Legislative Branch
Computer System Planning Council
60th Montana Legislature

MEMBERSHIP	MEMBERSHIP	COMMITTEE STAFF
SUSAN FOX, CHAIRPERSON	MARILYN MILLER	HENRY C. TRENK
SEN. JOHN BRUEGGEMAN	CLAY SCOTT	DIRECTOR OLIT, LSD
REP. LLEW JONES	SCOTT SEACAT	
	CLAYTON SCHENCK	
	DICK CLARK	

MINUTES

June 23, 2008

Room 102, Capitol Building
Helena, Montana

Please note: These minutes provide abbreviated information about committee discussion, public testimony, action taken, and other activities. The minutes are accompanied by an audio recording. For each action listed, the minutes indicate the approximate amount of time in hours, minutes, and seconds that has elapsed since the start of the meeting. This time may be used to locate the activity on the audio recording.

An electronic copy of these minutes and the audio recording may be accessed from the Legislative Branch home page at http://leg.mt.gov. On the left-side column of the home page, select *Committees*, then *Interim*, and then the appropriate committee.

To view the minutes, locate the meeting date and click on minutes. To hear the audio recording, click on the Real Player icon. Note: You must have Real Player to listen to the audio recording.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Sen. John Brueggeman (via teleconference)

Susan Fox, Chairperson
Marilyn Miller (via teleconference)
Tori Hunthausen
Clayton Schenck
Dick Clark

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED

Rep. Llew Jones
Scott Seacat
Clay Scott

STAFF PRESENT

Hank Trenk, Director OLIT, LSD
Darrin McLean
Karen Berger
Steve Eller
Terry Johnson
Fong Hom, Committee Secretary

VISITORS

Visitors' list, Attachment #1

COMMITTEE ACTION
•   The committee approved the May 5, 2008, meeting minutes.
•   The committee requested that Mr. Trenk continue finalizing the numbers for the Central IT Budget for approval at the August meeting.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

00:00:02   Susan Fox, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The secretary took roll visually. The minutes from the May 5, 2008 meeting were approved.

PROPOSED 2011 BIENNIUM CENTRAL IT BUDGET

Review of proposed budget - Hank Trenk, Director, Office of Legislative Information Technology

00:01:41   **Hank Trenk** discussed the Central IT Budget **(Exhibit 1)**.

Dick Clark, CIO, Department of Administration, said that in the last session, it was suggested that they take a look at rates and the composition of the rates. He said that there needs to be a partnership bilateral understanding with the agencies and branches as to what it costs to do work in IT.

Questions

00:08:29   **Karen Berger** asked at what date will the Legislative Branch have its first look at the smorgasbord of services? **Mr. Clark** said that they unveiled the services internally last week. They will start to lay it out for all the agencies on July 1.

Susan Fox asked if the $90.50 per month per network connection is what they have to go on, if that is high or low depending on the amount of services, and for budgetary purposes, is that a safe number to use? **Mr. Clark** said yes, because it was low.

Ms. Berger asked, because the set fee per month per connection has been a fixed cost in agency budgets, if that no longer is going to be the case? **Mr. Clark** said that it is probably going to be somewhat because it has always been treated as a fixed cost, but it is more of a semi-fixed cost. You are going to be able to order how many units you want, and once you've order those units, then it becomes a fixed costs.

Maintain the Operational Status of the Current Computer Environment

00:20:32   **Mr. Trenk** said that the replacement cycle of PCs and laptops is a 4-year cycle. He said that he decreased the number of PCs and increased the number of

laptops because there are some committee staffers who take laptops to the committee rooms.

Security and Disaster Recover
Mr. Trenk said that they set aside 12 PCs and a server so that they would have the ability to recover if the main server room was knocked out. He said that he set aside money to hire a contractor to do an assessment of their security plan and disaster recovery plan.

Software/Hardware/Systems to Help Legislators
Mr. Trenk said that since there are new legislators every biennium, he budgeted a purchasing allowance at $1,500 for 120 legislators.

Interface to Enterprise Systems
Mr. Trenk said that they need to integrate the calendars and the notification systems in the Branch. The reason that is under the Interface to Enterprise Systems heading is because the branch currently leases calendaring and email from ITSD.

