

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

November 2018 Board Meeting November 20, 2018

Opening

A meeting of the INK Board was called to order at 10:12 a.m. Tuesday, November 20, 2018 at Juli's Coffee and Bistro 110 SE 8th Ave, Topeka, Kansas (on site for the location of the KIC Technology Showcase), by Eric Rucker, representing the Secretary of State with the following members present:

Matt Billingsley, Chief of Staff, Kansas Department of Revenue

Doug Gaumer, representing the Kansas Bankers Association (*by phone*)

Lucas Goff, representing the Kansas Association of Counties

Lana Gordon, Secretary of Labor

Aaron Kite, representing the Kansas Bar Association

Glen Yancey, CIO, Kansas Department of Health and Environment, representing the Executive Branch Chief Information Technology Officer

Others Present

Secretary Sam Williams, Kansas Department of Revenue; Duncan Friend, Information Network of Kansas, Inc.; Nolan Jones, James Adams, and Andrew Goodrick, Kansas Information Consortium, LLC, Jeff Walker, Idaho Information Consortium; Grant Gordon, PayIt, LLC (*by phone*).

Rucker began the meeting by asking Friend to confirm there was a quorum of the membership present. Friend called the roll (listed above) and confirmed that there were seven members present, with Wamsley absent – and five members constituting a quorum by statute.

Consent Agenda

The consent agenda for the meeting included the draft October 2018 INK Board meeting minutes, the October / November 2018 Network Manager Report, and two contracts for approval: a KanForm application for Cherokee County (fee service) and a property tax application for Wallace County. The Consent Agenda was approved in two parts:

Action Taken: Motion made to approve the draft October 2018 INK Board meeting minutes and the October / November 2018 Network Manager Report by Billingsley, seconded by Yancey. There was no discussion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Action Taken: Motion made to approve the Cherokee County and Wallace County contracts on the agenda by Billingsley, seconded by Secretary Gordon. There was no discussion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Action Agenda

1. Network Manager Report (*Jones*)

AAMVA Region III Update. Jones welcomed the members to the Gizmo building location. He began by summarizing some of the topics and issues presented at the AAMVA Region III conference that he recently attended. He explained the purpose of the group with regard to motor vehicles regulation, reciprocity and other issues. He wanted to highlight a few key items brought up to inform the group

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

about issues facing governments in general and indicated Billingsley would be well aware of these as well. The first was the deadline for compliance with Real ID in 2020 and the difficult position some other states are in. The second is a push for “digital driver’s license” (phone-based). There is currently a small pilot in Iowa. He discussed some of the challenges with this, including privacy and the need to hand over the phone to law enforcement as part of being pulled over. The third issue is autonomous vehicles. While he has talked about this previously with the Board, this time he emphasized the virtual “convoy” concept being adopted by the trucking industry, requiring less drivers and achieving increased fuel efficiency from “drafting” by allowing multiple trucks, autonomously guided, to drive close to each other down the road. It is already starting to happen in Texas and California.

WebFile update. At the previous board meeting, they had demonstrated the new interface and application developed for KDOR’s *WebFile* online tax filing application. He wanted to inform the Board they were now moving to the next phase with marketing. They are now working on this with KDOR and the timing will be late in December. There will be printed materials for tax preparers; they will work with board member Wamsley to work with the libraries to distribute materials; and, finally, they are experimenting with doing some video advertising as part of social media, maybe even some video help. On a related note, they are also working on updates to the Homestead Tax application.

Agent Kay. Adoption of this tool continues to grow – they are now working with the Secretary of State’s office to add the functionality there, it already appears in the Business Center. Jones had two items to update the Board on. First, the technology is evolving quickly – and they were fairly certain they would have to change platforms eventually. Right now, they are talking with Microsoft and Amazon about their enterprise products. Second, they are considering “silo’ing” the chatbot for certain services, so there would be an individual instance of Agent Kay for a specific product. The reason is that for certain complicated things, it helps to have it narrowly defined to the topic – like a license. They are testing it with Property Tax right now as a way to see if it creates more confusion for the public, or gets them their answers quicker.

Law Enforcement Memorial (LEM). Jones thanked the Board for supporting them working with the Attorney General on the website related to the LEM and noted that the day before had been the official launch of that site. It had been a somber ceremony, but nice – the Governor and Attorney General were there. They are already close to their fundraising target of \$500,000. Jones explained their fundraising approach and the role of the website in that, went over the other features of the website, including those supporting the families, and discussed future enhancements.

