



# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT STUDY SUBCOMMITTEE

Room 110, State Capitol, ? P.O. Box 201711 ? Helena, MT 59620-1711 ? (406) 444-2986 ? FAX (406) 444-3036

## **COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

REPRESENTATIVE BOB RANEY, CHAIRMAN  
REPRESENTATIVE TOM ZOOK  
SENATOR GREG JERGESON  
SENATOR TOM BECK

## **LFD STAFF**

PAM JOEHLER, SENIOR FISCAL ANALYST  
GREG DeWITT, SENIOR FISCAL ANALYST  
CINDY CAMPBELL, COMMITTEE SECRETARY

## MINUTES

October 2, 2000  
Room 172, State Capitol  
Helena, Montana

### **ROLL CALL**

Rep. Tom Zook  
Sen. Tom Beck  
Sen. Greg Jergeson  
Rep. Bob Raney, Excused  
Pam Joehler, Senior Fiscal Analyst  
Greg DeWitt, Senior Fiscal Analyst  
Judy Keintz, Secretary

### **Call to Order** (Tape 1A-000)

The fifth meeting of the Information Technology Management Study Subcommittee (IT Subcommittee) was called to order at 8:15 a.m. by Senator Greg Jergeson, Acting Chair, on Monday, October 2, 2000. The meeting was held in Room 172 of the State Capitol, Helena, Montana.

### **1. Presentation of Subcommittee Requested Legislation**

(Tape 1A-1.2)

Greg DeWitt, Senior Fiscal Analyst, provided a computerized presentation of the Information Technology Management Study Committee=s Draft Legislation, (Exhibit 1). He presented an overview of the recommendation the Legislative Finance Committee had previously approved regarding information technology governance. He then proceeded to review in detail the components in each section of the draft legislation. He also provided a copy of the draft legislation (Exhibit 2).

### **2. Subcommittee and Interested Party Discussion of Legislation**

Tony Herbert, ISD, commented that the draft legislation reflects the intent of the IT Subcommittee. The repealing and replacing of certain existing statutes helps to clear up confusing language in the current statutes.

Jane Hamman, OBPP, remarked that they are comfortable with the draft legislation. She questioned how this would be presented to the legislature. It was her understanding that the IT Subcommittee had voted to have two members represented from each of the appropriations subcommittees, (e.g. a select subcommittee).

Mr. DeWitt explained that this would only include the upcoming legislative session. For the long-term, the Long Range Planning Subcommittee would review the same. This is reflected in the final report.

Ms. Hamman preferred keeping all the appropriation subcommittees involved with the process.

**Senator Jergeson** stated that this would not be precluded in subsequent sessions.

Mr. Herbert questioned whether the new Department of Information Technology (DOIT) would bring its full budget through the Long Range Planning Subcommittee. His understanding was that other state agencies would bring major initiatives through the Long Range Planning Subcommittee but their full budget would be presented to their separate subcommittees.

**Senator Beck** remarked that the other state agencies would need to go through the DOIT. The DOIT would present their budgets to the Long Range Planning Subcommittee.

Mr. DeWitt explained that the budget for DOIT would go to the Long Range Planning Subcommittee. The agency budgets would still be presented to their individual subcommittees. A biennial report has been added.

**Senator Beck** stated that he did not realize that technology would be reviewed in each department.

Mr. Hebert noted that the draft legislation provides the DOIT with a stronger position to work with state agencies. By June 30<sup>th</sup> a plan would need to be submitted to the DOIT for approval. If a particular approach was disapproved, it would not be requested within that agency=s budget. If a particular approach was approved and the agency then came in with a budget request that didn=t work with the approved approach, the Budget Office in conjunction with DOIT at that point would not approve the budget. His understanding is that during the upcoming session, the ISD budget would be reviewed by the select subcommittee to include their rate setting and policies for replacement cycles. Major agency requests would be determined by the Budget Office and the legislature. The select subcommittee would review the major development issues.

He believed the outstanding question was where the major initiatives would be reviewed during subsequent legislative sessions.

**Representative Zook** remarked that one group should review the various proposals. All initiatives should go through the DOIT. He questioned why the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) was exempted from this process. Mr. Herbert maintained that the OPI needed to interface with 400 school districts.

Mr. DeWitt explained that for the next legislative session, there would be a select subcommittee that would have the authority to approve the rates for the ISD. During the review of the Executive Budget, a decision would be made by the Legislative Fiscal staff on any issues involving a significant statewide issue.

In regard to the Planning/Budgeting Timeline, Mr. DeWitt remarked that a specific date was necessary for the DOIT to present the plan to the Legislative Finance Committee.

### **3. Action on Draft Legislation**

**MOTION: Senator Beck** moved that the State IT Plan be presented to the Governor by March 1st of even number years. The Legislative Finance Committee could review the same in March. This would allow for a final plan by April 1st. This would be included in Section 14 (2) of the draft legislation. **VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously. (Tape 1B-26.0)

**MOTION: Representative Zook** moved to adopt the draft legislation as amended. **VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously. (Tape 1B-26.9)

Dave Ashley, Department of Administration (DOA), suggested that a joint presentation be made to the Governor-Elect. This could be held sometime in December.

**Senator Beck** questioned whether the present Governor would be making any recommendations in his budget. Ms. Hamman noted that the Governor is aware of the proposal but the Governor=s budget is being prepared under present law.

### **4. Action on Final Report and Legislation**

(Tape 1B-30.9)

Pamela Joehler, Senior Fiscal Analyst, reviewed the Information Technology Management Study Final Report (Exhibit 3).

Ms. Joehler further reviewed the Unified Computer Budget Summary: Proposed Requirement Change, (Exhibit 4). At the December meeting, the IT Subcommittee recommended requirements for the Unified Computer Budget Summary. The requirements included that three questions be answered for each decision package that contains any IT expenditure accounts. 1) Description of what will be accomplished. 2) Impacts if the budget request is not approved. 3) Intra- and inter-agency benefits. The Governor=s Budget Office noted that answering these questions would result in a large volume of text and narratives that could hide decision packages of a more significant policy nature. The proposed alternative is to require individual narratives for decision packages that are identified as significant or those that contain certain expenditure accounts as set out on Attachment 1 of Exhibit 4.

Ms. Hamman added that the summary will be provided by decision packages. She further noted that significant is identified as an expenditure of \$300,000 for the biennium.

**MOTION: Representative Zook** moved to accept the proposed requirement changes for the Unified Computer Budget Summary. **VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously. (Tape 2A-2.5)

**Senator Jergeson** stated that **Representative Raney** had questioned the lack of reference to the alternative approach in the Final Report. The IT Subcommittee has discussed the fact that this issue is dependent on the decisions made by the next Governor. The staff will have amendments prepared. He encouraged a meeting with the Governor-Elect sometime in December.

**MOTION: Senator Beck** moved to accept the Information Technology Management Study Final Report as amended. **VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously. (Tape 2A-6.2)

#### **5. Approval of June 7, 2000 Minutes**

**MOTION: Senator Beck** moved that the minutes of the June 7, 2000 meeting be approved as presented. **VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

---

Senator Jergeson, Acting Chairman