

Approved 5-6-92
Date

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

The meeting was called to order by George Dean at
Chairperson

7:30 a.m./~~p.m.~~ on March 26, 1992 in room 529-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Representative Kline - Excused
Representative Patrick - Excused

Committee staff present:

Julian Efird, Research
Donna Stadel, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Jerry Sloan, Office of Judicial Administration
Paul Shelby, Office of Judicial Administration
Ben Coates, Office of Judicial Administration

Others attending: See attached list.

The meeting convened at 7:30 a.m. Julian Efird reviewed and explained the process of presenting the attached report before the committee (attachment 1).

Major Hornbaker, Kansas Highway Patrol, addressed the committee's report on Highway Patrol Computer system Acquisition and Funding and said he is told the \$95,000 for software is not in the inclusion of recommendation they anticipated in FY94. Julian Efird explained the subcommittee just looked at hardware and operating software to get them up and running, and visited with the department about the software since it was added after the budget was submitted. The subcommittee intended to focus on the budget as submitted for hardware and operating software. When the governor reduced an FDE position, he understand the department added the software as an alternative to the one FDE which was deleted. That really is a separate issue in terms of their budget perhaps; although if you don't have the programmer or software, then you don't have anything.

Major Hornbaker said they could live with this, and would make certain it would be included in FY94 request.

A draft of the Judiciary Needs Analysis HCR 5059 (attachment 2) was distributed, with Julian Efird explaining this is the concurrent resolution addressing the needs of the court system in requiring, what is defined here as, a judicial branch information system. The courts had approached the committee earlier in the session with their needs, particularly at the appellate level, regarding initiating the computerization process.

Mr. Jerry Sloan, Office of Judicial Administration, spoke in regard to the draft resolution of the needs analysis. He indicated he had worked with Mr. Wilson and together came up with the proposed clarifications. Considerable discussion followed regarding scope and funding.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Computers, Communications & Technology
room 529-S, Statehouse, at 7:30 a.m./~~p.m.~~ on March 26, 1992.

Revisor Jim Wilson, passed out his latest version of the draft resolution (attachment 2) and stated in preparing this document, he wanted to raise at least one overall question; that being his concern whether "needs analysis" may be confused by some as a system study. He explained the purpose of a "needs analysis" is just to identify needs. Hopefully developing from that, options from which you satisfy those needs; then policy making and cost benefit type analysis. From there, an implementation plan is made. All of the above might be described as a systems study; however, a "needs analysis" is really just "a beginning". Chairman Dean confirmed this is what he had intended, but wasn't sure if the committee was of the same understanding.

Mr. Wilson went on to say, the approach was to include, to the extent possible, the entire judicial branch. There has been some discussion, in both the sub-committees of the House and Senate, regarding funding--what would be included, and what this resolution encompasses. Thus, requiring the identification of suitable options, and development of a plan after policy, cost and benefits analysis consideration.

The resolving clause is the "doing" part of a resolution, urging the supreme court to conduct, through the office of judicial administration, a thorough needs analysis of activities and functions of the judicial branch, including the appellate courts and the district courts in all 105 counties; to identify appropriate options to satisfy needs in developing an implementation plan, after policy, cost and benefit analysis; and such options for the judicial branch information system, which is to be consistent and compatible; and which produces data which is directly usable by a criminal justice information system, which would include the uniform data base offender information, and with the information systems of other state agencies required to receive information from, or exchange information with, the judicial branch information system.

After considerable discussion, Rep. McKechnie moved to introduce resolution and refer to House floor. Seconded by Rep. Mead. Motion carried.

Revisor Wilson made comments on balloon copy of H.B. 3143, as amended March 24, saying he had made very basic amendments to this bill see (attachment 3). He pointed out since all would be members of the state service now, consequently they typically would have their expenses taken care of by their respective agencies.

Ben Coates, Office of Judicial Administration, appeared before the committee in support of this bill and provided a little background on the above bill. He said this bill came out of a year long study on consolidation of field services with last years legislature directed the sentencing commission to zoo. One of the problems, is the three agencies can't talk to each other and with approximately 32,000 people out there to be

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Computers, Communications & Technology,
room 529-S, Statehouse, at 7:30 a.m./~~p.m.~~ on March 26, 1992

supervised on a given day, there is no ability to track back and forth. We found great numbers of dual supervision on a one day count, about 2200 were being dually supervised among the three agencies. The original intent of this bill was for the three field services to be in a uniform database.

Mr. Coates asked the committee, who do you see staffing this? There was discussion that child in need of care was not included in this language.

Chairman Dean suggested this bill be discussed further in the meeting the next morning. The committee was agreeable.

