

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING**  
Pursuant to Iowa Code §21.4  
**DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES**  
**IOWACCESS ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
Wednesday, July 8, 2009 1:00 PM – 4:30 PM  
Hoover Building, Conference Rooms 329/330

1. Introductions, Approve Minutes, Change to Reimbursement Policy  
*Richard Neri, Chair*
  2. BLIC Project Update  
*Sherry Timmons, Dept. of Economic Development*
  3. Agile and Waterfall Software Development  
*Michael Tutty, Senior Architect, Information Technology Enterprise*
  4. Iowa Interactive Project Update  
*Tracy Smith, Iowa Interactive*
  5. IOWAccess Projects and Projections Spreadsheets/Monthly Report  
*Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager*
  6. DPS - Breath Alcohol Program Records - Planning **\$60,000**  
*James Bleskacek, Dept of Public Safety*
  7. DNR - Special Events – Execution and Hosting **Execution: \$135,000**  
**Hosting: \$7,500**  
**Total: \$142,000**  
*Jeff Kopaska, Dept. of Natural Resources*
  8. LSA - Iowa Code and Rules Easy Navigation and Search - Planning **\$20,000**  
*Jeff Van Engelenhoven & Richard Johnson, Legislative Service Agency*
  9. DOM - Local Government and Annual Report Database – Expansion to School Districts - **\$30,000**  
Planning  
*Jim Nervig, Dept. of Management*
  10. DPS - Iowa Sex Offender Registry Change Request **\$25,000**  
*Mary Hadd, Information Technology Enterprise*
  11. DRAFT IOWAccess Advisory Council By-Laws  
*Beth Baldwin, Committee Chair*
  12. ITE Project Updates  
*Mark Uhrin, Information Technology Enterprise*
  13. Wrap Up And Adjourn  
*Richard Neri, Chair*
-

**IOWAccess Advisory Council  
Meeting Minutes of May 13, 2009, 1:00 PM  
Hoover Building, Third Floor, Conference Rooms 429/430**

**Draft**

- Present: Barb Corson, Kathleen Richardson, Sheila Castaneda, Dawn Ainger, Beth Baldwin, Tom Gronstal, Randy Nyberg, Terri Selberg, Dick Neri, Terrence Neuzil, Herb Copley
- Absent: Kelly Hayworth, Dan McGinn
- Guests: Tracy Smith\*, Wayne Middleton, Malcolm Huston, Deb McDaniel, Mary Hadd, James Bleskacek, Julie Leeper, Jim Fox, Mark Uhrin, John Gillispie, Darrell Fremont, Teresa McMahon, Diane Van Zante

\* By phone

Council Chair, Dick Neri, opened the meeting at 1:06 p.m. and noted that a quorum of members was present.

1. Introductions, New Member, Approve Minutes, Election of Officers – Dick Neri, Chair.  
All members and guests introduced themselves.

The Council has a new member, Herbert Copley. Mr. Copley replaces Larry Lentz as the new federal government representative.

Sheila Castaneda moved approval of the January 7, 2009 meeting minutes. Barb Corson seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; the minutes were unanimously approved as written.

Election of Officers – The Code of Iowa states that officers will be elected annually. The last election was held in May of 2008. The floor was opened to nominations.

Sheila Castaneda nominated Dick Neri to serve as Chair of the IOWAccess Advisory Council; Terrence Neuzil seconded the nomination. Tom Gronstal moved that nominations cease; Sheila Castaneda seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken. Mr. Neri was unanimously re-elected.

Sheila Castaneda nominated Barb Corson to serve as Vice Chair of the IOWAccess Advisory Council; Dawn Ainger seconded the nomination. Tom Gronstal moved that nominations cease; Terrence Neuzil seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken. Ms. Corson was unanimously re-elected.

2. Iowa Interactive Project Update – Wayne Middleton, Iowa Interactive.  
Wayne distributed a white paper co-authored by NIC (Iowa Interactive's parent company) and the Center for Digital Government addressing three trends: going local, going social,
-

and going green. In terms of applications built by Iowa Interactive, transaction volumes for online campground reservations and driver's record lookups were up in both March and April. Several new applications have gone live: permits and inspections for the Electrical Board, the Plumbers and Mechanical Contractors application, Recovery.Iowa.gov (this website went from concept to live in five days), the website for the Department of Management Community Empowerment Division, the Department of Public Safety Interoperable Communications Systems Board, the Public Employment Relations Board survey redesign, the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Detention Center application, and the redesign of the Department of Management website.

What is the status of the redesign of the State homepage?

It is almost complete and is expected to go live within the next couple of weeks.

3. IOWAccess Projects and Projections Spreadsheets/Monthly Report/State Library Advisory – Malcolm Huston, IOWAccess Manager.

Malcolm summarized the current financial spreadsheet, highlighting significant numbers. Actual costs are reflected through the end of March. If the Council approves all of the projects under consideration today, it would bring projected unobligated funds to a deficit. As a point of clarification, recent legislation did not reduce the million dollar appropriation.

The unobligated balance of funds for new phases of existing projects and for proposed projects is a negative \$99,645.00. The total of projects being considered today is \$645,000.

If the Council does not approve anything at today's meeting, the unobligated balance at the end of April would be \$32,000; the unobligated balance at the end of May would be \$165,000.

