
Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

December 2018 Board Meeting December 6, 2018

Opening

A meeting of the INK Board was called to order at 10:13 a.m. Thursday, December 6 at 700 SW Harrison, 2nd Floor Conference Room, Topeka, Kansas 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 (*by phone – later in-person*)
Aaron Kite, representing the Kansas Bar Association
Gregg Wamsley, representing the Kansas Library Association
Glen Yancey, CIO, Kansas Department of Health and Environment, representing the Executive Branch Chief Information Technology Officer (*by phone*)

Others Present

Kathy Sachs, Kansas Secretary of State; Andrew Wiens, Governor's Office; Stanley Adams, Kansas Department of Commerce; Brent Legg, Connected Nation; Duncan Friend, Information Network of Kansas; Nolan Jones, Ashley Gordon, and James Adams, Kansas Information Consortium, LLC.

Consent Agenda

There were no contracts for approval on the Consent Agenda, only the draft November 2018 INK Board meeting minutes.

Action Taken: Motion made to approve the Consent Agenda in its entirety by Billingsley, seconded by Kite. Motion passes unanimously (*Gaumer, Gordon not yet in attendance*).

Action Agenda

Regular Business

1. Kansas Broadband Mapping and MF 2 Challenge Grant Update (Connected Nation)

Andrew Wiens thanked the Board for their support. Brent Legg, Vice President for Government Affairs with Connected Nation, the vendor engaged by Governor Colyer's office to implement two INK grants, presented an overview of the status of the related grant activity. (*A copy of his presentation is attached.*)

2. Network Manager Report (Jones)

Jones noted that the annual Disaster Recovery test required by the contract would be performed this coming weekend. He discussed KIC's participation in the Holiday Heroes event coming up for the second time at the Topeka Rescue Mission and the success of the Technology Showcase – he estimated around 50 attendees, including some legislators. He then went over KIC's accomplishments against the 2018 Business Plan metrics, including the move from KanPay to CCP, a platform used for payment by all the other portals. He felt they could have been more successful at data analysis at agencies, finding new sources of data of value to business and the public, which they will work on more in 2019.

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

3. 2019 Business Plan - Review / Approval (Jones)

(Rucker had left the meeting temporarily, as had Friend, so Sachs took over as chair and they moved to what had been the 4th agenda item, the 2019 Business Plan review / approval.)

Jones began by pointing out that the goals and objectives of the plan had been approved previously, but it was missing the final budget, which Friend had pointed out was required by the contract. He noted that they didn't plan to add staff this year, but were seeing significant growth in staff needed to support the chatbot, Agent Kay – essentially live staffing for overflow or backup when questions were more complex. And, they were targeting a 4% increase in revenue, but it was not based on fee increases, just “knocking on doors” to see what they could do. They were also going to look hard at branding in the coming year.

Rucker and Friend returned to the meeting. Jones indicated that they had moved on. Jones briefly recapped the discussion for the chair.

4. INK Bank Bid Review / Selection (Friend/Wamsley)

Friend indicated that the board had approved a motion at the last meeting to take action at this meeting on the issue of moving to a new bank. Friend indicated he had obtained five bids and that he had talked with the Board Treasurer before the meeting about the best course of action. He noted that Kaw Valley was one of the bids. Friend continued that there was complexity involved in terms of some of the investment proposals being made by the banks and this was part of what he had talked with Wamsley about. He said he did have them, and one did come from Gaumer's bank, CrossFirst. But, before he handed them out, he noted that Wamsley and he had talked about perhaps a finance committee being formed to evaluate them – then deferred to Wamsley.

Wamsley said that it didn't seem after looking over what he saw yesterday, it would be prudent to just hand them out and evaluate in the meeting – he thought they should do some review. He understood it was the desire to have the decision made in this meeting, but additional review would be prudent. Billingsley asked if he meant having the banks do presentations. Wamsley stated that possibly present to a committee if formed, or maybe if a committee just reviewed them and had questions about the proposals. Rucker asked if Wamsley would like a committee and Wamsley said he thought so. Rucker said that there was then a motion for a committee and that Wamsley would be chairman – and asked for volunteers. Friend excused the interruption, but polled Gaumer on the phone to make sure he was on the phone and solicited his input. Gaumer said his bank was very interested, and that he could answer questions but didn't believe he should serve on the committee.