Document Business Process for LFD
Mr. Trenk said that he told Clayton Schenck that he would put money in that category to document business processes for LFD in the amount of $119,000.

New Proposals
Mr. Trenk said that he added a Systems Analyst Level FTE. One of the duties of that position will be the documentation of the business process.

00:26:00   **Mr. Trenk** said that the grand total for the Central IT Budget is $2.9 million and the current budget is $2.4 million.

Questions
00:28:02   **Rep. Pomnichowski** asked if the notification system was a paperless system and what kind of new or improved equipment are we going to need for that? **Steve Eller** said that over the years we have used a statewide electronic calendar, a statewide Lyris Notification System, NewsLinks, and other internal calendars at which none of those things talk to each other. When someone is scheduling a meeting, they have to do certain things with certain systems. This is an attempt at coming up with a resolution to make those processes much simpler.

Mr. Johnson asked, that when Mr. Trenk makes reference to the 2009 Central IT Budget, does that include the legislator technology from the last session? **Mr. Trenk** said that last session it was a feed bill item. They put $75,000 into the IT Budget for the 2009 session. **Mr. Johnson** said that if you look at the 2009 versus the 2011, you see about a 1/2 mill increase which equates to about a 20% increase. He asked if there was something in particular that jumps out that causes such a large increase? **Mr. Trenk** said that the document business process for LFD wasn't in last budget; there is about $105,000 more for legislator

technology allowance, and $86,000 for managing firewalls for the Branch.

Broadcasting

00:35:19   **Mr. Trenk** said that there was some question as to whether this should be governed by the Computer System Planning Council or not because it might be under the Executive Director's authority. **Ms. Fox** said that it is a separate statutory function of the Legislative Services but is integrated with IT. She said that there has never been an integrated or comprehensive TVMT budget but she plans on working with the Legislative Council on that.

Ms. Berger said that the Legislature did not fund TVMT with any consistency. The funding sources have been hit or miss. They have used IT leftover funds, carry forward funds, and funds from the LSD regular operations budget. At the beginning, they have used some funds from the interim committees' budget for the pilot project when TVMT was first implemented.

Mr. Trenk said that TVMT has been proven to be a valuable function to the Legislature but they are now at a crossroad where they can't do that anymore and need to budget for that. He said that part of the problem is the infrastructure needed to create a broadcast signal, and having someone oversee the system.

Questions

Rep. Pomnichowski asked if Mr. Trenk was considering anything with the digital signal that is required in February of 2009? **Mr. Trenk** said that the signal goes out to HCTV, and Bresnan broadcasts it as Channel 11. It goes out to other cities as part of the PBS station. He said he didn't think that there is an impact on the digital signal on TVMT. **Ms. Fox** said that the impact is on the consumer's ability to receive the digital signal.

Reserve Account

Mr. Trenk gave a brief background on the Reserve Account. He said that when they were preparing the 2005 computer system plan, they identified 4 or 5 systems that were close to the end of their life cycle. They called them potentially obsolete systems. One of the problems was that IT didn't know when those systems needed to be replaced. A bill was introduced and passed in the 2005 Session which created a reserve account for the obsolete issues and funded by unspent/carry forward money and the remainders of the feed bill. He said that there is $1.29 million in the Reserve Account this biennium. Mr. Trenk said there are three potentially obsolete systems that need replacing that will cost more than what is in the net reserve account: 1) replace the bill drafting, engrossing, enrolling, committee minutes, journal and bill status systems; 2) MBARS replacement; and 3) upgrade branch macros to the new Office Suite. Mr. Trenk said that he would like to ask the Legislature to appropriate $5 million into the Reserve Account to be spent over two bienniums to replace the bill drafting, engrossing, enrolling, committee minutes, ournal, and bill status systems.

Questions

Terry Johnson asked if the LAWS system will be replaced. **Mr. Trenk** said that

not only the LAWS system will be replaced but also the bills status and the code update system that is used after session to create the MCA Annotations.