Does the Council really have money to spend?

If the Council does not approve any projects, it will be sitting on cash. The million dollar appropriation acts as a buffer between project approval and the actual expenditure of funds.

It appears that if nothing is approved today, by the end of July there could be \$430,000 in the IOWAccess fund. If the Council approves everything today, at the end of July there could be a \$214,000 deficit.

How much will existing projects need for future phases?

All projects that have been approved at the first or second level are included in the projections for future stages of those projects. Future phases of approved projects are based on estimates provided by the project managers.

The financial projections are at best a guesstimate. A question of continuing debate is whether the Council should go ahead and approve projects that are on the current agenda or wait until potentially more worthwhile projects come along a few months down the road.

---

State Library Advisory – The State Library “Dynamic Data on the Web” project did not take into account the cost for translation. We wanted to bring this to the attention of the Council to address any concerns/objections. None were raised.

4. Department of Public Safety (DPS) Breath Alcohol Program Records – Request for Planning Funds (\$85,000) – James Bleskacek, DPS.

Please note that this funding request has been reduced to \$70,000.

The Department of Public Safety is responsible for maintaining breathalyzer/assorted equipment records around the state. DPS would like to create a website to make the information more accessible, especially to attorneys. Approximately 12,000 breath tests are logged each year; the Department receives from one to six requests for information each week which must be researched manually. DPS is considering modeling its website after the Washington State Patrol whose current system makes the information available to anyone who wants it. Breath tests are public information, even before the case goes to court, however the name and driver’s license number are not publicly accessible. This project automates information that is already available to the public. An additional component of this project is training of law enforcement personnel in the use of the breath alcohol equipment; once initial training is received, this website would allow the recertification training to be conducted online.

At the January meeting, the Council approved \$30,000 for scope analysis funding. Scope analysis came in under budget; as a result, we anticipate giving back about \$15,000.

NOTE: Council member Kelly Hayworth joined the meeting; the time was noted as 2:04 p.m.

This project would also collect data that would be useful to officers, such as where the majority of offenses occur. It would be more statistical aggregate data than personal data as the data does not contain the perpetrator’s name or social security number. Having the information available on a website would also make it easier for officers and attorneys to share information across counties, etc.

Council comments/concerns:

- There appear to be two facets of this program, the records/statistics information and the officer training portion. I question how the two facets fit together.
  - While this is a worthwhile project, it doesn’t appear to be that useful to the public. It may not fall within the Council’s purview.
  - This project deals with maintenance records and reports, not people.
  - I have two major concerns: is it within the mission of this Council and do we know it will really cost \$70,000 with all the holes that are in the current scope analysis. The need for public access to this information is very small. The location information is broken down only to county, nothing more specific.
  - This doesn’t appear to be of benefit to the citizens, but more specifically of benefit to law enforcement.
  - Is there anything specific to the training online that links it back to the certification portion? DPS response: No.
-

- I see this as two projects; if we move forward with the training aspect, it should be a training program that would be applicable to other agencies as well.
- The training would not be for the citizens of Iowa, but for DPS officers.
- I can see that there would be some use by the media for raw data.

Barb Corson moved approval of planning funds; Kelly Hayworth seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken and recorded as follows:

Ayes – Kelly Hayworth, Tom Gronstal, Terri Selberg, Herb Copley, Barb Corson, Kathleen Richardson

Nays – Dawn Ainger, Beth Baldwin, Dick Neri, Sheila Castaneda, Terrence Neuzil, Randy Nyberg

Abstentions – None

The motion failed for lack of a majority.

5. Department of Administrative Services (DAS) American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Recovery Website – Request for Scope Analysis and Design Funds (\$125,000) – Mark Uhrin, ITE.

Iowa will be receiving \$2.5 million as part of ARRA, the federal economic stimulus program. States are required to administer the program and oversee the expenditure of ARRA funds. The State is requesting IOWAccess funding for the ARRA website and reporting database mechanism. Reporting is mandatory; data will be required for any grant or commitment of funds, from project onset to conclusion. We want to make the State's infrastructure available to as many political subdivisions as we can so that they don't have to develop their own. Exact reporting requirements are still being determined by the Office of Management and Budget. The project before you today seeks funds to put some of that infrastructure in place.

Prior to his departure for another meeting, John Gillispie addressed council members on this topic. ARRA gave us money, but nothing for program administration or reporting. Every Governor was asked to pledge that his/her state would make the recovery information available online.

Discussion:

Q. Will there be any collaboration with other states since everyone needs to do this?

A. Our state's accounting system is different than say for example Minnesota's.

Collaboration will come more on the back end.

Q. How comfortable are you with this number?

A. It is just a best guess.

Q. If we get federal funding for administering the program, will the IOWAccess money be returned?

A. Yes.

Q. Do other state agencies have to collaborate with you?

A. Yes, it is required. Right now, there is no money for any of the agencies to do any of this work. They have no money to administer the program.

- Q. How are we going to get a handle on the amount so that we can get our arms around it and know how much we have to fund future projects?
- A. We don't know. We are looking at reusing/repurposing some existing programs, so hope that we don't have to spend money for those pieces.
- Q. So the other states have the same problem?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And if the federal government provides administrative funds, we would get the money back?
- A. Yes.
- Q. There are currently no deliverables or no accountability. At the end of the planning phase, will we have more detailed information?
- A. Yes, to the extent that we know.

