Significant</u> use of information technology to reengineer government processes (7-10).

---

## B. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Planning phase of the project.  Include such items as **start date, projected end date**, planning, and database Planning.  Also include the parties responsible for each item.

The initiation of the project started in June 2008.  Development started in September and the new application is planned to be implemented in March, 2009 before the next program year starts on April 1, 2009.

---

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

## C.  Spending plan

**Explain how the funds will be allocated.**

DHR is asking the IOWAccess Advisory Council to fund 25% or $34,000 of the project plus the first year's hosting costs of $6,500.  With this funding, the IOWAccess will help add functionality to enhance the process; provide reporting abilities to improve management of the program by the agencies in the field and the central DHR office; and help offset the risks associated with custom built software development projects. DHR is funding 75% or $80,000 or the project.

## D. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

**Respond to the following and transfer data to the Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet, # 5 below and the Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet, # IV E3, as necessary:**

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

**Describe One Year Pre-Project Cost:**

**Quantify One Year Pre-Project Cost:**

|  | State Total |
|---|---|
| FTE Cost(salary plus benefits): | $ |
| Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.): | $ |
| Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.): | $ |
| Total One Year Pre-Project Cost: | $ |

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

**Describe One Year Post-Project Cost:**

**Quantify One Year Post-Project Cost:**

|  | State Total |
|---|---|
| FTE Cost(salary plus benefits): | $ |
| Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.): | $ |
| Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.): | $ |
| Total One Year Post-Project Cost: | $ |

**3. One Year Citizen Benefit** - Quantify the estimated one year 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:**

| Transaction Savings | |
|---|---|
| **Number of annual online transactions:** | |
| **Hours saved/transaction:** | |
| **Number of Citizens affected:** | |
| **Value of Citizen Hour** | $ |
| **Total Transaction Savings:** | $ |
| **Other Savings (Describe)** | $ |
| **Total  One Year Citizen Benefit :** | $ |

**4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance -** Quantify the estimated one year <u>non-operations</u> 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

**Response:**

Manually processing the data, preparing 18 different databases with only authorized data, updating the database by each agency, and emailing these database files back and forth requires 1100 hours by personnel in DHR and the 18 agencies each year.

**5**. **Planning Phase Cost Calculation**
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, etc., during the **Planning Phase**.

| | Current FY | | Current FY +1 | | Current FY +2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Cost($) | % Total Cost | Cost($) | % Total Cost | Cost($) | % Total Cost |
| State General Fund | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |
| Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund | $40,500 | 0% | $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) | $80,000 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |
| Total Project Cost | $120,500 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |
| Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total | $80,000 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |

### 6. Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. Total Six Year (Useful Life) Pre-Project cost | $ 235,200 | |
| B. Total Six Year (Useful Life) Post-Project cost | $ | |
| C. State Government Benefit for 6 year useful life | | $ 84,000 |
| D. Citizen Benefit for 6 year useful life | | $151,200 |
| E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit | | $ |
| F. Total Project Benefit | $235,200 | |
| G.  Project Cost Calculation | $120,500 | |
| Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) = | 1.95 | |
| Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100 | 337% | |

**6.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:**

Non – Quantifiable Benefits include:

- The new list of eligible clients is available earlier so homes can be weatherized earlier than in the past with the existing process.

- The new system will keep data confidential by eliminating emails with personal identifiable data and significantly restricting access to Social Security Numbers.

- Local agencies can to access their data anytime on a 24 X 7 basis.

---

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

# *Evaluation Summary*
## *[This section to be completed by application evaluator.]*

## Planning & Execution Phase:

**Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

**Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

**Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

**Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

**Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)**

**Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

**Planning/Execution Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

**Planning/Execution Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

**TOTAL PLANNING/EXECUTION EVALUATION (90 Points Maximum)**

**Execution Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

**Execution Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)**

**Execution Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

**TOTAL EXECUTION EVALUATION (35 Points Maximum)**

## Part V – Auditable Outcome Measures

**For each of the following categories, <u>list the auditable metrics for success</u> after Execution and <u>identify how they will be measured.</u>**

1. Improved customer service

   **Response:**

2. Citizen impact

   **Response:**

3. Cost Savings

   **Response:**

4. Project reengineering

   **Response:**

5. Source of funds (Budget %)

   **Response:**

6. Tangible/Intangible benefits

   **Response:**

# IOWAccess Advisory Council

---

## IOWAccess Revolving Fund Project Application

**Proposing agencies should complete and submit Parts I, II and III to request <u>Planning</u> approval, then complete and submit Parts IV and V to request <u>Execution</u> approval.**

## Part I - Project Information

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date:** | **December 12, 2008** |
| **Agency Name:** | **Department of Natural Resources** |
| **Project Name:** | **Special Events Coordination** |
| **Agency Manager:** | **Jeff Kopaska** |
| **Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:** | **Jeff.Kopaska@dnr.iowa.gov**<br><br> **Jeff Kopaska, Natural Resource Biologist**<br><br>**(515) 432-2823 X109** |
| **Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):** | **Ken Herring, Division Administrator, Conservation and Recreation Division, Department of Natural Resources, 515-281-5529** |
| ***Initial* Total for Planning:** | **$20,000** |
| ***Initial* Total for Execution:** | **$137,500** |
| ***Initial* Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:** | **$157,500** |
| **Project Timeline:** *(estimate start and end dates for project spending)* | **Planning Start Date: Dec. 1, 2008**<br><br>**Planning End Date: Jan. 31, 2009**<br><br>**Execution Start Date: Feb. 1, 2009**<br><br>**Execution End Date: Oct. 1, 2009** |
| ***Revised* Total for Planning and Execution:** | **$** |

| | |
|---|---|
| *Revised* **Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:** | $ |

# Part II - Project Overview

## 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.

**Response:**

The Iowa Department of Natural Resources is the government agency that leads Iowans in caring for their natural resources. It is responsible for maintaining state parks and forests, protecting the environment, and managing energy, fish, wildlife, and land and water resources in Iowa.

The DNR's mission 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.

In support of that mission the DNR offers state properties and other state-managed areas for use in terms of "special events." These special events include over 700 fishing tournaments; 300 to 500  all-terrain vehicles, snowmobiles, and boating activities; 120 Dog Field Trials; Scouting events; fireworks displays (approximately 5 annually); car shows; motorcycle poker runs; pancake feeds; equestrian events and trials; endurance challenges and marathons; "Geocaches" (electronic scavenger hunts using GPS devices – approximately 125 annually); and many more activities.