“Lucky Orange” Product Demonstration. James Adams introduced himself as well as Andrew Goodrick, a Senior User Experience Developer who has been working at the portal since 2005. Goodrick and Adams provided a brief demonstration of a product used to do real-time analysis of website use that they had been using at KIC/INK. It allows them to follow how individuals were using the site as it happened. It is based on the same information collected by Google Analytics, but presented in a different way. The presentation consisted of a pre-recorded session following a user at the Kansas.gov website. A member asked what kind of user information was collected. Goodrick confirmed that he could tell things like who their ISP was. Gordon asked what the practical application was. Goodrick described using it to get a feel for how people are using the website, but also use it for recording user testing. The Lucky Orange website is located at: <https://www.luckyorange.com/>.

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

Action Taken: None.

2. New Payment Processing Approaches (*Jones/Walker*)

Jeff Walker, the general manager for Idaho Information Consortium, LLC was introduced by Jones. Jones noted that Kansas was reusing an innovation from Idaho called “Prompt Pay” that had been discussed / presented on at a previous Board meeting. Walker stated that IIC started in 1999 and he had joined them in September 2000. The subject for his visit to the Board and Technology Showcase was payment processing. He brought along several physical devices to display that were used to take credit card payments. The state wanted to create a place that had different entry points for consumers but a single face to ensure security. They have over 300 deployments involving payment services in Idaho, but a large percentage is local. He covered the highlights of the *PayPort* offering, including the ability to accept credit cards by law enforcement “in-car” without a direct connection to the Internet - sort of “Square for Government.” Secretary Gordon questioned how this worked and there was a subsequent discussion of the way the risk was managed – a cap on payments, it being a law enforcement context, etc. The idea of allowing agencies to accept mobile payments turned out to be valuable to them. He then discussed the *Prompt Pay* product and its various uses, collecting overdue payments like utilities. The Board members had several questions about the products discussed, including how law enforcement officers greeted the idea of accepting payments while on the road. He indicated it varied and was county-by-county at present – some were in very remote areas and had staffing problems, so this was very helpful to them. Jones indicated they were very comfortable starting to use it here in Kansas <A copy a handout from his presentation is attached>.

Action Taken: None.

3. Information Network of Kansas Executive Director Position (*Rucker*)

Rucker opened this agenda item by stating that what he had in mind when he put this on the agenda was that, if it was the desire of the Board to look for an Executive Director, that it would be possible, he believed, for the Board to formulate a subcommittee to look at filling that – again, if that was the Board’s desire. If so, the Board would appoint individuals to serve on that subcommittee and begin the search process. He then asked, “What is the pleasure of the Board?”

Gaumer, participating by phone, responded “Maybe somebody could provide a little history for himself and the other members of the Board what the difference was, what would the roles and responsibilities be versus how we lean on Duncan today?”

Rucker responded that he thought that was an excellent question and asked Friend if he would like to take a first stab at that. Friend asked if it was the history versus what he was doing today. Gaumer responded that it would not be anything in great detail, just what roles the Executive Director filled that he was not filling today. He told Friend was trying to “understand the necessity of it versus what you do.”

Friend responded that other people in the past have expressed opinions in the past about whether there is anything else that needs to be done. He continued that Jim Hollingsworth was the Executive Director from since around 2001 and, from his position description, there was some interaction with statewide bodies, IT-governance type bodies....

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

Yancey interjected that, yes, from where he sat, the biggest difference was that for things like ITAB – the Information Technology Advisory Board, which is a group that advises the Executive Branch and legislative agencies on technology; ITEC, the Information Technology Executive Council – there is a whole governance group that flows down from governor-appointed positions into approval of IT policy that then flows into the CITO's (Chief Information Technology Officers for each branch) – and the Executive Director was an official person on those groups and, in some cases, that gave them a voting position in terms of approving policy decisions.

Friend continued that, in that case, when he started this, he was pretty much instructed to defer those roles to Nolan and Kansas Information Consortium, so Friend has not done this. Jones has been attending ITAB, participated ITEC, sort of representing the group and, of course, he reports back to the group on that. But as far as the audit, paying the bills, the other financial things, working with Jones on since he's been here, oversight, those kinds of things have been Friend's role, and those were the same things Jim Hollingsworth did, to his understanding. So that is his take.