Kelly Hayworth moved approval of \$125,000; Terrence Neuzil seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; the motion passed unanimously.

6. Department of Administrative Services (DAS) Transparency/Searchable Budget Database - Request for Scope Analysis and Design Funds (\$100,000) – Mark Uhrin, ITE.  
The legislature is interested in government transparency, one aspect of which is what the State gets for its money. A bill was proposed on this issue during the recent legislative session, but did not pass. We would like to provide that core information in a form that is easily accessible and downloadable. The proposed database will utilize financial information from the State's Accounting Enterprise and also include data from the Regents and DOT who use separate accounting systems. It would provide budget and transaction information (how the money is spent) to the public. The estimate for scope analysis and design is the same as that which was initially provided to the legislature, in response to the proposed legislative initiative.

Council comments/concerns:

- It is not the Council's job to fund things that the legislature mandates, but doesn't fund. Why are we bypassing the usual process that splits these two phases up (scope analysis and design)?
  - Why not just do scope analysis first?
  - How long will it take to complete this? ITE response: Our goal is to complete the work by the beginning of the next legislative session.
  - As written, this concept paper provides no budget or guaranteed deliverables. ITE response: This will be done using the iterative approach. We are strongly considering using crowd-sourcing. We may also conduct a boot camp. We would provide a search engine and a set of reports.
  - What is the urgency of this project? ITE response: We are six months away from another legislative session. The issue of transparency will come up again and we would like to have something in place before the issue resurfaces.
  - This is the kind of project that the Council should do. In hard times, people want to know how government is spending its money.
  - It is within our mission, but an undefined iterative approach is fiscally irresponsible.
-

- We don't know how much this is really going to cost. With limited funds, does the Council have money to fund open-ended projects?
- We should try to figure out what this is really going to cost. I agree this issue is not going to go away.
- We need to figure out what kind of scope we're talking about. An iterative approach for scope analysis doesn't make sense to me now.

Terri Selberg moved approval of \$30,000 for scope analysis; Beth Baldwin seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; the motion passed unanimously.

7. Iowa College Student Aid Commission (CSAC) College Student Aid Portal – Request for Execution Funds (\$350,000) – Julie Leeper, CSAC.

The College Student Aid Commission originally appeared in 2008 seeking \$20,000 for scope analysis. The Commission administers state scholarships and grants. Their mission is to help students and families explore and finance secondary education. CSAC wants to build a statewide web portal that includes career planning, college planning, financial aid, scholarship and grant search, college admission applications, electronic transcripts and Iowa employment opportunities. The portal will be called "I have a plan Iowa" and will save time by allowing students to complete applications and handle paper documents online, and save time for colleges and universities by making documents electronic. Eighty-six percent of funding for the portal will come from the Commission; if approved, 14% of funding (which only encompasses the financial aid component) will come from IOWAccess. The other components have already been developed elsewhere, but not with the connection to the financial aid piece. Initially the portal will show state and federal program dollars, but not yet private programs. That will be added later.

Q. How much has the Council already approved for this project?

A. \$186,000.

Q. How many students do you anticipate using the portal?

A. There are nearly 140,000 applications processed each year, but far more than that will use the portal.

Barb Corson moved approval of execution funds; Kelly Hayworth seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; the motion passed unanimously.

8. Draft IOWAccess Advisory Council By-Laws – Malcolm Huston.

Draft by-laws were previously sent to the Council. The first draft was essentially a mockup of the Technology Governance Board by-laws. The second draft more closely aligns with the IOWAccess statute, but is not meant to be all encompassing. By-laws can help define Council processes and goals, but can be amended at any time.

The proposed by-laws indicate that 50% of IOWAccess funds would be reserved for enterprise projects. This is meant to encourage collaboration so that more than one entity benefits. Some Council members favored the idea, but were not sure it was feasible. What about simply stating that the Council will give higher priority to collaborative projects?

---

Another concept is reviewing new projects on an annual basis, similar to the process used for grant applications. Projects are ranked and that ranking results in the final outcome.

Another issue: Why do we treat projects that are done internally different than those that are done externally?

As a first step, the Chair decided to form a subcommittee to work on the by-laws. A portion of the next Council meeting may be set aside to continue discussion on this matter.

9. ITE Project Updates – Mark Uhrin, ITE.

After an extended delay, the criminal history online application is again making progress. The School Alerts program continues to do well. We are looking at integrating social networking sites into the program. The Iowa sex offender registry should be up and functional by the end of June. The Business License Information Center (BLIC) is in production, but not yet available to the public. A June or July roll-out is expected.

10. Wrap Up and Adjourn – Dick Neri, Chair.

The next Council meeting is July 8.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m.