The expected results of this project include a unified Special Events web application and reporting system for the Conservation and Recreation Division of the DNR.  The objective is to coordinate various types of events into one streamlined application, approval, and notification process, whereby the citizens who use public lands and DNR staff have immediate access to information about what events have been scheduled, the type of events, and any special information regarding multiple events.  This online data will facilitate faster decision making by DNR staff, especially those out in the actual parks and other remote locations (field staff), based on accurate data that is updated in real time.  The current system does not allow access to information and is a manual, time intensive process.

The expected result is that the streamlining of workflow processes will occur, enabling appropriate levels of approval by DNR central office and/or field staff in an automated fashion. In some cases multiple levels of approval across Bureaus and State and Federal agencies will be necessary and this system will have the capability to automatically notify and prompt for the necessary approvals, without manual intervention.

The costs of the present system include an inherent delay in processing and notifying applicants via the use of paper forms and mailing of documents.  It is challenging to notify all parties if inadequate time is allowed by the applicant.  Currently, there is no good mechanism to share information with the general public about scheduled events.

Additional costs include staff time in collecting information, assessing the data collected, processing response documents, and mailing documentation of approval or denial to the applicant.

The costs of the new system will include development and maintenance of the web-based application and database system.  Involvement of staff and gathering of their detailed requirements will build a responsive and adaptable system that will serve the citizenry and public land users for a protracted period of time.

Benefits of the new system include improved and shared communication with the applicant while the application for a special event is being processed.  Resources of Iowa that are available to the citizenry will be better communicated by educating users about what is available and what requirements exist in order to access those resources.  Users of public lands and waters will be able to view a calendar of events that can be used to see what activities are scheduled for a specific date, geographic location or activity type.  This will allow the user to either participate in activities which interest them or perhaps avoid a location if scheduled events will interfere with their intended use of the resources.  This "compatibility of use" feature of the system is nonexistent in the present processes.

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

**Response:**

It is the mission of the Conservation and Recreation Division to protect the State's natural resources, provide public safety, and to educate and serve the public. We enhance, promote, and protect the natural resources of Iowa through management, public relations, education, and law enforcement, thus ensuring for future generations the rights, privileges, and benefits we now enjoy and hope to continue to enjoy well into the future.   DNR is proactively providing easier access to information to the public, regulated parties, and local law enforcement officials. This project will also provide the tools to make it easier for DNR personnel to perform their duties more efficiently, with better accuracy, and a quicker, better response to the public.

The DNR has identified five top strategic goals, and this project serves to address these goals.
1. Iowa will have a healthy and safe environment.
2. Iowa will have abundant, high-quality opportunities for responsible use and enjoyment of its resources.
3. DNR has resources aligned with its priorities.
4. DNR models and promotes sustainable practices.
5. DNR clearly articulates how we fulfill our mission.

Promotion of outdoor resources encourages active recreational choices and leisure activities for Iowans.  Being able to better coordinate special events will foster a safer environment for users and those charged with ensuring a safe environment.  Being able to better communicate any mandated restrictions or specifications for the event will also promote better and safer planning on the part of the sponsor.

Educating user groups about the resources that are available and how to access them will lead to increased use of those resources.  Also, a new streamlined process which is more responsive to user groups and which increases their satisfaction with the process will promote continued use of the natural resources of the State and has the potential of expanding the use of the natural resources of Iowa.  Increased use of the resources and exposure of public land and water users to events in their area or that appeal to their interests also creates the potential of increased use.   Providing this information via the Internet rather than through word-of-mouth communication will certainly increase the quality of experiences we provide to users of Iowa's natural resources.

By creating a mechanism to more effectively communicate restrictions on events and any special considerations users must follow, a path leading to greater sustainability of the natural resources will be paved.  Being able to better coordinate staff resources to support user groups will also create increased opportunities for education and teachable moments.

**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?

> **Response:**

Essentially there is no technology being used by the current processes other than the use of Microsoft Office Word and Excel to send out notification letters and to track applications once they have gone through the system.  Special events are not currently posted on the DNR's web site.  The proposed project impact is in keeping with the DNR and ITE's technical direction of providing access to the public via web applications.  The programming of the system will meet DNR and ITE established standards and requirements for technology.

A significant goal of this project is to utilize a service oriented architecture approach.  Designing a web-based application which allows for electronic communication throughout the entire process will make vast improvements for users of the system.  Using radio buttons for decisions, drop-down menus for populating information, integrating existing databases which can utilize information already collected, e.g., GIS location information, Conservation Officer's counties and contact information, Park Ranger locations and contact information, Army Corps of Engineers permit requirements and contact information, etc., will provide great time-saving and accuracy benefits to the applicants.  From the very beginning of the application process, users will be more connected to the elements that go into the decision-making process and will be better informed and educated about any restrictions or specifications that they must comply with.  For instance, a user who would like to gain approval for a "poker run" must have approval from the Department of Inspections and Appeals to hold a gaming activity.  The new system will provide the user with the specific statutory requirement as well as the process completion steps and contact information.  Until the user provides the specifics about the gaming permit applied for from DIA, the automated Special Events Application Process will not allow the user to proceed with the request for the special event.  Similarly, many events require the applicant to indicate proof of liability insurance to hold the event, and the system also requires that information prior to approval.

## D. Statutory or Other Requirements

> Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with a Federal law, rule, or order?
> X **YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)**
> Response:

Federal regulations are in place for the Coast Guard and Corps of Engineers in terms of navigation safety.  DNR must comply with the guidelines established.  In addition, this project will comply with the Budget and Finance Bureau, Information Technology Bureau, and the Information Technology Enterprise standards.  All processes must meet the standards, legal mandates, and requirements established for Special Events scheduling.

> **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.)

**Response:**

Yes, there are statutory requirements for special events that are covered under different sections of the Code of Iowa as well as rules adopted and published in the Iowa Administrative Code (IAC). (The Natural Resource Commission is agency 571 in the IAC). Fishing tournaments are defined by the rules regarding necessary event applications in 571 IAC Chapter 88. Special events for state parks are specified in 571 IAC Chapter 61. Dog trial events are explained in Iowa Code Section 481A.22. Special event applications for all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) are regulated by Iowa Code Section 321I.8, and snowmobile special events are similarly recognized in Iowa Code Section 321G.16. Boating special events are regulated in Iowa Code Section 462A.16, and are further defined in 571 IAC Chapter 44.