He noted that's this is how it started when it originally happened, there were some members that were still here, probably, that pretty strongly thought that's how the relationship should work. That has been Friend's understanding and why he didn't push to take on any of those roles.

Yancey said his question was, looking toward the future, does somebody have a vision of what the Executive Director would do that isn't (being done)? From his standpoint, in the early years, having an Executive Director was essential from kind of the agency liaison / marketing component, trying to bring on more counties – being that state-governed face of what then sat behind that, which was a private entity, the network manager providing those services.

Friend said, directing his comments to Gaumer on the phone, that he wasn't sure if that answered Gaumer's question. Gaumer responded that he appreciated the framework and he certainly understands sort of the "lobbying" expectations, the public relations side of it. As such, he said he would certainly have interest in serving on the subcommittee. He would certainly also have some other interest in just thinking about how the job description so that it captures everything that was just said – it would probably make some sense. Yancey agreed and said they were probably right in sync. He offered a motion to write a job description and define sort of the goals and scope of what they would want that position to focus on. And then, from there, they can decide who is performing those roles today and where do they go from there.

Billingsley added "And where we may lack in that service." Yancey said, right, what they have done in the past may not be what we want them doing carrying forward into the world of e-government. Maybe it was a different skill set than we relied on in the past. Because, in the past, we were really looking for IT Director type people. Jim Hollingsworth, that's what he was, he was an IT director in the past. And, Yancey thinks they really need to evaluate – do they really need more of an e-commerce, e-government visionary to help do some of that stuff.

Kite asked Friend if there was anything in the by-laws that offers any guidance or requirements on the Executive Director position – or on how that's supposed to be one how that's supposed to be gone about and who's in charge? Friend responded that, from his familiarity, no. As he recalled – he attempted to call them up on his computer while they were talking – were pretty perfunctory in terms of how meetings were executed, and the number of officers that need to be elected – those kinds of things. They

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

don't really speak to the Executive Director position, per se. He thought there was a codicil or something that had to do with Executive Director expenditure authority, but there is not really guidance around how you would hire – or not hire – and Executive Director, or how you would do that. He continued to say that the concept of employees of INK is referenced in the statute – there's some complexity to actually how that has been executed...his role, Jim's role, how that works and how they are paid, but none of that is really in writing anywhere that he is aware of.

Secretary Gordon asked Friend if currently he was the only employee of INK. Friend responded by saying that, just so it was very clear to the Board how it actually works – Friend's official title is the Manager of the Kansas Business Center. He worked for the Secretary of State, he worked for OITS and was involved in these groups – ITEC, ITAB, others – and then he ended up working for the Secretary of State for a while then was hired by INK, which at that time was the Board – he asked to be corrected if he was misspeaking – being interviewed also by the Secretary of State – to work on the Kansas Business Center project which was a multi-agency project. The Board had partially funded that – so the Board really funds his salary that way. As far as being an employee of INK – this had been discussed before and he said he didn't mind being frank about it – basically his salary is paid into the state system as a check from INK, so he is almost on loan from the state in that role. Then, when Jim Hollingsworth basically resigned in March 2016, from that time period, those roles fell to him – the same thing: signing off on the audit, doing those things, fell to Friend. His position description did not change, and his title did not change. Yancey rephrased that is was a bit more transactional “Can you start doing this for the INK board?” Friend responded that he just took up when Jim was doing – Friend just took over his laptop and did the same things he was going, except for representing INK statewide. He stated that he does work for the Board, but, it is a little more amorphous than that. Yes, he is the only one right now.

Yancey stated that the challenges for INK have changed. When Jim Hollingsworth was brought on (Friend interjected that was in 2001), the challenges were technical in nature. How are we going to use this Internet “thing” and how do we build the infrastructure and what does that look like? That is done and now the challenges are really more about how INK is going to continue to offer relevant integrated e-commerce, e-government services and what does that look like – how is INK going to continue to facilitate government-citizen interaction - understanding what INK's users do on the website is a big part of that, but not the only part, as the Board thinks about social media and other forms of citizen-government interaction, it would be appropriate to examine, and maybe appoint somebody to say “Look, this is what we want you to do, we want you go out and figure out what your vision of the future is like and how we actually execute that and come back the Board and say I want your permission to go develop a plan.” And he thinks the Board kind of needs to start with let's define what the position is, write a position description – you wouldn't really be able to hire reliable quality candidates without that.