---





# IOWAccess Advisory Council

## IOWAccess Revolving Fund Project Application

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

### Part I - Project Information

<b>Date:</b>	July 8, 2009
<b>Agency Name:</b>	Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Investigation
<b>Project Name:</b>	Breath Alcohol Program Records
<b>Agency Manager:</b>	James Bleskacek
<b>Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:</b>	515-725-1500 <a href="mailto:bleskace@dps.state.ia.us">bleskace@dps.state.ia.us</a>
<b>Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):</b>	
<b>Initial Total for Planning:</b>	\$60,000
<b>Initial Total for Execution:</b>	\$150,000
<b>Initial Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:</b>	\$
<b>Project Timeline: (estimate start and end dates for project spending)</b>	Scope Start Date: Jan 7, 2009 Scope End Date: June 30, 2009 Planning Start Date: July 9, 2009 Planning End Date: Nov 1, 2009 Execution Start Date: Nov 16, 2009 Execution End Date: May 1, 2010
<b>Revised Total for Planning and Execution:</b>	\$210,000.
<b>Revised Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:</b>	\$

## 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 goal of this project is to provide the public access to maintenance reports, accuracy reports and individual reports for the Breath Alcohol Testing equipment. There are currently 183 instruments statewide. These instruments are managed and tested by the Department of Public Safety (DPS) Division of Criminal Investigation (DCI) Crime Lab. With those instruments, 15,000 to 18,000 tests are administered annually. DCI staff members receive from one to six discoveries weekly which must be answered. One of the purposes of this project is to automate those requests. Members of the public, to include the media and Mothers Against Drunk Drivers (MADD), have also expressed an interest in the information which will be provided.

An additional item to this project is the training of law enforcement personnel. Law enforcement personnel are required to receive training before they may administer tests using the Breath Alcohol equipment. They must then receive recertification training every five years. The website will allow the recertification training to be conducted on line. This will eliminate the need for DCI personnel to travel to administer the training or law enforcement personnel to travel to receive the training.

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

**Response:** The DCI Crime Lab is tasked with owning, administering and testing the Breath Alcohol Test equipment. They are also tasked with providing the information on the machines to the public and in court. DPS would like to provide as much public information as possible in a manner that makes it easily accessible at all times to the public. This project will provide a means to disseminate the public records and information as it pertains to the Breathalyzer equipment and tests.

**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 person must request the records from the DCI. The DCI employee must then obtain the records from their database and files. The information is then provided to the requestor.

This project is in alignment with the DPS direction in providing public information in an easily accessible manner.

The programming elements are consistent with an SOA approach. Elements from existing projects will be used as much as possible in the development of this project.

The programming elements have been reviewed with ITE and DPS to ensure they are consistent with existing enterprise standards.

## 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: No**

**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**

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

YES (If "YES", explain.)

**Response: No**

**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 will directly affect state government employees in that the time needed to obtain and provide the information to the public will be greatly reduced. Currently, the agency receives one to six requests weekly for this information. This will eliminate the need to call the agency to obtain the information. The user may access the information on line. This project will provide a means for attorneys to quickly obtain the information that is needed for court cases. It will also provide the public user with a way to very quickly and easily obtain records.

This will also provide the agency staff with a means of obtaining the information if they are not located at the main building. State, county and city law enforcement agencies will be able to obtain records on the machines in their possession at any time. They will also be able to review a particular case as needed.

**An additional benefit will be the access to reports. Law Enforcement agencies will be able to quickly determine the time of year, week and day that most Driving While Under the Influence (DUI) charges are imposed. This will enable them to plan their policies to accommodate the increase or decrease in DUI cases.**

**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: Attorneys will no longer have to depend on the normal working hours of the DCI Crime Lab staff members to obtain information. The user will be able to review the information, determine if they need an actual printed copy of the information and, if needed, print the information. The information can be obtained at any time.**

**The public will have access to the easily obtainable data at all times. The website will also provide many more details that have not been able to be accessed by the public.**

**The DCI staff will no longer be required to spend time looking up the information and printing the information to be delivered to the requesting party. This will enable a great savings on time, printing costs and mailing costs.**

**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 information is public knowledge. This project will provide the citizens with the information that has always been available but hard to obtain. In many cases, the public was not aware of the information that is available. Citizens will also have access to information concerning the number of tests given by law enforcement agencies as well as when more people are inclined to fail the tests. This information can be used for many purposes. The information can also be used by the news media and organizations such as MADD and the Automobile Association of America (AAA).**

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

**Response: In knowing when more DUI offenses are committed, this will enable law enforcement agencies to take more preventive actions during the times of increases activity.**

---

**[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 absorbed by your agency from non-Pooled Technology/IOWAccess funds? If desired, provide additional comment / response below.

**Response: Development and first year hosting funding is anticipated to come from lowAccess. After the first year of the project being in production, the agency will absorb 100% of the ongoing operational and maintenance costs.**

[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: \$70,000**

### 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: Currently, citizens requesting Breath Alcohol testing information must submit a request to DPS/DCI. This can be done in person, by phone or by sending in a request. The DCI personnel must then retrieve the requested data in a printed format. The data is then given to the citizen either by mail, fax or the person coming to the office. Our office is located on the DMACC campus in Ankeny. The citizens are not provided with reports annotating the number of cases which were tested and the results. These can only be retrieved by DCI personnel at this time.**

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 citizens will be able to quickly and easily obtain a broader range of information such as being able to search for data based on date or instrument number. They can quickly and easily obtain the information on a particular device. They will also have access to the Accuracy and Maintenance documents, certification records and Breath Record reports which have been scanned and saved into the DPS file system. Other advantages will include**

the ability of the user to specify a time period and retrieve reports based on the numbers of tests during that period. Users will also be able to retrieve data based on county. This new system will also allow law enforcement personnel to become recertified online. This will eliminate the need for law enforcement personnel to travel to Des Moines for recertification.