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

The health, security and safety of the citizens of Iowa, visitors to Iowa, vendors, promoters and sponsors, DNR staff, law enforcement agencies, federal entities, etc., is of utmost importance to the DNR. The solution provided by a new application process will definitely streamline functions for the public and other stakeholders. In addition, this project will enhance the DNR's ability to provide various services to the public and secure their safety, while allowing all stakeholders an opportunity to enjoy Iowa's natural resources and recreational opportunities.

Specifics related to health, safety, and security requirements that will be addressed and/or enhanced by a new application process include sanitation and facilities, regulation of vendors if concessions are provided, overall integrity of food served at an event, identification and mitigation or risk factors associated with an event, provision of adequate patrol to control movement and activities of an event, assessment of safety of routes being used, protection of natural resources in general but in particular those that are fragile and vulnerable to detrimental influences, and the provision of liability insurance by event sponsor.

Once the appropriate forms are submitted to the department there is substantial coordination required to ensure that the events are approved, denied, or modified by the park or area supervisor, fisheries or wildlife biologist, conservation officer, internal staff supervisors, etc. This process is complicated for a number of reasons including the manual processes. There is a need to consider safety, crowd control, and environmental issues before the DNR approves usage of state land, especially when multiple events may be occurring at the same time. Data regarding the events will be available immediately in one data system to assist the DNR in coordinating and approving events.

Coordination of these efforts is imperative so that events do not substantially or adversely interfere with or impede the normal use of the area by the public or cause any extra or unusual hazards to spectators. The DNR is responsible for addressing any objections to events that may be received from other interested parties. Objections may be submitted and processed online, thus reducing the amount of time it takes for the potentially impacted individual(s) to hear back from the DNR.

The sponsoring organization needs to indicate whether their patrolling is adequate for safe conduct of the event, and in some cases if additional law enforcement assistance is required. The number of vessels or vehicles provided by sponsoring organizations for safety assistance must be known and planned. They will be prompted for this information and will not be allowed to proceed without entering the required information. Having all required information provided at the time the application is submitted will decrease frustration on the part of the applicant as he

or she will not be mistakenly submitting an incomplete application.  This will improve the timeliness of DNR's ability to process the special event requests, which will result in notifying the applicant of a decision in a more responsive and time-sensitive manner.

Often proof of liability insurance naming the applicant and the DNR as additional insured is necessary.  Event coordination is necessary to limit the DNR's responsibility for injury to persons or damage to property arising out of or incident to the activities that are subject to the application.  Approval of a special event application does not imply that the applicant has exclusive use of the area unless a facility has been reserved pursuant to DNR rule, so it is important that the applicant understand exactly what privileges have been approved. This type of information will be provided and requested more quickly due to automation.   As with other processes in this new system, the applicant will be required to provide proof of insurance coverage prior to the application being submitted.  The policy number, name of carrier, agent contact information, and amount of coverage will be provided on the application blank.  A hard copy of the proof of coverage will be required to be carried by the sponsor during the event.  A hard copy of the proof of coverage will also be submitted to the entity which is responsible for approving the event.  The automated system will notify the applicant of this requirement and will prompt them to acknowledge this requirement.

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

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

**Response:**

Currently, special events processes are manual and time consuming.  When applications come into the DNR it is possible that they are directed to the wrong entity for approval, be missing information, or the information may be incorrect.  All of these situations, as well as others not noted, require manual follow-up measures. The manual process results in delays for processing the applications. Because there is no single database, sharing of data across the State is extremely difficult and time consuming.  In addition, inconsistent methods are in place in terms of data collection and dissemination of information, which creates further impediments to a seamless process.

The impact of the proposed project on the agency's technological direction is that if falls in line with the strategy to improve public access via the Internet.  Data from this system will be accessible and automated reports will be available on demand.  Established enterprise standards will be followed.  In addition, this project meets Governor Culver's Green Government Initiative.

---

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

**Response:**

Interested parties include the general public and recreational users, private businesses, organizations, contestants, exhibitors, United States Coast Guard, Federal Government, DNR field and central office staff (including park managers and rangers, fisheries and wildlife biologists, foresters, law enforcement and policy staff, etc.), politicians, associations, stakeholder groups, friends groups, partners, etc.  In addition to these groups, DNR is also aware that certain youth groups and day care providers use special event programs as well as internal DNR resources as a form of social network and these groups would also be impacted.

Because applications are generated by entities outside of the DNR, the DNR serves in a facilitator-type role with these events.  We provide this service at a multitude of levels, all the way from an individual's concerns and needs to rather large public gatherings that could include hundreds of people.  The DNR serves this capacity for other municipal entities, from county conservation boards up to and including other executive-level agencies.  The DNR serves to balance the needs of the State's resources, including a protection and maintenance function, against the interests and demands of a variety of user groups.

Specific participants for the project:  Director Leopold, the Division Administrator for Conservation and Recreation, and associated Bureau Chiefs are committed to this project.  It is so important that a committee of eight DNR staff from different program areas has been formed to ensure requirements are defined and it is properly implemented.  Each of these individuals has expertise in a particular area pertaining to various types of events and they have knowledge of special requirements for state property and for working with the Coast Guard, Corps of Engineers, etc.  Contractors will be utilized to complete this project.  DNR has a proven track record with managing IT projects involving consulting firms on time and within budget, so the likelihood of success is great.

The number of direct users impacted is estimated at: approximately 2,000 citizens or groups submit applications annually, resulting in approximately 180,000 direct spectators/participants

The number of other interested party users is estimated at: approximately 15.2 million users/visitors to public parks, other lands, and waters annually

Citizens will experience greater convenience through the use of the web application in terms of planning, scheduling, and applying to conduct events on state-owned property.  More specific benefits are outlined throughout this document.  This project will contribute to streamlined data management processes, increased use in electronic forms, reduction of duplicate entry, an increase in response rate to public contacts, and it will maintain and increase public safety.

