MINUTES OF THE __House__ COMMITTEE ON __Computers, Communications&Technology__

The meeting was called to order by ___George Dean___ a
Chairperson

__7:00__ a.m./pxxx on ___April 4___, 19_91_ in room __529-S__ of the Capitol

All members were present except:

Committee staff present:
Norman Furse, Revisor of Statutes
Julian Efird, Research
Diane Duffy, Research
Mary Valdivia, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:
Jean Turner, Department of Administration
Gene James, DISC
John Oliver, DISC

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Dean at 7:05 Am.

Jean Turner, Department of Administration, introduced Gene James and John Oliver from DISC.

Mr. Oliver gave a brief background of his involvement with DISC and when he inherited Department of Corrections which was in 1988.

The DOC' computer system was very antiquated, and they were having problems with their telecommunications. The total DP staff at that time consisted of (1) Computer System Analyst III, (1) Programmer II and (2) Computer Operators, there was an individual that was on a half time basis. Considered the following options.

1) Rewriting the code for the system.

   This did not work because the system was crashing on a daily basis. It was a very fragile system, one that every modification made to it caused it to have problems. Would have been costly.

2) Move DOC applications to the DISC main frame. Encountered the following problems:

   (a) Would have required replacement of field equipment

   (b) Lack of personnel and their lack of mainframe experience. The resources to redesign applications would have to come from another source which meant DISC or contract with outside services. DISC did not have the resources at that time to commit to the project and the outside resources got rather expensive.

3) Do nothing and try to reschedule some of the operations. Doing some of the work during off hours. This did not work because the System 36 was busy running all night long.

4) Upgrading System 36. Cost of upgrading System 36 exceeded the cost of replacing with AS400.

5) Replace System 36 with some other type of mini-computer. Cost became prohibitive.

6) Look at replacing System 36 with AS400 B30, at a cost of $133,812. It allowed an upgrade path for future expansion without having to replace any of the hardware, was compatible with the existing field hardware, was compatible with CROSS which is the direction the state was moving to for its electronic mail network, provided reasonable word processor support both with an 80 product on the machine which they call a display write, but also was capable of working as a file server with the state standard Wordperfect on mini-computers.

It allowed the DOC to phase in as much or as little automation as the management of the organization wanted to do. The support for the system could be maintained with their existing staffing levels. Any expansion or enhancement to it would require additional staffing, but knew the status quo could be maintained with the existing staff.

They did buy the AS400, and this is the present one they have. A small one was purchased for Ellsworth at a later time which ties in to the fact that after the decision made to move to this a complete plan was developed to phase in the re-engineering of all applications to get them out of the condition they were in, to investigating the possibility of distributed data processing and distributing those resources to the inmate facilities to help cure the problem of telecommunications.

As it pertains to the plan and what they want to do now, it is my understanding the plan is the same as it was then, basically going to distributed data systems. The AS400 B30 meets the central office needs for that plan.

Mr. James stated that as it is commonly done in industry today they do not put all data on a central mainframe. The DOC plan calls for small boxes at each of the institutions so data can be distributed to that institution.

Q. Have you looked at their plan?

A. I am familiar with that plan.

Q. In your estimation is it a good plan?

A. The concept is a good concept, we have not looked at the individual pieces of that plan, they have not requested approval to purchase individual pieces of that plan except for the El Dorado facility. (AS400 B-35)

Q. Have you reviewed the plan?

A. No I have not, I have seen a paper that Jim prepared I think for Legislative Committee that outlined in some detail the requirements.

Q. Did you review the needs study? The one that Jim wrote for this Committee.

A. If it is what I am thinking of, yes. I have seen the document by Jim that documented some of the needs of the system.

MINUTES OF THE _____House_____ COMMITTEE ON Computers,Communications & Technology,

room 529-S, Statehouse, at 7:00 a.m./p.xmx on _____April 4_____, 19_91_

Q.   Is that a reasonable document in your estimation?

A.   It is a beginning, I do not think that document in itself would justify the purchase of all that equipment, no. That needs to be approached on a case by case basis as they require funding to approve each elements of that system.

Q.   Yesterday testimony was given that it would take five years to implement their plan, to put their information on the mainframe, that it would take five years. Do you dispute that statement?

A.   It would be a large effort but I cannot imagine five years.

Q.   Initial request was made in 1989 for some of this data processing plan, we are here in 1991 a quarter through the year, they have presented I assume, per state law, their plan to you. Where are you in the process of either approving, modifying or rejecting the plan submitted to you?

A.   The last plan received from DOC was prior to Mr. Kent's hiring, was submitted by the department and they did not include detailed plan for what they intended to do but indicated they would submit such a plan when Mr. Kent arrived on board. This was around mid year of last year.