[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.

Begin Date for Planning: March 12, 2009 Planning will be conducted by the following:

- Project Manager – Mary Hadd, DAS/ITE
- Business Analyst – Amelia Adkins, DAS/ITE
- Customer Member – Jim Bleskacek, DPS/DCI
- Customer Member – Leon Frederick, DPS/TSB (data issues and connectivity)
- Developer (mock up screens) – as yet unnamed, DAS/ITE
- Developer (.NET) – as yet unnamed, DAS/ITE

End Date for Planning: September 4, 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.

Customer Meetings	80 hours	\$9,040
4 team member/20 meetings with customer		
Team Meetings	100 hours	\$11,300

Detail Design	96 hours	\$10,848
Project Management	74 hours	\$8,362
Business Analysis	80 hours	\$9,040
Mock up screens	60 hours	\$6,780
Test Document	40 hours	\$4,520
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$60,000</b>

### 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:**

Criminalist personnel time, paper, toner, fax toner, long distance calling charges. Additionally, the criminalist conducts an excess of 400 training classes annually. These classes are held at the DCI Lab in Ankeny as well as other areas of the state.

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

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits): FTE criminalist @ approximately 35% of time on this matter	\$ 35,000
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.): (travel to include mileage, lodging and food and office supplies)	\$ 25,000
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	\$225
Law Enforcement Personnel (training)	1,200 personnel
Law Enforcement travel time (1,200 x 2)	2,400
Law Enforcement personnel savings for travel time (\$31 x 2,400) This savings is primarily to the county and city law enforcement agencies.	\$74,400
<b>Total One Year Pre-Project Cost:</b>	<b>\$ 134,625</b>

**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:**

Costs will be greatly reduced as most information currently requested can now be obtained by accessing the website.

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

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits): FTE criminalist @ approximately 5% of time on this matter	\$ 5,000
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$ 350



Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.): This application will be co-located with other DPS applications. At this time, it is felt all data will be retrieved from DPS databases. This eliminates the need for hosting fees.	\$0
<b>Total One Year Post-Project Cost:</b>	<b>\$ 5,350</b>

**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.

We have used a mixed rate which includes \$10 an hour for citizens and \$100 an hour for attorneys. We estimate the attorneys' use at 60% and the general public's use at 40%.

**Describe savings justification:**

<u>Transaction Savings</u>	
Number of annual online transactions:	350
Hours saved/transaction:	2
Number of Citizens affected:	127
Value of Citizen Hour	Various
Total Transaction Savings:	\$44,800
Other Savings (Describe)	
<b>Total One Year Citizen Benefit :</b>	<b>\$44,800</b>

**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:** The National Safety Council of Alcohol and Other Drugs recommends that officers receive training on a periodic schedule of 5 years on the operation of evidential breath alcohol instruments. It is felt that when the laboratory becomes ISO certified in Breath Alcohol, that ASCLD (American Society of Crime Lab Directors) will follow that recommendation requiring continual training.

**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
<b>State General</b>	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%

<b>Fund</b>						
<b>Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund</b>	\$60,000	100%	\$0	100%	\$0	0%
<b>Federal Funds</b>	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
<b>Local Gov. Funds</b>	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
<b>Grant or Private Funds</b>	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
<b>Other Funds (Specify)</b>	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$60,000	100%	\$0	100%	\$0	0%
<b>Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total</b>	\$60,000	100%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%

### 6. Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet

<b>A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):</b>	\$134,625	
<b>B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):</b>	\$5,350	
<b>C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):</b>		\$129,275
<b>D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):</b>		\$44,800
<b>E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):</b>		\$0
<b>F. Total Planning Benefit (C+D+E)</b>	\$ 174,075	
<b>G. Planning Phase Cost Calculation (Section III D5):</b>	\$60,000	
<b>Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =</b>	2.90	
<b>Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100</b>	190.125	

**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 greatly enhance the citizen's interaction with the government. Data which currently must be retrieved by submitting paperwork, waiting for the research to be completed and the return of the results will now be done on line with instant results.

This project also provides information which, at this time, is not available to the public. This information includes the number of OWI offenses by county and law enforcement agencies. It also provides information on how many offenses there are by date, month, year, time of day, etc. The reports can also provide the limits that were reached on the tests based on the previously mentioned factors. This will be an invaluable tool to the media, organizations such as MADD and law enforcement agencies.

An ad hoc report will be available to the public. This will allow the public to determine the factors needed for their reports using much of the data included in the database. The user will then be able to analyze the retrieved data in ways different from those currently performed by the agency. With the valuable insight gained from the reports, the user may then use the analyzed data for additional reports, research, to inform the public or more detailed informational purposes.