The ability to send forms, data, and information electronically provides a benefit to the public. Information will be passed on electronically to and from the general public, recreational users, businesses, organizations, contestants, exhibitors, United States Coast Guard, Federal Government, DNR field and central office staff (including park managers and rangers, fisheries

and wildlife biologists, foresters, law enforcement and policy staff, etc.), politicians, etc. in a more timely fashion.

The service to the public will be greatly enhanced and improved through this new web application, enabling 24 x 7 access to information and the ability to interact and submit applications and information.  The public will also receive faster feedback regarding their requests through special editing in the application process and faster routing through the approval sequence.  Scheduling and approval obstacles will be removed in the new system.  Finally, the overall experience with interacting with the DNR and enjoying Iowa's great natural resources will be superior as a result of implementing this new application.

The public reporting component will be a web interface where interested parties can query the back-end database to determine when and where special events are scheduled.  This query ability will include date queries, location queries, and event-type queries.  Query information will help the public to be better informed regarding activities that they chose to participate in, or those that they choose to avoid, at a state-managed area.  A particularly useful feature of the new system is that prior to completing an application a sponsoring organization and the public will be able to view events already planned and approved for a particular state property online.  This will alert the applicant of any conflicts that already exist for the date or location of their special event and will provide them with the opportunity to select an alternative site or date for their event.  Information will be stored and displayed on the web site as it is approved, which is a benefit to the DNR and in particular the public that either will be planning a special event or trying to avoid one.  Access to data will save effort on the part of the public and the DNR and will reduce the need for individual inquiries.  It will be especially important to the public as information can be accessed on demand at any time and will not require direct contact with the DNR during regular working hours.

Eliminating many of the manual processes will result in streamlined processes for the public, sponsors, vendors, Corps of Engineers and law enforcement agencies, while providing the best customer service possible utilizing updated technology.  The present system lacks a centralized information repository that is accessible to a variety of users, and has no calendar of events.  Currently, it is nearly impossible to provide to the public, or even obtain from other staff, useful and accurate information concern special events.  Even attempting to attain such information is a frustrating experience.

Law Enforcement agencies will use the information contained in and obtained from the system to adequately patrol and enforce proper safety procedures and protocol, keep all pertinent jurisdictions informed about pending activities in order to best coordinate resources, and have a visible and positive presence at scheduled special events.  Proper planning is the key to the successful execution of special events.

Within the DNR the Budget and Finance Bureau staff, the Customer Service Bureau staff, and the Division of Conservation and Recreation staff will also benefit from the new system through more accountable government practices and the ability to improve customer service dramatically.

**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.

**Response:**

Web applications are attractive because, by their nature, they enhance citizen access.  This particular application will also pull all the various special event processes into a "one stop" application that allows greater interactivity between the citizen and the DNR.

The current process for booking these events requires promoters, organizers, and the public to plan for their event and to contact the DNR to apply to hold the event(s) a minimum of 30 calendar days before the event.  Currently each Conservation and Recreation bureau in the DNR has its own application procedures and paper forms that must be completed to hold an event on state property.  The public may have to make multiple inquiries to obtain the proper paperwork to apply to hold the event.  Often multiple applications must be submitted, as is the case for certain fishing tournaments where the Fisheries Bureau and Parks Bureau may have to give approval for the event.  Additionally, the current system provides no possibility for an individual from the public to determine if or where events are occurring without contacting a specific individual within the DNR.  Now, all information will be provided any time of day via the citizen's own personal computer or via public computers with access to the Internet.

The ability to inform an applicant before their application is accepted into the approval sequence what requirements exist and must be met will greatly reduce the government hassle factor that some users of the current system experience.

Other types of event applications submitted to the DNR capture information about the specific location of the event (lake or specified boat ramp, shelter, picnic area, beach, marina, parking lot, trails, portions of the wildlife area, etc.).  The number of participants, the number of spectators, and vendor information is also collected.  Fishing tournament applications and reports enable the collection of key information necessary to monitor and manage biological species of fish.  This includes the number of fish caught, whether or not the fish are released, the fish weights and lengths, and the number of people entered for the tournament.  Special conditions are also noted by fisheries biologists for internal use by the DNR and, if requested, the applicant must return a report within 30 days after the tournament to the DNR.  These types of conditions can be presented upfront.  In addition, the system could be prompted to do automatic reminders to the applicant that the report is pending and not yet received.

This project will be a total replacement of multiple current special event processes for which the DNR has responsibility.  No electronic process currently exists and this new system will bring all of the processes together in one application for ease of use by the public, vendors, and sponsors.  It will enable faster processing of the forms and event applications because the system will know where to route the information, and if multiple parties at the DNR need to be involved.  This will result in a substantial improvement in customer service provided to the public.  An increase in the DNR's ability to be responsive to public land and water users will have a direct, positive impact on these customers' satisfaction.

For example, sometimes the public is unaware that the Coast Guard, Corps of Engineers, or other Federal Government entity is in charge of property and bodies of water in and along the State of Iowa when they are planning an event.  The new application will advise them of this and of the need for both State approval and/or Coast Guard, Fish and Wildlife Service, or Corps of Engineers authorization.  In addition, the plan is to provide a link from this system to the Federal entity as an additional service to the customer.  An exchange of information and data will be possible by linking various systems.  For example, automatic links from the new system with the existing DNR Campground Reservation system and other existing DNR systems will be programmed, so that information may be relayed and coordinated between interfacing systems.

There is a national movement which is a direct result of Richard Louv's publication of *"Last Child in the Woods."*  It is called the "Children's Outdoor Bill of Rights," and is designed to engage children in fundamental experiences that will develop a healthy, active lifestyle.  This movement points out the value of outdoor recreational activities and leisure skills. In fact, two of the indicators used to determine quality of life are environment and recreation.  By developing a system which promotes access to the State's natural resources, Iowans will be continuing to lead the way in terms of proactive participation in healthy lifestyle choices.

**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?

**Response:**

As mentioned previously, the application will direct or "lead" the person through the process so that he/she knows the proper forms to complete online; the data to provide will be known and edited as it is entered.  The citizen will know upfront and immediately the availability of state resources for their event.   It will also inform the consumer/recreationalist when other entities must approve special events.   The system will "know" who needs to be informed of the application based on geographic reference information.  For example, the approval may go to a specific conservation officer based on the county, or a park ranger and/or park manager if the event is planned for a state park.