Action Taken: Wamsley moved to formulate a committee comprised of Wamsley as chair, Goff, and Billingsley in anticipation of making a recommendation to the full board in January with where the board should go from here with regard to banking services. Yancey seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Billingsley addressed the fact there was a motion to bring forward that information at the December meeting (today). He suggested it would need to be amended to reflect that it would be extended to the January meeting. Billingsley moved to amend the motion made at the November meeting to extend it to January. *(Rucker left the meeting)* Sachs began chairing. She asked for a second and it was seconded by Wamsley and unanimously approved with no further discussion.

5. INK Board 2019 Proposed Expense Budget – Review / Approval (Friend)

(Rucker returned to the meeting). Friend asked the members to look in the Board packet. He had missed the part of the meeting where the 2019 INK Business Plan was presented, but directed them to the last page of that where a table showing the financial piece was located (Portal Financial Plan) to explain the materials he was going to hand out (the INK Expense budget) and its relationship to the whole. He asked if the business plan had been approved and it had not. He handed out the draft INK Expense Budget to the members and emailed it to the members on the phone, then walked through it. He indicated he had used the same approach as in the past, but there were some questions / unresolved issues including disposition of the issue related to direction on disaster recovery (move from Avamar to Rubrik); the possibility of changes in the new Secretary of State's approach to offering space for the INK office, or it being free of charge. At the end of the presentation, Rucker indicated he thought it was premature for the board to take action in approving the INK Expense Budget. Rucker formed the motion as noted below, made by Billingsley.

Action Taken: Motion made by Billingsley to have the committee that was just formed for the banking review take on the review of the 2019 Business Plan and the Expense Budget for approval and to review it along with the other matters the committee is going to review as far as bank is concerned and report back for final action at the January meeting. Seconded by Kite. No further discussion. Approval was unanimous.

6. INK Grant Request Status (Friend)

Friend indicated that a grant was received from the Kansas Human Rights Commission. He said they had applied before, it wasn't approved, but they had come back and re-tooled the proposal. It was being presented by the chair of the board, Melvin Neufeld. He noted in his cover letter that the federal government did this online and they'd like to serve their customers in the same way, so Friend felt it should be entertained in the normal way that grants were evaluated by the Board. It was around \$150,000 – he informed the group of how this committee was normally handled. The board did not choose to place a member on the committee, but defer to the CITO's.

Action Taken: No motion made. Rucker directed Friend to provide the grant information to the three Chief Information Technology officers that normally made up the committee. It is not a must, but they would like to have a report back by the January 2019 meeting.

7. INK 2019 Officer Nominating Committee Report

Friend indicated he did not know status, but confirmed the members of the committee as Goff, Kite, and Gaumer. Rucker asked if they'd had the opportunity to speak yet. Rucker suggested that between now and the time that the Executive Committee report (meeting) is held, they meet and do their due diligence on who they think ought to lead from this time forward. And, when that Executive Committee meeting is held, he is going to call upon one of the individuals of the Board (from the Nominating Committee) on that call and give them (the current board officers) an update on who is being considered for next year's office assignments.

Action Taken: None.

New Business: Recognition of Kathy Sachs. Before Rucker left the meeting, he discussed with the board the idea of recognizing Sachs for her service to the Board at the next meeting and they agreed.

Note: Rucker left the meeting, turning over Chair responsibilities to Sachs.

8. INK Executive Director Position Committee Report

Sachs said she thought Billingsley had an update on the Executive Director. Billingsley stated that the committee has not met and that he didn't know that there was a chair of the committee as of yet – he didn't think it was appointed in the minutes. He did have a position description he had obtained from Sachs he would distribute that likely needed an update.

