

February 6, 1991
Approved _____ Date

House _____ Computers, Communications & Technology
MINUTES OF THE _____ COMMITTEE ON _____

The meeting was called to order by _____ Rep. George Dean _____ at
Chairperson

7:30 a.m. ~~pm~~ on _____ February 5 _____, 1991 in room _____ 529-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Rep. Bob Mead, excused

Committee staff present: Julian Efird, Legislative Research
Norman J. Furse, Revisor of Statutes
Mary Valdivia, Committee Secretary

Conferees Appearing Before the Committee: Emil Lutz, Dir. Legislative Serv.
David Larson, Dir. Infor. Syst.

Emil Lutz, Director, Legislative Services, was introduced by Chairman Dean. He gave a presentation on the process used by Legislative Services on computerization.

It became apparent that tools were not available to take care of the secretarial needs. Equipment was antiquated for what needed to be accomplished in such a short period of time. There were enough memory typewriters to take care of about half of the standing committees, and ordered enough to take care of the rest of the committees the first year (\$1000 per typewriter, spent around \$20,000 to take care of Committee Secretaries.)

When visiting with legislators, found they had Word Processing capabilities in their offices. A little over two years ago a letter was written to the LCC recommending that a study be made to determine if it was feasible to computerize the Kansas Legislature. Sen. Burke appointed a subcommittee. Shortly thereafter the subcommittee decided that a "task force" type group was needed to get input from the various leadership offices, all the legislative agencies, state library, anyone connected with the Legislature, to see what the needs were and get their suggestions, needs, etc. DISC was also involved at that time.

Several such meetings were held on this matter and it was determined that a survey was needed to get this on record and get the inventory down. A questionnaire was made up to survey each of the legislators and asked for their suggestions, and recommendations. Also sent to other states that were comparable with Kansas to see what experiences they had and what they had to recommend.

Reports were made regularly to the LCC, and the LCC decided that a consulting firm should be obtained to study this. During this period of time contacted NCSL headquarters in Denver on this and asked for their suggestions and recommendations. They recommended several firms, one in Michigan and one in Washington state who had done this type of work for other states. Visited with them and during 1989 annual meeting in Tulsa met personally with representatives from each of these firms. Their cost was quite high and decided not go with them.

Steering Committee decided there was a great deal of information and LCC approved, based on using information available, to contact consulting firms for quotations. About this time it was recommended to contact Andersen Consulting Company and get their quotation on this study. Andersen offered to do a two week type preliminary study to see if worthwhile, without cost or obligation on our part. They did so with approval of LCC and suggested that we computerize.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Computers, Communications & Technology
room 529-S, Statehouse, at 7:30 a.m. ~~p.m.~~ on February 5, 1991

Plan approved by LCC at this time is a two phase plan.

- 1) 1991 - all of leadership offices are to be networked together with all of legislative agencies. (Speaker, president, majority and minority leaders, speaker pro tem.)
- 2) 1992 - Remainder of Legislative offices would be computerized, meaning in affect every secretary would have wordprocessing capabilities.

Discussion followed after the presentation. Some of the highlights were:

Some of the reasons for type of equipment recommended were ease of learning, user friendly, utilization of existing telephone network.

In October when it became obvious that this was going to be quite consuming and at the recommendation of the LCC recommended that an additional staff person be hired to handle this. It was felt this would be more feasible to hire our own staff who could help design and formulate the plan for computerization, rather than paying for a larger consulting firm to come in and do this.

It was also felt that with the acquisition of the Reapportionment computer equipment, we would have some assurances that whatever was purchased for the Reapportionment line, we could incorporate with computerization of the legislature.

At the present time we are talking of two entirely different systems that do not inter connect. Each has its own function and does not cross over to the other. The crossover, or merging, will not take place until after reapportionment obligations are met.

Visualize three networks, Disc, main frame and it runs many terminals. On that system resides bill status, star system, etc. Then we have the re-districting system which is a two year project to draw maps from a very large geographical and demographic area. Then we have our office network of PC's wired together. One of first things going to do is link our office PC network to the DISC mainframe, so that every PC also functions as dual duty as access to the DISC main frame. These two networks will be linked together, in two years we propose to link Redistricting series of terminals to our network also. Reason being that unit has a large capacity, has the ability to add additional data we might want to have available for the legislators. Going to use fibre network that we installed as part of Redistricting system to provide high speed path ways between floors.

David Larson was asked to return February 6, to conclude his presentation.

Copies of January 29 and 30, 1991, meeting were reviewed and adopted as submitted.

Meeting adjourned 8:30 AM.