Minutes of the March 18, meeting was presented for approval. Motion made by Rep Pauls to approve. Seconded by Rep. Mead. Motion carried. With no further business, the committee was adjourned until Friday, March 27, at 7:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE REPORT

March 24, 1992

TO: House Appropriations Committee
Senate Ways and Means Committee

FROM: House Committee on Computers, Communication, and Technology (CCT)

RE: Highway Patrol Computer System Acquisition and Funding

The House CCT Committee reviewed, as requested by the Highway Patrol, the proposal for a computer system acquisition project. The Highway Patrol had requested funding of \$179,291 in FY 1992 and \$136,769 in FY 1993 to begin a multi-year project estimated to cost between \$495,293 and \$560,548 (including interest charges), depending on whether it was financed over four or five years. The Governor did not recommend expenditures in either fiscal year. The House Appropriations Committee asked the Senate Ways and Means Committee or the 1993 Legislature to review the request.

The Highway Patrol has revised the estimated cost, and as of March 6, 1992, estimates a total cost of \$455,988 for the project and adds an additional \$95,000 for software. The revised estimate does not include any cost of paying interest to finance the acquisition.

The Highway Patrol believes that sufficient financing will be available from the VIN Fund for annual payments, in addition to the expenditures and transfers recommended by the Governor in FY 1993, and approved by the House Appropriations Committee.

> BACKGROUND

The Committee received the following documents from the Highway Patrol which provided information about the proposal and answers to questions raised by the Committee. The Committee notes that the second and third documents provided the needs analysis and system design documentation required to justify the Patrol's proposed acquisition of a new computer system.

1. Testimony to the House Committee on Computers, Communications and Technology, March 19, 1992, including Projected Payment Schedule and Projected VIN Fund Expenditures dated March 10, 1992.
2. Kansas Highway Patrol Information System Acquisition Justification, March 6, 1992.
3. Kansas Highway Patrol Information Management Study, September 15, 1991.
4. Revised Project Payment Schedule and Projected VIN Fund Expenditures, March 20, 1992.

> COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The Committee reviewed the Highway Patrol's proposed computer system acquisition. The original plan (see Attachment 1) included interest charged for financing through KDFFA for either four or

*House CCT
Attachment 1
3-26-92*

five years. A revised plan was presented to the CCT Committee, and this second plan (see Attachment 2) provides for annual expenditures from the VIN Fund financing which would not include interest payments. Sufficient financing would be available from the VIN Fund in FY 1993, FY 1994 and FY 1995 to purchase the equipment outright, and not pay interest, according to the Highway Patrol projections in the second plan.

The two payment schedules were reviewed by the Committee: The first payment schedule (see Attachment 1) included buying all equipment in one year, financing the acquisition with a certificate of participation, and paying the costs of acquisition over a four year period. The second payment schedule (see Attachment 2) was drafted at the Committee's request to pay annual costs of acquiring only the amount of hardware which could be paid annually without financing the purchases. Due to the additional costs of maintaining existing computer equipment during the phase-in purchases of the second schedule, the Committee believes that by purchasing all computer system equipment at one time and then paying off a certificate of participation may be more cost-effective in this case. The interest charges would be \$54,316, compared with maintenance and other additional charges of \$90,103 if purchases were spread over several fiscal years to avoid interest charges of a one-time acquisition.

> CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The CCT Committee recommends that the Highway Patrol acquire all of its requested computer system equipment included in Phase I, with an estimated FY 1993 project cost of \$455,988 (plus \$54,316 interest over four years) based on today's prices. It is suggested that the Senate Ways and Means Committee may wish to consider the following recommendations during its initial review of the Highway Patrol budget, or that both the Senate Committee and the House Appropriations Committee may wish to review these recommendations during Omnibus consideration by the 1992 Legislature.

1. Increase the expenditure limitation for the VIN Fund in FY 1993 by \$125,000 to make the first installment payment after acquiring the necessary computer system equipment and system software.
2. Recommend repayment costs of \$128,435 in FY 1994 and FY 1995, with a final installment of \$128,434 in FY 1996 as shown in Attachment 1.