Friend asked if he might be recognized. He stated again, if it is incumbent upon someone to say something like this, he will have do it, but the Board has about seven weeks until there is a government transition – Yancey agreed – and the shape of the Board is such that, from his perspective, there is a vacancy that could be filled by the new Governor, there are two cabinet secretaries that, respectfully, historically those people could turn over, the CIO that sits on the Board that could potentially turn over, and there will be a new Secretary of State, so there are as many as five positions that could be different in approximately seven weeks. He just wants to make sure that is on the table – clearly everyone in attendance knows that – but that's a position that there has been about two and a half years without one. But, he added, it never hurts to start.

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

Yancey agreed, but said, yes – Gordon noted she thought one could still start – he continued that they could still put something together and that regardless of who the members on the Board they should come in and see of the value of looking at that and deciding that. Billingsley noted that there will still be three members – like the Kansas Bar. Friend agreed and suggested that maybe they should be more involved – from a continuity standpoint – Secretary Gordon agreed.

Secretary Williams was recognized by the chair. He stated that he remembered that, from the early days, there was some statute associated with the Board and that it would be good for all of them to be reminded what that statute says and how it all works together. Secretary Gordon expressed agreement. Williams continued that he agreed with what Yancey had said – the world has changed so much. And, as an agency head, he looks at INK as one of several solutions he has. When this was created, it was the solution. He doesn't think that exists and, to Friend's point, getting it all out on the table – within the framework of what's going on now. He continued that having a leader is really important, and if that's what we're saying is that we need a leader, and it goes beyond what Friend has been doing, it goes beyond that, every organization has to have a leader. But, he is not so sure that the group understands how this organization – he would second what Yancey said – “what does this organization do today?” Because as an agency head, and Nolan knows this, INK is one of the choices that we have, and the state – sometimes they pick it and sometimes they don't.

Rucker asked if there were further comments. Hearing none, Rucker went on to state that he has always believed that individuals serving on committees should have an interest in the topic. He asked for individuals besides Gaumer who would be willing to serve. Yancey agreed to participate. Secretary Williams stated that he would volunteer Billingsley. Rucker asked if the Board was content with those three individuals – Friend read back the members so far to the group. Rucker said this is not to cut off, but they do not want the majority of the Board actually being on the subcommittee because then there would be open meetings problem. But, outside the legality of that, the size made no difference to him, it has to do with what the wishes of the Board are. Billingsley asked if the subcommittee came under the Open Records Act – Yancey said certainly, but the three of them meeting wouldn't. <There was some crosstalk about it not being a majority>. Friend noted that there would just be one person there that would not be potentially transitioned. Yancey submitted that the charter for the subcommittee would be to hold at least one meeting between “now and January” and try at least produce a scope statement for what the committee's work would be and that, if there is transition on the Board, they can report that back out to the new Board members or the remaining board members, and then the new Board can look at that and decide whether there's merit for continuing that on. He continued, it would be “Here's why we were formed, what we are planning to do, what we see as the scope of the activity. We've had one meeting to try and toss that out and put some formality around it – you want us to keep going or stop?”

Secretary Williams stated that one thought that came to his mind was that he didn't know if would be that concerned about – “it's easy for me to say because I'm a lame duck, so take it for what it means” – but government is going to go on and the fact of this transition doesn't change the fact that we exist and everything that needs to be done, and - if he were in the Governor-elect's position – this would not be on the list of a hundred things I would worry about in the first year of my administration. So, if what we're dealing (with) is as valuable as we all know it is, why would we not just get our action plan together – you know, in the real world, 7 weeks is an eternity... Why – I would just say don't wait. I don't think we need to because that position you're going to make is really going to be appreciate by someone coming in - because the service that Nolan and his group is needed, and the additional service that we would provide by having this organization ongoing would, I think, be appreciated. So, I

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

wouldn't wait.

Secretary Gordon stated that some of that could be determined when this committee determines what we might be looking for, or what this organization might need going forward. Because, she continued, she is thinking that organizations evolve – what was needed when it began is different than what might be needed today, therefore that's the reason for looking at what a job description might look like. Secretary Williams added “also the statute, and so forth.”

Billingsley indicated that also what was needed was a strategic plan and at the present time it has run out. He thinks that would be something that a new board would want to look at, because that's a chance to change and get input from your customers for your services.