In addition, authorized users, such as park managers and fisheries biologists, will have the option to select specific days that certain special events will NOT be allowed at a location, in order to ensure the public has regular access and usage of facilities at the location (transparent to users).

Applicants will be required to enter contact information that will be used to provide feedback on their application, e.g., they cannot apply for a special event on a particular date.  The contact information will also be valuable in case there is a park closing, flooding of a trail system, etc., that will affect the event and for which the event coordinator will need to be informed.

The time it takes for the applicant, the DNR, or another governmental entity to acquire the information they need to make informed decisions about availability of resources and adequacy of sponsor's plans will be shortened dramatically due to the elimination of postal and manual processing requirements.

Notification letters to applicants informing them of approval or denial of their request will be generated through the system.  Those responsible for making this determination will have preset stipulations available to them via radio button selections which will result in a letter specific to the sponsor, the event, and the location resulting in better sharing of information with the sponsor.  Also, the DNR sometimes attaches separate written information once the event has been authorized, such as policies for after-hour access to the park.  Therefore, the information must be processed in a manner  which allows responses from the DNR containing separate attachments or documentation with specific stipulations for usage.  For example, applicants must have authorizations available during the event so they can provide it to any State Park Personnel or Conservation (law enforcement) Officer upon request.

By streamlining the process and making the decision criteria more transparent, citizens will become more informed.  Uniform application of criteria facilitates accountability on the part of the DNR as well as the applicants.  The entire web application will be backed by administrative rules written by each bureau to support the criteria established as the basis for making determinations.  The development of these administrative rules will also facilitate accountability.

Part of the process of implementing administrative rules is to present them to the Natural Resource Commission and the Administrative Rules Review Committee, which fosters public comment and input and also encourages citizens to participate in this democratic process.  All of the steps of the administrative rule development process – notification, publication, review, and public comment – serve to engage citizens in the government process.

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

**Response:**

Utilization of an automated system results in citizens benefiting by having DNR staff spend more time preserving natural resources and encouraging use of our public land rather than time spent filling out, copying, and sending forms and approvals.  Increased efficiency allows for greater productivity and that means that citizens get more for their recreational dollars.  Increased activity and productivity means a safer community for our citizens as well as better protection for all of our natural resources.  Greater efficiency means more time for DNR staff to spend interacting with the public and that equates to a more informed public.  A more informed public is indicative of a more law-abiding public and compliance is what we strive for.  Creation of a system which fosters a more law-abiding public will contribute to improved public health and safety for all interested parties.  A more informed and better educated public will result in less time needed for enforcement activities and repair to damaged resources.  This will give the public more access to DNR staff time and facilities which will result in a more satisfied user base.

Additionally, many groups and organizations across the nation are searching for ways to reconnect children with nature and this system may prove to be a method for additional awareness.  The benefits to children of time spent outdoors are endless.  Spending time in natural settings is beneficial for physical and mental health, improving behavior, and faster learning.  This system will promote various opportunities available for children and citizens and contribute to the health and well being of Iowans.

---

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

- Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).

- Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).

- Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).

---

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**
**Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)**

- Minimally improves customer service (0-3 points).

- Moderately improves customer service (4-6 points).

- Significantly improves customer service (7-10 points).

## F. Scope

**Is this project the first part of a future, larger project?**
**YES** (If "YES", explain.)    **X NO, it is a stand-alone project**

**Response:**

It is envisioned that this application will eventually have linkage to the data from the existing Electronic Licensing System of Iowa.  This application will also serve data to the Campground Reservation System and all interested parties via GeoRSS feeds.

Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?

☐ **YES (If "YES", explain.)**

**Response:**

Other than enabling the ability to interface and perhaps exchange information, the answer is no.

---

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**
**Scope 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 Execution and termination of the project / expenditure would waste previously invested resources.

---

## G. Source of Funds

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

**Response:**

The source of funding will be 100% IOWAccess funding the first year. The DNR plans to support the maintenance of the system in the future through the fishing tournament application fees, and potentially other special event application administration fees, that will be collected.

The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Conservation and Recreation Division is funded partially by the sale of hunting and fishing license and partially by the State's general fund for the maintenance and upkeep of state parks, forests, and preserves.  As a blended project neither funding source is solely responsible for this project and determining the percent responsibility or benefit to each entity would be guesswork.  Thus, DNR decided to examine funding sources external to the division.  No other funding sources for governmental IT projects in support of natural resource amenities were readily discovered, thus IOWAccess was determined to be the most favorable funding source.  Additionally, this is a collaborative project with significant public benefits, so it seemed to be a natural fit for IOWAccess funding.  Internal

funding for this project would be difficult, as the natural disasters of 2008 have resulted in reductions in hunting and fishing license sales, general fund dollars to DNR remain flat, and the clean up and repairs from the aforementioned natural disasters have drained both budgets.

The current method of accepting special event applications is disjunctive, and many staff that receive and process these applications do not have the ability or authority to process payments to the state.  Thus, the DNR has not implemented comprehensive transactions or other customer fees to date.   Implementing an online application and payment system will allow us to commence an organized, trackable payment and fee system.  Income generated by this system will not be available until after project completion and deployment, but that income could be used for system maintenance and upgrades once payment collection begins.  Statutory authority for collecting fees for special events other than fishing tournaments is being explored, along with the writing of expanded and enhanced administrative rules.  Any anticipated revenue from these sources will be used for maintenance and upgrades to the system.

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

## Part III – Planning Proposal

## Amount of Planning Funding Requested: $

## A. Process Reengineering

*Provide a pre-project or pre-expenditure (before Execution) 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 current process for booking these events requires promoters, organizers, and the public to plan for their event and to contact the DNR for applications and authorizations to hold the events a minimum of 30 calendar days before the event.  Currently each Conservation and Recreation bureau in the DNR has its own paper forms that must be completed to hold an event on state property.  The public may have to make multiple inquiries to obtain the proper paperwork to apply to hold the event.  Often multiple applications must be submitted, as is the case for certain fishing tournaments, where the Fisheries Bureau and Parks Bureau may have to give approval for the event.