hwyp192.cct

KANSAS HIGHWAY PATROL
PROJECTED VIN FUND EXPENDITURES
W/C.O.P. FOR SYSTEM UPGRADE

	<u>FY92</u>	<u>FY93</u>	<u>FY94</u>	<u>FY95</u>	<u>FY96</u>
Carryfwd from Prior Year	41,544	320,222	117,243	118,000	118,000
Estimated Receipts	<u>1,236,096</u>	<u>1,236,096</u>	<u>1,236,096</u>	<u>1,236,096</u>	<u>1,236,096</u>
Total Available	1,277,640	1,556,318	1,353,339	1,354,096	1,354,096
<u>OPERATING EXPENDITURES</u>					
7001 (Gasoline)	300,000	610,872	386,121	368,858	350,389
7004 S&W/OOE	<u>657,418</u>	<u>703,203</u>	<u>720,783</u>	<u>738,803</u>	<u>757,273</u>
Total Oper. Exp.	957,418	1,314,075	1,106,904	1,107,661	1,107,662
C.O.P. Payment-OP#1)	<u>-0-</u>	<u>125,000</u>	<u>128,435</u>	<u>128,435</u>	<u>128,434</u>
Total Expenditures	<u>957,418</u>	<u>1,439,075</u>	<u>1,235,339</u>	<u>1,236,096</u>	<u>1,236,096</u>
Carryfwd. to Next Year	<u>320,222</u>	<u>117,243</u>	<u>118,000</u>	<u>118,000</u>	<u>118,000</u>

NOTE: Projected expenditure for Program 7004 in Fiscal Years 1994-1996 includes an additional 2.5% for inflation.

By extending the Payoff one additional year an additional \$28,503 would be available for Gasoline, etc. in Fiscal Years 1994, 1995 and 1996.

Attachment 7

KANSAS HIGHWAY PATROL
PROJECTED VIN FUND EXPENDITURES
PHASED IMPLEMENTATION TO AVOID FINANCE CHARGES

	<u>FY92</u>	<u>FY93</u>	<u>FY94</u>	<u>FY95</u>	<u>FY96</u>
Carryfwd from Prior Year	41,544	320,222	24,862	49,591	43,882
Estimated Receipts	<u>1,236,096</u>	<u>1,236,096</u>	<u>1,236,096</u>	<u>1,236,096</u>	<u>1,236,096</u>
Total Available	1,277,640	1,556,318	1,260,958	1,285,687	1,279,978
Operating Expenditures					
7001 (Gasoline)	300,000	610,872	386,121	368,858	350,389
7004 (S&W/OOE)	<u>657,418</u>	<u>703,203</u>	<u>720,783</u>	<u>738,803</u>	<u>757,273</u>
Total Oper. Expenditures	957,418	1,314,075	1,106,904	1,107,661	1,107,662
Projected Expenditures*	<u>-0-</u>	<u>217,381</u>	<u>104,463</u>	<u>134,144</u>	<u>95,000</u>
Total Expend.	957,418	1,531,456	1,211,367	1,241,805	1,202,662
Carryfwd to Next Year	<u>320,222</u>	<u>24,862</u>	<u>49,591</u>	<u>43,882</u>	<u>77,316</u>
Additional costs as a result of delayed implementation					
- L.E. Equip. Maint.		18,300	7,843	-0-	-0-
- P.C. Maint.		10,000	5,000	-0-	-0-
- Focus Support		1,200	1,200	1,200	-0-
- Commun. Line Costs		<u>31,752</u>	<u>13,608</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
		61,252	27,651	1,200	-0-
Running total of additional costs		61,252	88,903	90,103	90,103

* - Projected expenditures would be as follows:
 FY93 - GHQ and Troop B (as test system)
 FY94 - Troops A,B,C,F
 FY95 - Troops D,E,G and other remotes
 FY96 - Packaged software

1-4

Attachment 2

913 296 5956
 Kansas Highway Patrol
 TEL: 913-296-5956
 Mar 20.92 9:10 No.001 P.02

DRAFT HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. _____

For Consideration by Committee on Computers, Communications
and Technology

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION urging the Kansas Supreme Court to conduct a thorough needs analysis for the Unified Judicial Branch for the purposes of a Judicial Branch Information System which is consistent and compatible with and which produces data that is directly useable by the information systems of other state agencies that are required to receive information from or exchange information with the Judicial Branch Information System.

WHEREAS, The Unified Judicial Branch of Kansas State Government is composed of the Kansas Supreme Court, the Kansas Court of Appeals, 105 District Courts, the Office of Judicial Administration, the Clerk of the Appellate Courts, the Appellate Reporter, the Law Library, the Commission on Judicial Qualifications, the Board of Law Examiners, the Board of Examiners of Court Reporters, and the Supreme Court Nominating Commissions and 17 District Court Nominating Commissions; and

WHEREAS, The primary function of the Unified Judicial Branch is adjudication, to hear and dispose of all civil and criminal actions, including appellate jurisdiction over criminal cases in the municipal courts, which entails considerable administrative support responsibilities in the operation and administration of the courts to perform this function; and

WHEREAS, The Unified Judicial Branch adjudication activities involved approximately 28,400 criminal cases and 131,200 civil cases during fiscal year 1991 which was an increase of approximately 8% in each category over fiscal year 1990; and

WHEREAS, The Unified Judicial Branch has experienced increases in the number of criminal and civil cases for several years and the rate of increase has remained approximately 8%