Rucker noted that having three individuals on the Board that were interested, and knowing that a majority of the board members are five, he asked if there was anyone else who wished to serve on the committee. Kite offered that he would serve as well. Rucker asked Friend to read back the members of the committee so far for the record, which Friend did as follows:

Kite
Gaumer
Yancey
Billingsley

Friend asked if there had been a motion to form the committee (he was taking minutes for the meeting in the absence of Nikki Reed). The group noted that it was just discussion at this point.

Secretary Gordon asked if a motion was needed. Rucker said he thought it would be better to make it formal.

Action Taken: Secretary Gordon made the following motion “To form a committee that will look into a job description, or a direction, a possible job description for an Executive Director position.”

Rucker asked if the purview of the subcommittee include “the possibility of entertaining interest from applicants as well?” Secretary Gordon replied that she thought a job description was needed first. Rucker responded okay. She continued that she wasn't sure what the rest of the Board thought, but that was her motion.

Billingsley seconded the motion. Rucker asked for further discussion.

Discussion: Friend stated that the motion as he had written it was “A motion to form a committee that will look into a direction or possible job description for an Executive Director”. Yancey said “Is it to evaluate the need and then, if, create a job description for the potential position?” Friend asked if it was a friendly amendment, deferring to him – he was just attempting to take the notes – Rucker stated that he didn't mind his involvement. Friend asked so change it to “create a job description if needed?” Secretary Gordon said that worked for her, which is why she had said “possible”. Rucker asked if there were further discussion by the Board.

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

Friend asked to confirm that the motion did not include “entertaining applications”, it was just “forming a job description.” Yancey agreed. Billingsley and Yancey then said “...and bringing it back to the Board” and Yancey continued to post and whatever they were going to do. Rucker again asked if there were further discussion. A vote was called for by Rucker.

The motion was unanimously approved. Rucker told Friend to note that he had abstained.

4. INK 2019 Officer Nominating Committee Selection

Rucker began by noting that it has been previously mentioned that there will be some changes on the Board. He (Rucker) will be one of those changes. He is open for any suggestions as to who would serve on the nominating committee for the selection of officers for 2019. Billingsley asked if the by-laws said that they had to do this, he assumed that they did and that they were probably specific. Friend noted that this was the tradition, but he would look at the bylaws (on his laptop) while members continued to talk – he didn’t know that it was specified exactly. Secretary Gordon asked if it might be more appropriate to leave it to January 15 because half of the membership might be gone from the Board. Rucker stated that just because of the lateness in January, the Board would still meet in January. Billingsley asked if it was the second Thursday – Friend confirmed it was the first Thursday. Secretary Gordon stated that the board, then had two more meetings before then and Rucker confirmed. Friend located the by-laws and before reading from them, Billingsley stated “For the history of the people, do they not know who is currently serving?” Rucker stated that he was serving as chairman in the absence of the Secretary of State. He continued that, in all frankness, Kathy Sachs had attended more meetings than he had chaired. Kathy by way of introduction since she is not here, is a 35-year employee of the Secretary of State’s office who has seen... Secretary Gordon noted that she had seen it through a lot of stages. Secretary Gordon is the vice-chair, Gregg Wamsley is the Treasurer – from the Kansas Library Association, and Billingsley introduced himself as the Board Secretary.

Friend added that, as a practical matter, due to the situation with the Secretary of State – he indicated to Rucker he thought this was true – in Sachs case, the Secretary of State has an unusual situation in that they are empowered to act as the Secretary. So, even in the Chair’s absence, when Rucker is absent, Secretary Gordon as vice chair would do that, but Sachs, because she has the ability to act in the Secretary’s place, it is a little different, as she chairs. So, it is a little different. Secretary Gordon asked if the Secretary of State’s office is named in statute. Friend responded that the position is ex-officio, but the last couple years they have been chair, usually it has been a member from a user association that has been chair. Rucker confirmed that it is not statutory that they be chair, but it is statutory that they are on the Board. Secretary Gordon was thankful for the confirmation.

Note: Gaumer, who was attending by phone, had to leave the meeting (approximately 11:30). He stated that he certainly supported the nominations however it went and apologized to Friend that he wouldn’t be able to attend the banking status agenda item, but thought Friend’s summaries were good.

Friend stated that he apologized because he had just followed the normal process, so he was glad someone had asked, and read aloud from the by-laws: “Election: The Officers of INK shall be elected annually by the Board at the January meeting...and each shall hold office for the term of a year or until a successor shall be elected and qualified.” So, Friend stated, a nominating committee is still needed.