Once the appropriate forms are submitted to the department there is much coordination required to ensure that the events are approved, denied, or modified by the park or area supervisor, land manager, internal staff supervisors, etc.  This process is complicated for a number of reasons including the manual processes.  There is a need to consider safety, crowd control, and environmental issues before the DNR approves usage of state land, especially when multiple events may be occurring at the same time.

Coordination of these efforts is imperative so that the events do not substantially or adversely interfere with or impede the normal use of the area by the public or cause an extra or unusual hazard to spectators.  The DNR is responsible for addressing any objections to events that may be received from other interested potentially impacted parties.

The sponsoring organization needs to indicate whether their patrolling is adequate for safe conduct of the event, and in some cases when additional law enforcement assistance is required.  The number of vessels or vehicles provided by sponsoring organizations for safety assistance must be known and planned.

Other types of event applications submitted to the DNR capture information about the specific location of the event (lake or specified boat ramp, shelter, picnic area, beach, marina, parking lot, trails, portions of the wildlife area, etc.).  The number of participants, the number of spectators, and vendor information is also collected.  Fishing tournament reports enable the collection of key information necessary to monitor and manage biological species of fish.  This includes the number of fish caught, whether or not the fish are released, the fish weights and lengths, and the number of people entered for the tournament.   Special conditions are also noted by fisheries biologists for internal use by the DNR and, if requested, the applicant must return a report within 30 days after the tournament to the DNR.

Often proof of liability insurance naming the applicant and the DNR as additional insured is necessary.  Event coordination is necessary to limit the DNR's responsibility for injury to persons or damage to property arising out of or incident to the activities that are subject to the application.   Approval of a special event application does not imply that the applicant has exclusive use of the area unless a facility has been reserved pursuant to DNR rule, so it is important that the applicant understand exactly what privileges have been authorized. This type of information will be provided and requested more quickly due to automation.   As with other

processes in this new system, the applicant will be required to provide proof of insurance coverage prior to the application being submitted.  The policy number, name of carrier, agent contact information, and amount of coverage will be provided on the application blank.  A hard copy of the proof of coverage will be required to be carried by the sponsor during the event.  A hard copy of the proof of coverage will also be submitted to the entity which is responsible for approving the event.  The automated system will notify the applicant of this requirement and will prompt them to acknowledge this requirement.

Notification letters to applicants informing them of approval or denial of their request will be generated through the system.  Those responsible for making this determination will have preset stipulations available to them via radio button selections which will result in a letter specific to the sponsor, the event, and the location resulting in better sharing of information with the sponsor.  Also, the DNR sometimes attaches separate written information once the event has been authorized, such as policies for after-hour access to the park.  Therefore, the information must be processed in a manner  which allows responses from the DNR containing separate attachments or documentation with specific stipulations for usage.  For example, applicants must have authorizations available during the event so they can provide it to any State Park Personnel or Conservation (law enforcement) Officer upon request.

Provide a *post-project or post-expenditure* (after Execution) 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:
The vision is that the public will access the DNR web site to find information about natural resources-related events on State property for any date, whether they want to plan, attend, or avoid an event, or just use existing facilities.  The application will include instructions for all event types and various information regarding requirements for multiple applications.  The application will also include other necessary information for the public and organizers.

The DNR will allow submission of the applications for special events online utilizing the new system.  The application will be automatically routed to the correct approvers.  The system will "know" who needs to be informed of the application based on geographic reference information.  For example, the approval may go to a specific conservation officer based on the county, or a park ranger and/or park manager if it is in a state park.  In addition, authorized users, such as park managers, will have the option to select specific days that certain special events will not be allowed at a location in order to ensure the public has regular access and usage of facilities at the location.

Sometimes the public is unaware that the Coast Guard, Corps of Engineers, or other Federal Government entity is in charge of property and bodies of water in and along the State of Iowa when they are planning an event.  The vision is that the new application will advise them of this and of the need for both State approval and/or Coast Guard, Fish and Wildlife Service, or Corps of Engineers authorization.  In addition, the plan is to provide a link from this system to the Federal entity as an additional service to the customer.  An exchange of information and data could be possible by linking various systems.  For example, automatic links from the new system with the existing DNR Campground Reservation System and other existing DNR systems will be programmed so that information may be relayed and coordinated between interfacing systems.

Applicants will be required to enter contact information that will be used to provide feedback on their application, e.g., they cannot apply for a special event on a particular date.   The contact information will also be valuable in case there is a park closing, flooding of a trail system, etc. that will affect the event and for which the event coordinator will need to be informed.

The public reporting component will be a web interface where interested parties can query the back-end database to determine when and where special events are scheduled. This query ability will include date queries, location queries, and event-type queries. Query information will help the public to be better informed regarding activities that they choose to participate in or those that they choose to avoid at a state-managed facility. In addition, prior to completing the application, the sponsoring organization and the public will be able to view the events already planned and approved for a particular state property online through this system so they have an opportunity to select an alternative site. Information will be stored and displayed on the web site as it is approved, which is a benefit to the DNR and in particular the public that either will be planning the special events or trying to avoid them. Access to data will save effort on the part of the public and DNR and will cut down on inquires. It will be especially important to the public as information can be accessed on demand at any time and will not require direct contact with the DNR during regular working hours.

The system must include a mechanism for online payments to handle new application fees associated with fishing tournaments. Compliance with the with PCI (Payment Card Industry) standards, the State Treasurer Office's requirements for depositing money, and the DNR's Budget and Finance Bureau's staff expectations shall be assured. The coding of the web application should provide the ability to reuse code and charge for other types of fees in the future.

Eliminating many of the manual processes will result in streamlined processes within the DNR for DNR Budget and Finance Bureau, Customer Service Bureau, and the Conservation and Recreation Division staff, while providing the best customer service possible utilizing updated technology.

As we transition to a new system, we will also want to ask the applicants if tournaments are "open" or "closed/club only/invitation only" tournaments, which is an enhancement to the existing processes. Administrative rules will be changed in parallel with system development to streamline processes and requirements.

The services to the public will be greatly enhanced and improved through this new web application, enabling 24 x 7 access to information and the ability to interact and submit applications and information and to receive feedback regarding their requests through special editing. Scheduling and approval obstacles will be removed for them. Finally, the overall experience with interacting with the DNR and enjoying Iowa's great natural resources will be superior as a result of implementing this new application.