**[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: \$

Amount of Hosting Requested: \$

*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:

<p>[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]  <b>Execution Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).</li> <li>The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).</li> <li>The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).</li> </ul>	<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/>
---	--

### 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	\$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%
<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>

[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:

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

Budget Line Items	Budget Amount (1 <sup>st</sup> Year Cost)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1 <sup>st</sup> Year)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Software	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Hardware	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Training	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Facilities	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Professional Services	\$		%	\$	%	\$
ITE Services	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Supplies, Maint., etc.	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Other	\$		%	\$	%	\$
<b>Totals</b>	\$		%	\$	%	\$

**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.

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

**[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)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b><u>TOTAL PLANNING EVALUATION</u></b> (90 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Execution Timeline Evaluation (10Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Execution Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Execution Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b><u>TOTAL EXECUTION EVALUATION</u></b> (35 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Execution Phase:

## Part V – Auditable Outcome Measures

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

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 Planning approval, then complete and submit Parts IV and V to request Execution approval.

### Part I - Project Information

<b>Date:</b>	July 1, 2009
<b>Agency Name:</b>	Department of Natural Resources
<b>Project Name:</b>	Special Events Coordination
<b>Agency Manager:</b>	Jeff Kopaska
<b>Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:</b>	<a href="mailto:Jeff.Kopaska@dnr.iowa.gov">Jeff.Kopaska@dnr.iowa.gov</a> Jeff Kopaska, Natural Resource Biologist (515) 432-2823 X109
<b>Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):</b>	Ken Herring, Division Administrator, Conservation and Recreation Division, Department of Natural Resources, 515-281- 5529
<b>Initial Total for Planning:</b>	\$67,250
<b>Initial Total for Execution:</b>	\$152,500
<b>Initial Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:</b>	\$219,750
<b>Project Timeline: (estimate start and end dates for project spending)</b>	Planning Start Date: Dec. 1, 2008 Planning End Date: May 22, 2009 Execution Start Date: July 20, 2009 Execution End Date: Dec. 1, 2009
<b>Revised Total for Planning and Execution:</b>	\$
<b>Revised Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:</b>	\$

## 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?**

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?**

**X 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 it 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 absorbed 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: \$47,250

#### 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 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.

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 new system must be online and able to accept applications by December 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.

100% for planning of 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:**

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.):	\$
<b>Total One Year Pre-Project Cost:</b>	<b>\$ 84,000</b>

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

**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 \$209,750.

<u>Transaction Savings</u>	
Number of annual online transactions:	<b>2000</b>
Hours saved/transaction:	<b>1</b>
Number of Citizens affected:	<b>15.2 million</b>
Value of Citizen Hour	<b>\$10</b>
Total Transaction Savings:	<b>\$20,000</b>
Other Savings (Describe)	<b>\$13.6 million</b>
<b>Total One Year Citizen Benefit :</b>	<b>\$13.6 million</b>

**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:**

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	100%
<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$47,250</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>
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):		\$13,620,000
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):	\$47,250	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =	292	
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100	29106	

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:**

**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.]**

**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: \$ 145,000**

**Amount of Hosting Requested: \$7,500**

*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 selected vendor will be responsible for all items, DNR will be involved in all project phases.

Start Date, 7/20/2009

Definition of requirements, start 7/20/2009, end 7/23/2009

Inspection/confirmation of requirements, start 7/22/2009, end 8/2/2009

Development of detailed work plan, start 8/2/2009, end 8/9/2009

Database and application framework development, start 8/10/2009, end 8/30/2009

Application development (coding), start 8/12/2009, end 9/29/2009

Testing, start 8/24/2009, end 10/25/2009

Documentation/training, start 9/7/2009, end 11/8/2009

Deployment into production, start 11/10/2009, end 11/16/2009

Projected date of final release, 11/16/2009

Post development support, start 11/16/2009, end 8/16/2010

[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	\$152,500	100%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Federal Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Local Gov. Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%

Grant or Private Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Other Funds (Specify)	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>\$152,500</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>
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:

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

Budget Line Items	Budget Amount (1 <sup>st</sup> Year Cost)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1 <sup>st</sup> Year)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff	\$78,000	5	100%	\$13,800	100%	\$29,400*
Software	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Hardware	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Training	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Facilities	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Professional Services	\$135,000	4	100%	\$0	%	\$33,750
ITE Services	\$7,500	1	100%	\$7,500	100%	\$15,000
Supplies, Maint., etc.	\$6,000	1	100%	\$1,200	100%	\$7,200*
Other	\$10,000	1	100%	\$0	100%	\$10,000
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$236,500</b>		<b>100 %</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>\$95,350*</b>

*\*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 Execution/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 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:**

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):	\$95,350	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =	145	
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100	8987%	

[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)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b><u>TOTAL PLANNING EVALUATION</u></b> (90 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Execution Phase:

Execution Timeline Evaluation (10Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Execution Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Execution Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b><u>TOTAL EXECUTION EVALUATION</u></b> (35 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Part V – Auditable Outcome Measures

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

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**



# IOWAccess Project Concept Paper

---

1. **Email completed copy to the IOWAccess Manager: [malcolm.huston@iowa.gov](mailto: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:** 6/25/2009

**Project Name:** Iowa Code and Rules Easy Navigation and Search

**Requesting Agency:** Legislative Services Agency (LSA)  
State Capitol  
Des Moines, IA 50319

**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 (include name and phone number):**

Jeff VanEngelenhoven & Richard Johnson  
Room G01, State Capitol  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
515.281.3566

**Project Sponsor (include name and phone number):**

Iowa Code Office, LSA  
Iowa Administrative Code Office, LSA

**Business Case Justification:**

The Iowa Legislative Services Agency (LSA) is a non-partisan agency that organizes, updates, and publishes the Iowa Code and the Iowa Administrative Code. The Iowa Code is the official collection of Iowa's permanent laws. The Iowa Administrative Code is a composite of all rules written by the executive branch which have the full force and effect of law. The Iowa Administrative Code contains rules that have been adopted by the state agencies to implement, interpret, or make specific the law enforced or administered by the agencies.

