SENATE FINANCE & CLAIMS

Exhibit No. 7

Date 3-5-09

Bill No. SB 427

Legislative Services Division
New Proposals - IT Systems Replacement
2009 Session

The Legislative Services Division (LSD) is proposing that the following IT Systems be replaced:

1. **Bill Drafting** - This is the system that Bill Drafters use to prepare the initial bill draft i.e. the LC.

2. **Bill Introduction** - This system takes the bill draft and reformats it for introduction. It also preforms some diagnostics on the document to make sure the markup in the document is correct.

3. **Bill Amendment Preparation** - This is the system used by bill drafters to prepare amendments and send them to the amendments coordinator. The amendments coordinator then uses this system to put the amendment in final format and print it out for the committee chair or sponsor.

4. **Bill Engrossing** - This is the system used by document processing staff to put amendments into the bill and print out a new version of the bill.

5. **Bill Enrolling** - This is the system used by the document processing staff to prepare the final copy of the bill (after it has passed both houses) for leadership and governors signature.

6. **Committee Minutes** - This system is used to prepare a written record (to supplement the audio recording) of the key actions taken by the committee.

7. **House and Senate Journals** - This system is used to prepare the written record of all actions taken by the House and Senate during floor sessions.

8. **Bill Status System (LAWS)** - This system records all actions taken on each bill. It also has a web interface that can be used to report several other key pieces of information, such as all of the bills a particular legislator is sponsoring and the current status of each bill. This system is used extensively by the legislature and the public to keep track of legislation.

9. **Session Law Publication** - This system uses the enrolled version of the bill and creates the session law publication.

10. **MCA and Annotations Publications** - This system takes the session law and reformats

it into the MCA format. It is used to support the codification process done by LSD attorneys.

The reason LSD is requesting that these systems be replaced is several fold. The bill drafting, bill introduction, bill amendment preparation, bill engrossing, bill enrolling, committee minutes, House and Senate Journals, and Session Law Publication systems all use word processing software called WordPerfect and a programming language called PerfectScript. These systems were originally developed in the 1997 - 1998 time frame so they are about 10 years old. LSD is currently on a supported release of WordPerfect. However, WordPerfect has a small percentage of the market share for word processors. Also, WordPerfect was recently sold to a private investor and thus the company that owns WordPerfect is no longer publicly traded. It is difficult to determine the financial status of the company—i.e., whether or not they are on the verge of going out of business. Many other state legislatures are replacing their WordPerfect systems. Also, it is hard to find classes which teach WordPerfect or the programming language PerfectScript. It is also difficult to find programmers with PerfectScript experience.

The Bills Status system (LAWS) was originally developed in the 1997 - 1998 time frame and use Oracle Database software. Oracle continues to be a strong market leading company. Although this system could use some minor enhancements LSD doesn't believe this system is quite obsolete and therefore is looking at two options for this system. Option one is to keep the current system with some minor upgrades and interface it with the new bill drafting, bill introduction, bill amendment preparation, bill engrossing, bill enrolling, committee minutes, House and Senate Journals, and Session Law Publication systems (the current systems have these interfaces). The second option is to replace the entire system. This second option is only viable if the selected vendor has a canned system that would work better and in the long run is cheaper than having to rewrite the interfaces mentioned in option one.

LSD uses mainframe software called TextDBMS to support the MCA and Annotations Publications process. LSD has extensively used the programming language for TextDBMS to enhance the processes used in this system. LSD has a significant investment in this system, which it has used for the last 19 years. The system currently meets all of the needs of LSD and requires very little maintenance. However, the original owners of TextDBMS are no longer involved in the legislative market. About 10 years ago, the original owner sold the rights to TextDBMS to a small company (two to three employees), which LSD currently contracts with for support. Additionally, since mainframes are a declining technology, it becomes more and more difficult to hire mainframe programmers.

Another reason for replacing these systems is the pending large number of potential staff retirements. Several of the staff that are or will shortly become eligible for retirement have key knowledge of how these systems work. Replacing these systems now will allow the capture of some of this key knowledge.