Many of the Iowa Great Places applied for this designation and were selected due to their natural resource amenities. This project will support and bring greater attention to the events and activities related to natural resources that are offered to the public in the identified Iowa Great Places.

---

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

## B. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Planning phase of the project.  Include such items as **start date, projected end date**, planning, and database Planning.  Also include the parties responsible for each item.

The Planning Start date will be February 1, 2009.  The new system must be online and able to accept applications by July 1, 2009; other components of the system, such as some of the internal communication pieces, can be implemented prior to the project completion date of October 1, 2009.  The selected contractor will be responsible for the planning phase.

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

## C.  Spending plan

**Explain how the funds will be allocated.**

100% for design/implementation of project.

## D. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

**Respond to the following and transfer data to the Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet, # 5 below and the Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet, # IV E3, as necessary:**

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

The current suite of special event application procedures cost approximately ½ FTE for each of the Fisheries, Parks, and Law Enforcement Bureaus of the DNR, around $78,000.  Additional costs include postage, forms, and other office supplies, for an annual cost of $84,000.

**Quantify One Year Pre-Project Cost:**

| | State Total |
|---|---|
| **FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):** | $ 78,000 |
| **Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):** | $  6,000 |
| **Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):** | $ |
| **Total One Year Pre-Project Cost:** | $ 84,000 |

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

Estimated cost reductions will be achieved primarily through more efficient use of personnel, electronic forms, and data sharing.  Efficiency improvements in the process resulting from project implementation should result in a 90% improvement in time utilization on these applications, elimination of postage costs, and an 80% reduction in supplies, for a total annual post-implementation cost of around $9,000.

The cost of paper, the hassle factor for filling out forms/reports/etc. will be greatly reduced.  Work processes will be improved so that more time can be spent on other departmental priorities. Money will be saved by not utilizing a slow, sometimes inefficient mail service, which can take as much as ten (10) days to reach a supervisor or staff in our central office located in Des Moines, Iowa.

**Quantify One Year Post-Project Cost:**

|  | State Total |
|---|---|
| **FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):** | $ 7,800 |
| **Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):** | $ 1,200 |
| **Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):** | $ |
| **Total One Year Post-Project Cost:** | $  9,000 |

3. **One Year Citizen Benefit** - Quantify the estimated one year 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:**

This project will significantly benefit persons and groups submitting applications (~2,000 applicants annually), and if their benefit amounts to two hours of their time, plus cost-savings on forms and postage, that would yield a citizen benefit of $41,500.  Approximately 180,000 individuals participate directly in these events, and if their benefit amounts to one-half hour of their time, that would yield a citizen benefit of $900,000.  Recreational users of state lands and waters number 15.2 million users/visits, and if they utilize this system for 5 minutes to determine location and timing of special events, the benefit to citizens would be $12.7 million.  The total benefit is around $13.6 million with a project cost of only $137,500.

| Transaction Savings | |
|---|---|
| Number of annual online transactions: | 2000 |
| Hours saved/transaction: | 1 |
| Number of Citizens affected: | 15.2 million |
| Value of Citizen Hour | $10 |
| Total Transaction Savings: | $  - |
| Other Savings (Describe) | $13.6 million |
| Total  One Year Citizen Benefit : | $13.6 million |

**4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance -** Quantify the estimated one year <u>non-operations </u>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

**Response:**

The information that DNR is the custodian of will be improved and public access to information will now be available in one place, at all times.  The public did not previously have access to this information, and the value of this to the public is reflected in the $12.7 million public benefit listed above.  Additionally, there is a risk/loss avoidance value of $75,000 for dealing with health, safety, or legal issues.

**5**. **Planning Phase Cost Calculation**
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, etc., during the **Planning Phase**.

| | Current FY | | Current FY +1 | | Current FY +2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Cost($) | % Total Cost | Cost($) | % Total Cost | Cost($) | % Total Cost |
| State General Fund | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |
| Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund | $47,250 | 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% |
| Total Project Cost | $47,250 | 100% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |
| Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |

**6. Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1): | $ 84,000 | |
| B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2): | $ 9,000 | |
| C. State Government Benefit (= A-B): | | $ 75,000 |
| D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3): | | $13,600,000 |
| E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4): | | $ 75,000 |
| F. Total Planning Benefit (C+D+E) | $ 13.8 M | |
| G.  Planning Phase Cost Calculation (Section III D5): | $ 138,000 | |
| Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) = | 100 | |
| Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100 | 100000 | |

**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:**

**Collaboration--**The Coast Guard, Corps of Engineers, or any other Federal, State or Local Government entity would be able to take advantage of using the code.  If they do not want to use the application, it will still enable the DNR to communicate with them and for the user to coordinate their special events and ensure they have the proper permitting with the other governmental entity.

**Transparency --**The current process for booking these events requires promoters, organizers, and the public to plan for their event and to contact the DNR for applications to hold the events a minimum of 30 calendar days before the event.  Currently each Conservation and Recreation bureau in the DNR has its own paper forms that must be completed to hold an event on state property.  The public may have to make multiple inquiries to obtain the proper paperwork to apply to hold the event.  Often multiple applications must be submitted, as is the case for certain fishing tournaments, where the Fisheries Bureau and Parks Bureau may have to give approval for the event. The citizen will be advised when more information is needed, thus enhancing their experience with the agency.  The time frame for submission of information may be shortened depending on the ability to process forms, data, etc., more quickly.

Once the appropriate forms are submitted to the department there is much coordination required to ensure that the events are approved, denied, or modified by the park or area supervisor, land manager, internal staff supervisors, etc.  This process is complicated for a number of reasons, including the manual processes.  There is a need to consider safety, crowd control, and environmental issues before the DNR approves usage of state land, especially when multiple events may be occurring at the same time.  Thus, any previously approved events for a specific date and location will be displayed for staff review with any new requests for that location and date.  The data will be more readily available and this process will be more transparent to the citizen—it will just happen.

**Efficiency--**Automation via the Internet is definitely the best solution.  The information will be available 24 x 7 to anyone accessing the Internet, whether they reside in Iowa or will be utilizing Iowa's public lands and waters. An economic boost will result in that vendors and sponsors will have information about events and will come to Iowa to participate in an event.  They will likely have to stay in one of Iowa's motels, purchase food from local restaurants, and shop at local markets and malls.  There is no legacy system to replace in terms of an automated system; however, the old manual paper processes will be completely eliminated and replaced. Once

again, the information will be localized and more available than ever before in one automated system, with access at any time.