*House CCT
Attachment 2
3-26-92*

throughout the period; and

WHEREAS, The performance of administrative and support functions for the Unified Judicial Branch include budgeting, accounting, personnel administration, compilation and reporting of statistical information on court activity, case management activities, predispositional and other investigations and probation and some parole supervision activities; and

WHEREAS, Performance of these functions includes manipulation and processing of enormous amounts of scheduling, recordkeeping, reporting and issuing and service court process, notices, rulings, orders and mandates; and

WHEREAS, The Unified Judicial Branch also has been assigned substantial responsibilities for child support enforcement activities, in conjunction with the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, which regularly involves the collection of approximately \$155,000,000 in child support per year; and

WHEREAS, The Unified Judicial Branch also has been assigned substantial responsibilities to report certain types of information to other state agencies in a timely manner and in a readily useful format, including, but not limited to:

(1) Abstracts of motor vehicle violations to the Division of Motor Vehicles of the Department of Revenue;

(2) vital statistics information to the Department of Health and Environment under the Uniform Vital Statistics Act;

(3) reports of moneys received accompanying the remittance of the moneys to the State Treasurer, including the required crediting of the moneys among the funds in the State Treasury;

(4) criminal sentencing and other information for the Department of Corrections; and

(5) criminal history record information, including certain juvenile offender information, to the Kansas Bureau of Investigation for the system of criminal history record information; and

WHEREAS, The development and implementation of a Judicial

Branch Information System would enable the Unified Judicial Branch to perform the information intensive portions of the functions and activities of the Unified Judicial Branch more efficiently and effectively and would make possible the satisfaction of major data sharing requirements with regard to other state agencies; and

WHEREAS, The existing data processing software and equipment of the Unified Judicial Branch are inadequate and ill-suited to meet the current and anticipated needs and do not satisfy the need for a fully-integrable information system; and

WHEREAS, A thorough needs analysis of the activities and functions of the Unified Judicial Branch is essential to the identification of appropriate information system options for satisfying needs and an implementation plan for a Judicial Branch Information System which is developed after policy and cost and benefit analysis of such options: Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein: That the Kansas Supreme Court is hereby urged to conduct a thorough needs analysis, through the Office of Judicial Administration, of the activities and functions of the Unified Judicial Branch, including the Appellate Courts and the District Courts in all 105 Kansas counties, for the purposes of identifying appropriate options to satisfy needs and developing an implementation plan, after policy and cost and benefit analysis of such options, for a Judicial Branch Information System which is consistent and compatible with and which produces data that is directly useable by a Criminal Justice Information System, which would include a uniform database of offender information, and with the information systems of other state agencies that are required to receive information from or exchange information with the Judicial Branch Information System; and

Be it further resolved: That the Kansas Supreme Court is also urged to present a timetable to the Legislature at the

beginning of the 1993 regular session for conducting each portion of such needs analysis and to convey a request to the Division of the Budget and to the Senate Committee on Ways and Means and the House Committee on Appropriations for funding of each portion of the needs analysis, if additional costs are anticipated beyond existing resources and appropriations; and

Be it further resolved: That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be directed to send an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

HOUSE BILL No. 3143

By Committee on Judiciary

2-26

8 AN ACT concerning criminal procedure, relating to the development
9 of a uniform database of offender information.

10 *Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas:*

11 Section 1. ~~The judicial administrator of the courts shall confer~~
12 ~~and consult with the secretary of corrections in order to~~ develop a
13 common, uniform database of offender information by July 1, 1993.

14 After July 1, 1993, the data collected by the courts, community
15 corrections programs and parole programs shall adhere to the re-
16 quirements of this new database. Data shall be collected on each
17 offender placed in a nonincarcerative sanction. This information shall
18 be stored in the Kansas bureau of investigation's central repository.
19 All field service officers shall have access to data contained in the
20 Kansas bureau of investigation's central repository.

21 Sec. 2. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after
22 its publication in the statute book.
23

establishing a task force on criminal justice information

(a) There is hereby established the task force on criminal justice information which shall be composed of members as follows:

- (1) A representative from the office of judicial administration appointed by the chief justice of the supreme court, who shall be the chairperson of the task force;
- (2) the director of the Kansas bureau of investigation, or the director's designee;
- (3) the director of information systems and communications of the department of administration, or the director's designee; and
- (4) the secretary of corrections, or the secretary's designee.

(b) The task force on criminal justice information shall meet on call of the chairperson and shall

The task force on criminal justice information shall submit a report to the committee on ways and means of the senate and the committees on appropriations and computers, communications and technology at the beginning of the 1993 regular session of the legislature.

direct

(c)

HOUSE GOT
ATTACHMENT 3
3-26-92