Q.   When did you first receive from the DOC a needs statement some sort of analysis, something on a piece of paper that which what you now understand their $1.9 request for AS 400, etc. When did you first receive that from them?

A.   After this session began and that was prepared for the Senate Committee and I received a courtesy copy.

Q.   So prior to that they had not submitted to you their detailed plan?

A.   No.

Q.   You have had two or three months to look at it, is that a fair statement?

A.   Yes

Q.   And after two or three months you have yet to come to any conclusion whether it is a plan that should be accepted, modified or rejected?

A.   That is not exactly a plan. That is a list of hardware, software, training needs, and all related items they see as being a part of that. That is not a complete plan.

Q.   What is a complete plan by your criteria?

A.   A complete plan would include rationale, goals to be fulfilled by the acquisition of that equipment in more detail, more detail on specifically why equipment was needed.

MINUTES OF THE _____House_____ COMMITTEE ON <u>Computers,Communications & Technology</u>,

room __529-S__, Statehouse, at __7:00__ a.m./p.m̶x̶x̶on _____April 4_____, 19_91

Q.   You don't think they have given you enough justification?

A.   That is true. If they were asking for approval to buy that
     equipment we would ask for considerably more. They have
     not.

Discussion followed on prescribed guidelines and procedures
within the state to be used in presenting a plan to DISC. Copy
of guidelines for a plan is to be sent to the Committee and
Committee Secretary.

Q.   How long would it take if they got the necessary report by
     Friday, how long would it take you to approve?

A.   I assume you are talking about them submitting a long range
     plan of the direction they want to go and our approving
     managerial and the acquisition of the hardware?

Q.   Assume they gave you the plan talked about earlier, how long
     would it take from the time they gave you the plan to
     approval to purchase the data?

A.   There are two processes you are talking about.   One is
     submission of a plan and the other is request to acquire
     hardware.   The normal process would be for them to submit a
     plan every year and update plan every year and say this is
     the direction we are going.   If we problems with that plan
     we would discuss with them. There is no formal approval or
     disapproval.

Q.   If they submitted a document to you, how long would it be
     before you got back with them to say you are going down the
     wrong track.

A.   Probably around 30 days.

<u>Subcommittee #1 Report:</u>
Rep. McKechnie submitted documents entitled Table 1 Rev.Est. Cost
of Computerizing the Legislature 4/4/91 Plan <u>(Attmt. #1)</u> and
Table 1 Rev. Est. Cost of Computerizing the Legislature 4/4/91
Plan A <u>(Attmt. #2)</u>. Rep. McKechnie stated that the sub-committee
recommended that Plan A, with the least amount of money being
spent this year, be adopted. Discussion followed.

It was recommended that before the Committee voted on accepting
these cost plans, that a written report needed to go along with
Attachments 1 and 2.   Rep. McKechnie was asked to write this up
in a dissertation form to include the plans, cost, need, and our
opinion for justification.   This would be submitted   to
Appropriations to say we have looked at the computerization of
the legislature and have them make the decision as to whether or
not money should be spent on this.

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 AM.

GUEST LIST

COMMITTEE: __CCT__   DATE: __4-4-71__

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)	ADDRESS	COMPANY/ORGANIZATION
Tom Beardmore	515 SW 37th St.	Computerland
Lorne A. Phillips	Topeka	KPHG
John C. Bottenberg	Topeka	Apple Computer
Pat Hubbell	Topeka	Apple
John Oliver	Topeka	DISC
Steven Davies	Topeka	SOC
June Fearly	Topeka	DOC
Jean Turner	Topeka	DISC
Jim Kent	Topeka	KDOC
Gene James	Topeka	DISC

TABLE 1
REV. EST. COST OF COMPUTERIZING THE LEGISLATURE

	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993	Total
Original LCC Request 11/90	$206,569	$711,339	--	$917,908
Apple Computers/Printers	25/13	109/109	--	134/122
Rev. Config. Est. 4/4/91	$99,843	$264,613	$107,229	$471,686
Apple CPUs/Other Printers	22/10	56/52	44/0	122/62
Difference in Cost Estimates	($106,726)	($446,726)	$107,229	($446,222)

CCT
4-4-91
attmt #1

TABLE 1
REV. EST. COST OF COMPUTERIZING THE LEGISLATURE

	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993	Total
Original LCC Request 11/90	$206,569	$711,339	--	$917,908
Apple Computers/Printers	25/13	109/109	--	134/122
Rev. Config. Est. 4/4/91	$99,843	$153,562	$218,281	$471,686
Apple CPUs/Other Printers	22/10	36/36	64/16	122/62
Difference in Cost Estimates	($106,726)	($557,777)	$218,281	($446,222)

C C T
4-4-91
attach #2