The LSA is currently engaged in a multiyear computerization project to consolidate multiple publication platforms into one database publishing and management platform using standardized software. This project includes replacing the current legacy systems used for the production of bills, amendments, the Iowa Code, and the Iowa Administrative Code. The project is in the third year with the production release of all phases to be complete by March 2010.

The major change has been the implementation of a standardized content markup language (XML) across all critical databases. This has been key to enhancing both the integration and extensibility of the new platform and software system.

The development focus has been on document creation, the internal business process, and workflow. The LSA will now begin the development of the publicly accessible tools that will improve citizen access and understanding of Iowa law.

Currently users of the Iowa Code and the Iowa Administrative Code face two issues that would be addressed by this project:

- The Iowa Administrative Code rules which are implementing the statutes in the Iowa Code are paper-based, sometimes inaccurate in terms of referencing the Iowa Code, and hard to access.
- The current index taxonomy of the Iowa Code and the Iowa Administrative Code is not uniform, the indices are designed for paper-based delivery, and, at times, the publication of the indices occurs significantly later than the updated versions of the law.

**Expected Results in this Project:**

The expected result of this project would be to improve citizen access to and understanding of the relationship of the Iowa Administrative Rules and the Iowa Code. This would be accomplished by refining and exposing their relationship. Many citizens are not clear of the difference or relationship between the Iowa Administrative Rules and the Iowa Code. The project will result in an easy to use navigation and search across the Iowa Code and the Iowa Administrative Code.

There currently is a paper-based table that lists which rules are implementing the Iowa Code. Unfortunately the current system is not very accurate. The Iowa Code is changed every year. Sections are added and deleted and provisions are renumbered. The Administrative Code contains 18,000 pages that are the responsibility of the Executive Branch agencies to keep up to date. The development effort would create the tagging of Iowa Administrative Code references to the Iowa Code. The new system would recognize changes in the Iowa Code and the resulting reference changes required. This would allow a citizen who was interested in a certain topic to see the relevant Iowa Code sections and the rules implementing the Code section in context with each other.

The creation of a uniform index for the Iowa Code and the Iowa Administrative Code and the development of enhanced electronic index capabilities. This would allow the following:

- Allow a user the ability to build collections across legal documents. An example could be a user interested in amphibians. In a single location that user could find all statutes and rules related to amphibians and build a single document that contained the related content.
- The creation of a uniform index would allow customized, subscription-based delivery of legal documents to be based upon uniform index entries. A person could subscribe to "Amphibians" and be notified of changes or proposed changes to the Iowa Code or the Iowa Administrative Code.

**Recipients of this Service:**

Anyone who interacts with Iowa law.

**Request (include dollar amount and description of what will be purchased – i.e. services, hardware, software)**

This request is for \$20,000 for services to complete the Scope Analysis. The LSA will request additional funding for the Design and Implementation phases in the future.

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

The LSA will be putting an emphasize on creating many tools that will create greater access to bills, amendments, the Iowa Code, and the Iowa Administrative Code. The additional tools include:

- Development of a customized subscription-based delivery of legal documents. This would allow the user to sign up for updates by RSS, email, etc. The user could subscribe by index subject, keyword, chapter, or committee. The subscription could be across the various products.
- Allowing developers access to the current legal documents through the creation of web services.
- Providing a tool for local delivery of collections with automatic updates. This may be a good delivery mechanism for people who do not have constant web connectivity (field workers).
- Allowing storage by individuals of annotations that are tied to pieces of content. This could be a repository for comments or notes on a specific Code section or a bill.

The development effort on the delivery of all of these tools for the public will require a large effort. We anticipate a significant cost in developer services. In addition, the use of LSA resources for the development effort will be significant.

Without the scope of effort defined it is unclear what the resource requirements are. A very rough projection could be a level of need of \$1 million with the LSA seeking funding for 1/3 of the cost.



# IOWAccess Project Concept Paper

---

- 1. Email completed copy to the IOWAccess Manager: [malcolm.huston@iowa.gov](mailto: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**

June 29, 2009

**Project Name**

Web-Based Local Government and Annual Report Database – Expansion to School Districts

**Requesting Agency**

Iowa Department of Management

**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 (include name and phone number)**

Jim Nervig 515-242-5240; Lisa Oakley 515-281-8485

**Project Sponsor (include name and phone number)**

Dick Oshlo 515-281-5201

**Business Case Justification**

Goal: To establish a centralized database and application with Internet accessibility that would allow school district officials to prepare and certify budgets each year. This database and application will be added to the web-based local government and annual report database developed last year. School districts currently prepare budgets using an Excel file that is uploaded through the web to the Department of Management. The data is extracted to the department's mainframe system. Various mainframe Cobol programs are used to audit the budget data and calculate school foundation aid. The goal of this project is to provide functionality and features at least comparable to the existing Excel spreadsheets and mainframe programs currently used. This architecture will eliminate the current process of the Department of Management sending revised budget information back to school districts through the mail.