---

**[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]**
<u>**Planning Financial Evaluation**</u> **(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).

## Part IV – Execution Funding

**Amount of Execution Funding Requested: $ 110,250**

**Amount of Hosting Requested: $6,000**

*Note: Projects developed by DAS-ITE allow first year of hosting charges*

### A. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Execution phase of the project.  Include such items as **start date,** coding, testing, deployment, conversion, parallel installation, and **projected date of final release**.  Also include the parties responsible for each item.

 Response:

The start date for the planning and execution phases will be February 1, 2009.  Coding, testing, deployment and installation will occur from February through June, 2009.  The new system must be online and able to accept applications by July 1, 2009; other components of the system, such as some of the internal communication pieces, can be implemented prior to the projected date of final release, October 1, 2009.  The contractor selected for this project will be responsible for all items, with DNR program staff also associated with the testing phase, and ITE and DNR IT staff working on installation.

---

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

### B.  Execution 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, etc., during the **Execution Phase**.

| | Current FY | | Current FY +1 | | Current FY +2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Cost($) | % Total Cost | Cost($) | % Total Cost | Cost($) | % Total Cost |
| State General Fund | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |
| Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund | $82,700 | 75% | $27,550 | 25% | $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 (Hosting) | $0 | 0% | $6,000 | 0% | $0 | 0% |
| Total Project Cost | $82,700 | 75% | $33,550 | 25% | $0 | 0% |
| Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% | $0 | 0% |

## C. 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.

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

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

| 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 | $78,000 | 5 | 100% | $13,800 | 100% | $29,400* |
| Software | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Hardware | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Training | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Facilities | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Professional Services | $157,500 | 4 | 100% | $0 | % | $39,375 |
| ITE Services | $6,000 | 1 | 100% | $6,000 | 100% | $12,000 |
| Supplies, Maint., etc. | $6,000 | 1 | 100% | $1,200 | 100% | $7,200* |
| Other | $ | | % | $ | % | $ |
| Totals | $247,500 | | % | $21,000 | % | $87,975* |

**\*Iowa Fish and Game Trust Fund is the funding source for a significant amount of the DNR Conservation and Recreation Division, only State Parks and Forests are supported by General Fund dollars.  The Trust Fund money is derived from the sale of hunting and fishing licenses.  The actual % that is the State's share cannot be determined at this time, but in reality it is much less than 100%**

## D. Spending plan

**Explain how the funds will be allocated.**

100% will be used for design/implementation.

## E. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

**Respond to the following and transfer data to the Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet, #3 below, as necessary:**

**1. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance –** Quantify the estimated annual <u>non-operations</u> 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.

**Response:**

The information that DNR is the custodian of will be improved and public access to information will now be available in one place, at all times.  The public did not previously have access to this information, and the value of this to the public is reflected in the $12.7 million public benefit listed above

**2. 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:**

This project will revolutionize the way the Iowa DNR processes applications and advertizes, presents, organizes, delivers, records and maintains information regarding specials events.  Utilizing technology in this manner is key to streamlining processes and impressing the Iowa citizen with opportunities that our agency has to offer. This will improve our relationship with the public, and will allow the public to access all necessary information about any special event that they wish to attend or avoid.  Additionally, there is a risk/loss avoidance value of $75,000 for dealing with health, safety, or legal issues.

It is the mission of the DNR to protect and enhance the State's natural resources.  It is also our goal to lead Iowans in the enjoyment of the great Iowa outdoors and to educate and serve the public in their recreational interests, safely.  We plan to enhance, promote, and protect the natural resources of this state through public relations, education, management and law enforcement, thus ensuring for future generations the rights, privileges, and benefits we now enjoy.  This project will assist all users of the outdoors in Iowa.

**3**. **Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet** – Copy items A through F from Part III (Planning Phase), Section III D6; item G is from Section IV C, above.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1): | $84,000 | |
| B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2): | $9,000 | |
| C. State Government Benefit (= A-B): | | $75,000 |
| D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3): | | $13,600,000 |
| E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4): | | $75,000 |
| F. Total Planning Benefit (C+D+E) | $13.8M | |
| G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C): | $138,000 | |
| Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) = | 100 | |
| Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100 | 10000% | |

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

# *Evaluation Summary*
## *[This section to be completed by application evaluator.]*

## Planning Phase:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)** | ☐ |
| **Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)** | ☐ |
| **Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)** | ☐ |
| **Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)** | ☐ |
| **Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)** | ☐ |
| **Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)** | ☐ |
| **Planning Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)** | ☐ |
| **Planning Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)** | ☐ |
| **TOTAL PLANNING EVALUATION (90 Points Maximum)** | ☐ |

## Execution Phase:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Execution Timeline Evaluation (10Points Maximum)** | ☐ |
| **Execution Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)** | ☐ |
| **Execution Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)** | ☐ |
| **TOTAL EXECUTION EVALUATION (35 Points Maximum)** | ☐ |

# Part V – Auditable Outcome Measures

**For each of the following categories, <u>list the auditable metrics for success</u> after Execution and <u>identify how they will be measured.</u>**

1. Improved customer service

   **Response:  80% of public respond positively to survey.  DNR will collect comments from the public via web survey.**

2. Citizen impact

   **Response:  DNR will record the number of hits on the Special Events search page.  This will estimate improved services to the public and the utility of the system.**

3. Cost Savings

   **Response:  DNR will conduct an internal survey to determine the amount of time spent servicing special event applications via the current system, and contrast that to the amount of time spent processing paper applications in previous years.**

4. Project reengineering

   **Response:  New web design improves access and quality of data while reducing time spent on this process by the public and staff.  DNR will conduct a web survey to determine public response to the new system.**

5. Source of funds (Budget %)

   **Response:  Program funds will be maintained at the same level or above.  Administrative fees collected for application processing will be used for system maintenance and upgrades.**

6. Tangible/Intangible benefits

   **Response:**

   **Improved timeliness of application processing**
   **Streamlined data management**
   **Improved public access to the application process**
   **Improved public access to special event information**
   **Improved communication within the agency regarding special events**