Additionally, several important improvements could be made to these business processes that would be of great benefit to the Legislature. For instance, many state legislatures are moving toward automatic engrossing.

These systems are toward the end of their life cycle and although they may last a few more years, it is time to begin the planning and funding phases to replace these systems.

The current ballpark estimate for replacement of these system is $5,000,000. (See Attachment A for ball park figures on what other legislatures have spent replacing similar systems).

This project qualifies for use of the IT obsolete systems reserve account. However, there is not currently, nor will there in the next 4 years be, enough money in the IT obsolete systems reserve account to fund the $5,000,000 necessary to replace these systems. Therefore, LSD is requesting $5,000,000 be allocated by the 2009 Legislature and placed in the IT obsolete systems reserve account. While it is true that there is a potential for approximately another $1,000,000 to be placed in the IT obsolete systems reserve account over the next 4 years through the IT obsolete systems reserve account allocation method, this money may be needed for other emergency obsolete systems that come up.

Replacement of these systems is currently planned to take about two bienniums. There are two options for going about replacing these systems. Option 1 is to do the requirements analysis and development of MCA and Annotations Publications system the first biennium and the requirement analysis and development of the bill drafting, bill introduction, bill amendment preparation, bill engrossing, bill enrolling, committee minutes, House and Senate Journals, Session Law Publication, and Bill Status systems the second biennium. The reason for working on the MCA and Annotations Publications system first is that it's hardware and software is more obsolete.

Option 2 is to do the requirements analysis for all systems and then begin work on development. This option would probably mean that no systems will be completed and replaced by the 2011 session. However, once requirements analysis is completed, all systems could be developed in parallel and most likely be replaced by the 2013 session. This option is more desirable from the standpoint that it immediately captures the knowledge base of the pending retirees. Another benefit of this option is that developers could actually see these systems in operation during and immediately after the 2011 session and thus develop more beneficial systems.

Attachment A
Cost of Replacing Bills Processing and Code Update Systems
Last Updated April 7, 2008

State	Cost	Replace-ment Timeframe	Included in Cost[1]	Source
Pennsylvania	$6,000,000	2007 - 2009	Bill Processing, Bill Status, Journal, Committee Minutes, Code Update	Conversation with Propylon - Clyde Hatter
Oregon	$3,000,000	2006- 2008	Bills Processing, Journal, Committee Minutes	Conversation with Propylon - Clyde Hatter
Idaho	$3,000,000	2007 - 2009	Bill Processing, Bill Status, Journal, Committee Minutes, Code Update	E-mail from NCSL
Maine	$5,000,000	?	??	E-mail from NCSL
Florida (House Only)	System Costs $2,900,000 Legal Expenses $2+Million	2000-2001	??	E-mail from NCSL Dispute with the Contractor is the reason for the Legal Costs.
Illinois	$8,000,000	1999 - 2003	Bill Processing, Bill Status, Journal, Committee Minutes, Code Update	E-mail from Illinois
Virginia	$1,000,000	2004	?	Conversation with International Roll Call - Bill Schaffer

State	Cost	Replace-ment Timeframe	Included in Cost[1]	Source
California	???	2006-2010	Bill Processing, Bill Status, Journal, Committee Minutes, Code Update	NCSL - NALIT News Letter
North Dakota	$4,648,224	2007 - 2009	Bill Processing, Bill Status, Journal, Committee Minutes, Code Update	E-mail from NCSL
Washington	???	1995 - 2003	Bill Processing, Bill Status, Journal, Committee Minutes, Code Update	NCSL - NALIT News Letter
Maryland	???	2004-2006	Bill Drafting, Engrossing and Enrolling	NCSL - NALIT News Letter

1. Note: Comparing functionality from one legislature to another is like comparing apples to oranges. For instance when one legislature says they have a bill status system, all they may have is a bill status report that is run each night. Where as the Montana Legislature has an online up to the minute bill status system. Online systems cost a lot more to develop and maintain than a reporting systems.

c43 H:\DATA\WP\Computer System Planning Council\Writeup for replacing Bills Processing MCA etc.wpd