Importantly, the goal is also to make budget information available on-line as soon as the data is reported by the school district authority and again, after the school foundation aid formula is calculated and finalized by the Department of Management. The school district budget information will also be available to the general public.

Project Purpose: This project will create a web-based application for the school district budget process, eliminating the need for the Department of Management to deliver and support individualized Excel files to local governments on an annual basis.

By going to web entry and a centralized database, school districts will be able to directly load budget data into, and edit the data on, a SQL database. This system will be able to make preliminary budget data available on-line, saving significant time and effort for the public and any other parties, looking for such data. Currently someone wanting preliminary data for a school district must contact that school district directly. The new system would eliminate that

process and allow them to get the preliminary data from the database via the Internet, with a minimum of effort.

Background: The Iowa Code requires school districts to prepare and adopt a budget annually by April 15. The Department of Management provides an Excel workbook that is used to create files for reporting the data. The Department of Management has to make sure the workbooks will work over the wide range of Windows operating systems and office suites used by school districts. The workbooks contain numerous error checks to ensure data is entered correctly.

The completed budget files are then uploaded to the Department of Management’s website. After County Auditors’ certify the budgets, selected data is then extracted from the Excel files and imported into the existing mainframe system. After the Department of Management checks for errors and calculates the school foundation aid formula using mainframe Cobol programs, the resulting final budget data is posted to the website for downloading.

For those interested in detailed information from school district data, reports can be generated upon request. Some users (Department of Education, Legislative Services Agency, Iowa Farm Bureau) request the entire database.

**Expected Results in this Project**

The move to a web-based budget database for school districts will allow the general public and other interested parties to have web access to school district budgets. School district staff will be able to enter budget data using a standardized platform. Moving to a web-based system will allow the state to make essential information about school district budgets available to school districts and the public for their general usage. This will help to reduce errors and expedite availability of information.

**Recipients of this Service**

- General Public
- School District Officials
- Iowa County Auditors
- Iowa Department of Management
- Iowa Department of Education
- Iowa Department of Revenue
- Legislative Services Agency
- Iowa Association of School Boards
- Iowa Association of School Business Officials
- Iowa Farm Bureau Federation

**Request (include dollar amount and description of what will be purchased - i.e. services, hardware, software)**

This request is for \$30,000 for the Scope Analysis phase.

**Project Timeline**

<b>Phase</b>	<b>Start Month/Year</b>	<b>End Month/Year</b>	<b>Estimated Amount</b>
<b>Scope Analysis</b>	07/2009	10/2009	\$30,000
<b>Design</b>			
<b>Implementation</b>			

**Resources Being Contributed (people or funds being contributed to the project by the sponsoring agency- include role/% of time or amount in dollars)**



Department of Management staff will be available to work with ITE staff in defining the scope of the project.

## 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?

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.

### 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.)

### 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.

## 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.

## 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.

## 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.

# 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 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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:** Iowa Sex Offender Registry **CR #: 3**  
**Project Sponsor:** Jim Saunders  
**Change requested by:** DPS  
**Originator:** Mary Hadd  
**Urgency:** Major **Date requested:** 06/30/2009

<b>Justification</b>	Changes in application screens and data acquisition processes dictated by changes in statutes. Estimate includes receipt of additional data from Computer Products of Illinois (CPI) as well as additional testing of data presentation.
----------------------	--

Hours	Description of Change Requested:
16 hours	Additional information as dictated by current legislation: Include: "2,000 ft. Residency Restriction", "Exclusion Zones", and "Prohibited Employment" data. This data must be included in the information received from DPS and must be displayed on the new website as: Subject To: 2,000 ft. Residency Restriction (Yes or No) Exclusion Zones (Yes or No) Prohibited Employment (Yes or No)
60 hours	Information from earlier legislative sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicle information (car, boat, plane)</li> <li>• Email address</li> <li>• Telephone numbers</li> <li>• Tier information</li> <li>• Other addresses</li> <li>• Employer Information</li> <li>• School Information</li> </ul>
60 hours	Coordination and development of CPI processes



30 hours	Name conversion to include accepting data from a revised flat file and then an xml file.
30 hours	Meetings with DPS personnel and CPI
24 hours	Retooling of National Registry for new name standard
220 hours	\$24,560
<b>Reason for Change:</b>	New laws passed during the legislative session of 2009. Changes needed for data that is required to be displayed.
<b>Proposed Approach to Resolve:</b>	Incorporate the changes while building the revised website
<b>Description of Change Requested:</b>	

### Impact

**Impact on Scope:** Additional information is needed in the data received from DPS. Additional testing will also be required to insure all required data is included in the data feed.

**Impact on Scope Risk:** The data will need to be closely reviewed to insure the data received is the same data as is in the master database.

**Impact on Schedule:** The schedule is increased by 220 hours. This will require approximately an additional minimum of 2.5 months to complete.

**Impact on Staffing Effort:** The main resource will be needed for an additional amount of time to complete the project.

**Impact on Spending:** Additional \$25,000 is needed.

### Previous Spending

Planning and Design: \$5,816.00 – funded by DPS

Execution: \$75,000 – funded by lowAccess

Approval

Project Leader/Date	Customer/Date	Sponsor/Date