Mr. Johnson asked if WordPerfect and Text DBMS will no longer be available? **Mr. Trenk** said that the reason for addressing these systems is that they are mature systems and were developed in 1997 and 1998 and first used for the 1999 Session. He said that another concern is that those people who now support and operate those systems are getting close to retiring. If you want to capture that knowledge base in a new system, it is probably better to replace the systems in the short term than trying to make them last longer.

Discussion, revision, and preliminary approval of the proposed budget
Susan Fox said that she would recommend taking the Broadcasting portion out and include an information piece later. **Mr. Johnson** asked if it would it make sense to propose statute changes to include the Broadcasting portion in the computer system plan for the future so that it could be included in the Central IT Budget. **Ms. Fox** said that TVMT needs a committee like the CSPC to plan for it. Her problem is that she doesn't know who can carry the weight for that in both the House and Senate. **Rep. Pomnichowski** said that she would research that. **Ms. Fox** asked if Rep. Pomnichowski recommends keeping that with the Computer System Plan? **Rep. Pomnichowski** said at least part of it should be. She thinks that some of this is all tied together and needs to be represented in the Central IT Budget.

Ms. Fox said that the Broadcasting portion will stay in the budget and she and Mr. Trenk will identify the factors that are most closely IT related.

Ms. Fox asked for input on upgrading branch macros in the new Office Suite. **Ms. Berger** said that item should be within the Branch's regular budget rather than be identified as a Reserve Account item.

Motion
Marilyn Miller moved that Mr. Trenk continue to finalize the numbers for the Central IT Budget for approval at the August meeting. The motion passed.

Microsoft Enterprise License Agreement
01:20:03   **Hank Trenk** gave an update on the Microsoft Enterprise License Agreement. He said that the Executive Branch recently signed a License Agreement with Microsoft for three years. That covers the Desktop OS and the Microsoft Office Suite. One of the concerns that the Legislative Branch IT has is the cost in that agreement. Would it be more costly for us to do something on our own?

SEN. JOHN BRUEGGEMAN joined the meeting at 10:30 a.m. via teleconference.

DISCUSSION OF CONTENTS OF 2011 COMPUTER SYSTEM PLAN
01:27:22   **Mr. Trenk** talked about Proposed Contents of FY 2010-2011 Computer System Plan **(Exhibit 2)**. He said that between now and the August meeting, he would incorporate the budget into the Plan. He said that the Table of Contents is

available on the website.

Questions

Marilyn Miller asked if the section on TVMT will be added. **Mr. Trenk** said that it could be incorporated into another existing section. **Ms. Miller** said that that would allow the Legislators to address whether they want that to be in the Legislative Council. She said that it is an important part and should be included.

BREAK

ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE - Darrin McLean, Architecture

01:49:13   **Mr. McLean** talked about the principles of the Enterprise Architecture **(Exhibit 3)**.

Questions

01:58:23   **Ms. Fox** asked if Mr. McLean wanted the CSPC to adopt this at this time? **Mr. McLean** said that in the last Council meeting they approved the BCA process. The Architecture and the BCA are going to go hand in hand. He would like to get it adopted so they can move forward with one.

Discussion

02:00:29   **Mr. Trenk** asked if the Planning Council would tell them if they are on the right track and should continue to work on this throughout the summer and bring it to the August 25th meeting for approval to put into the Plan.

    Tori Hunthausen said that she has concerns regarding the "tone" in it. She said that she would rather not approve it at this time. **Mr. McLean** said that he is not looking for official approval, but that they are looking for a statement that "this is the Enterprise Architecture, the Branch needs to go that route and we need to start developing one." He could work on it all he wanted, but if there is no direction from the Computer Systems Planning Council, there is no reason to develop this.

    Ms. Fox said that she would like to go ahead with it. The principles are good but she would like to spend more time on it.

    Dick Clark said that governance is a huge issue when you start talking about Enterprise Architecture. He said that you need to get the governance structure planned out.

SECURITY UPDATE - Dale Gow, Security Officer

02:10:31   Mr. Gow gave an update on the Information Security Program **(Exhibit 4)**.