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

Rucker stated that the Board could nominate the nominating committee today, or, if they really wanted to jam it up, it could be done in December, but they would have to have their decision by January. And, again, it is just the way that the dates fall, the 14th is just about as late as one is going to have an inauguration, but that's what we have. He doesn't think it is a necessity to do anything different than what it would do – it should meet at its regular time in January before we have a change in administration.

Yancey stated that, following that, the Board would elect officers in the month of January, so, yes, the Board needs a nominating committee. Rucker asked who would like to serve on that nominating committee. Yancey said that he thinks they have several people that they know are going to be there – one of them just left (the call). So, he suggests that Gaumer (who had left the meeting previously) and those to his left should be on the committee.

Action Taken: Yancey made a motion to nominate Aaron Kite, Lucas Goff, and Doug Gaumer as the nominating committee. Billingsley seconded the motion. Rucker asked for discussion and there was none. The motion was unanimously approved.

Yancey continued afterwards that what he would ask that group informally in the way of charges, is that between the December and the January meeting, work with others on the current board, or as they have opportunities to understand if the administration has decided on things like that and it was known, in terms of nominating new officers. We will probably know, by then, if they would have a new CITO by then, he would think. So, they may have some of that information to incorporate that – but perform some outreach to see if they can get that. This is his informal advice. They could use Friend as a conduit to help do that.

5. **INK Banking Status - (Friend)**

The meeting was running short on time, so Friend quickly began the topic – however Yancey indicated he might have to leave and was afraid he might make the Board lose a quorum, so they asked if Friend needed approval on anything. He said he did, so they moved to the next topic (to return to this momentarily).

Action Taken: (see below) None.

6. **Kansas Business Center / Business Form Finder Update (Friend)**

Friend related that the Kansas Business Center Advisory Group had a Form Finder meeting. In a previous meeting, the Board had met by phone (in August?) and there had been a request to the Board to offer up some funding from a pool that had been established to do some enhancements to, specifically to make it mobile, the Form Finder app – it has already won an award and they had a good reception to that. The funding that was asked for on the call was \$25,000. Friend noted that he was not directly involved in coming up with that number. The way this is working out, frankly, he continued, is that they do have a person who does this, but they are with another state agency and there is a memorandum of agreement for them to do it, and that money did not actually include the fringe part of it. So, he is coming back with the same scope of work to make the enhancements, but the money was a little short. They had asked for \$25,000 but needed, like \$28,500, roughly. Yancey asked if there was a motion. The motion that he would ask was for \$30,000, just to make sure.

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

Action Taken: Yancey made a motion to increase the previously approved amount provided by the Board for Business Form Finder enhancements to \$30,000. Motion was seconded by Secretary Gordon. Rucker asked if there was any discussion. There was not. The motion was approved unanimously.

7. INK Banking Status - (Friend) (*continued*)

Yancey asked if there was anything else they needed a quorum for. Friend returned to this agenda item briefly to summarize the status of the process of obtaining proposals to provide INK's checking account. He said that he had worked with Gaumer and was soliciting bids. CoreFirst was supposed to have submitted another proposal but hadn't yet. They were monitoring INK's bank balances and getting monthly reports from Kaw Valley. Friend's question had been how many more banks should they go out to. Gaumer had expressed that CrossFirst would be interested, so he would not want to go out to just two banks plus the bank a board member was affiliated with, so he had asked the Board, and get the state's bank plus the ones we have, so he is trying to get the estimates together to move it and getting the monthly reports to make sure things are going wrong at Kaw Valley.

Billingsley requested that we have this done by the December board meeting so that they can vote on it. He felt that they had enough time to be able to finalize this. And, they already know, for the new people, he said that they were under securitized from the bank and it will show up on the next audit of the first six months of this year. So, he, personally would like to see that we close this out and the auditors can notate that it has been taken care of.

Action Taken: Billingsley said he would make the motion that it be brought to the Board for a vote. Secretary Gordon seconded the motion. There was no discussion, the motion was passed unanimously.

Adjournment

A motion was made and approved to adjourn the meeting at 11:40 am. The next INK Board meeting will be held at 10:00 am on December 6, 2018 at 700 SW Harrison, 2nd Floor Executive Conference Room, Eisenhower State Office Building, Topeka, Kansas.

Minutes submitted by: Duncan Friend