Questions on Sensitive Data

Ms. Fox said that she understands that Karen Berger has identified financial and personnel records that may be sensitive, both electronic and hard copy. She asked if there might be anything missing from the Services Division. **Mr. Gow**

said that he didn't believe so. He said that he would sit down with each division to discuss what kinds of data they have, and if it is sensitive data, then the division needs to make sure there is some type of protection in place prior to getting a policy in place.

Ms. Fox asked Mr. Gow to make sure that Ms. Miller and Sen. Brueggeman gets a copy of the policies he sends to the directors.

Terry Johnson asked if the three directors and a representative from the House and Senate will ultimately vote on the adoption of policies? **Ms. Fox** said that they are working on that. Mr. Petesch had talked about the authority structure, and because the Legislative Council adopts the Computer Systems Plan, from a legal basis, that's how it works. But because CSPC has a representative from all three divisions, plus the House and Senate, CSPC is the place where it is vetted. What remains is the question of enforcement. In the end, Legislative Services and the Executive Director is responsible for providing the network, the security, and the support to the branch.

SUPPORT FOR LEGISLATORS LAPTOP

03:02:17   **Mr. Trenk** said that when you are supplying computing resources to legislators, there are two approaches taken: one is that the state purchases the computers and supports them; the second is, provide an allowance and the legislator buys their own laptop. In talking with other states and working with NCSL, he found out that Montana is the only state that has the allowance process for supplying computing resources to legislators.

Mr. Trenk talked about the pluses and minuses of both approaches:

Purchase laptops approach
If the state purchases laptops, it is easier to give technical support because everybody gets the same laptop. The downside is that not all legislators want the same laptop. He asked the question: what do you do with the laptop after usage during the session? Do you let the legislator take it home? If you do that, what type of support do you give the legislator at home?

Allowance approach
On the allowance side, the legislator chooses his/her laptop that satisfies their own personal usage requirement. The only negative part is, from the state's perspective, how do you make it work in the legislative environment? How much support do you give for that?

Discussion
Mr. Trenk said that they came up with a form that is filled out when requesting an allowance to purchase a laptop. On that form, you describe the type of laptop you purchased and attach a copy of the receipt. It is stated at the bottom of the form that the Legislative Branch IT staff would only support connecting the laptop to the Legislative Branch network but the Legislative Branch IT staff would not support individual applications. If you brought the laptop to IT, they would make

sure that the firewall and the proper virus program was working. He said that worked during the session; however, since the session, the IT staff has been getting requests from some legislators asking for help on installation of programs, etc., or technical support for some programs. Mr. Trenk said that he would like guidance on what kind of support the IT staff can give.

Rep. Pomnichowski said that she liked the allowance process because then that computer is her computer and she can run whatever programs she wanted. She said that IT should just say no to the requests of the legislator because that laptop that they purchased is not a state laptop but their own personal laptop.

Sen. Brueggeman said that he agrees with Rep. Pomnichowski. We should develop policies on things that we will support. He said that perhaps we should be looking at hiring temporary staff, such as college interns, during the session to be on the floor to support the legislators with their software programs.

Ms. Fox said that she can work with Mr. Trenk on some numbers for hiring temporary staff as Sen. Brueggeman suggested. **Mr. McLean** said that if a legislator would need access back to state resources, that might become an issue because we won't know what we are letting in. **Sen. Brueggeman** said that he wanted it clear that there should never be a time where legislators are on the state network.

Ms. Berger asked if it would be appropriate at this point in time to discuss the second round rules for laptops. The first round, this last session, we developed a number of specific rules and the specifications that the laptops had to meet to receive the purchase dollars. For the second round, there should be some differential related as to who received laptops last time. **Ms. Fox** said that they have had discussions on that issue and they should not only bring a proposed set of specifications for laptops the next round, but rules for who would get one. She said that she will bring a proposal to that effect at the next meeting. **Ms. Berger** said that that would also provide Mr. Trenk a basis for the funding figure that is in the budget related to laptops on an ongoing basis.

03:24:41   Public Comment
            None at this time.

Next meeting date
03:25:04   It was agreed that the next meeting date would be changed from August 25th to August 18th.

Adjournment
03:26:21   With no further business before the committee, Ms. Fox adjourned the meeting at 12:29 p.m.

Cl0425 8220fhxa.