A motion was made by Sachs, which did not receive a second, to authorize the committee, if they deemed it to be a good idea, to hire a professional search firm to bring back to the committee three-to-five names that the committee should pursue. The board members had an extensive discussion of the specific charge of the committee and what assistance it might need, resolving that it was, per a motion approved at the previous (November) meeting, to decide if an Executive Director position is needed, and, if so, develop a position description. At the end of the discussion, Wamsley said he would be in favor of authorizing the committee to come into a contract with someone to help develop a job description, if that were needed. Friend confirmed by reading the by-laws aloud that they would allow the committee, if specifically charged by the board, the authority to contract for that purpose.

Action Taken: Wamsley moved to give the committee the authority to engage a contract of up to \$5,000 to help develop a job description, if they determined that was needed. Yancey seconded. There was no further discussion and the motion was approved unanimously, with Sachs abstaining.

9. New Business: Electronic Access to Historical Statutes

Sachs moved forward with New Business ahead of lunch. She outlined the situation with “law books” at the Secretary of State's offices, including Session Laws and the supplementals for each year. She presented the use case for an attorney for example, wanting to see what the law said in a particular year (2005) on an issue. Westlaw could be used, which many do, or the session laws. But, the idea was that they kept a certain amount of those because an attorney or a court might want to certify that “this was the law at that time”. So, the question was how many to keep. Once a year, for example, they sell an old “supp”. She talked with the Revisor about this, the Historical Society also had a set. She continued to explain the occasional need for this in terms of requests both of the Revisor and Secretary of State. Secretary Gordon asked if this was not available electronically and it is not. So, Sachs thought that this would fall into INK's mission. She said that there wasn't an agency, per se, to sponsor it – it would be up to Friend to watch it get done. She had talked with BTCO about scanning and Billingsley indicated DCF had used them as well as KDOR. Sachs outlined the costs that BTCO had proposed to her. Friend asked who the funds would go to. Sachs indicated the Friend would pay them (BTCO). Sachs said there are three sources for the content. Friend confirmed the process that was intended: He would have them scanned. Then have the Historical Society advise for quality (or, it was suggested, use their standards). Then he would work with Jones to develop a website to display them. Then going forward it would be owned by an agency. Sachs confirmed it was just back scanning. She confirmed it was five cents a page.

Action Taken: Sachs moved that Friend and Jones would work with BTCO and the Historical Society in order to begin scanning the historical Session Laws, Supplements, and Kansas Administrative Regulations, and other related legal publications to an amount not to exceed \$30,000. And, authorizing Friend to sign a contract at a rate of five cents per page. Gordon seconded – discussion followed.

Yancey suggested that he agrees with it, but he has had a lot of experience working with BTCO and that he thinks the Board would want to review a potential contract to see the detail on that before they actually sign

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

off on that. Friend asked if Yancey wanted the Board to see that. Yancey responded yes. So, he asked, to bring a contract back for the next meeting. Friend asked if they had issues with their quality. Yancey said his experience had been uneven and it had always been better if they had certain service levels and expectations detailed in the contract, in terms of how files would be digitized, how they will be sent to them. Sachs questioned whether Friend and Jones would have that experience – if the Board. Yancey said he was fine to review.

Billingsley said it depended on where the records were ultimately going to reside. Sachs asked Jones if he was saying he would have a spot for them on the Network and Jones said yes. Then, she said, she would be shocked if the Secretary of State didn't provide a link to them along with the Revisor and other places.

Friend asked Billingsley if, from a web accessibility standpoint, these were OCR'd (optical character recognition)? That is, if he couldn't see, he wouldn't be able to view anything. Billingsley said they did – it was a pdf. Sachs responded that they would have to find out if the price includes that. Secretary Gordon confirmed that the Historical Society would not let them do it if it were not accessible. Sachs said that this may increase the price and, if it does, then she thought that should come back to the Board. Friend said he would ask Veatch. Yancey agreed to be involved in reviewing the contract with Friend and Jones.

Action Taken: *(continued)* Sachs asked if there was any more discussion. Seeing none, she called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously. (Gaumer had left the meeting by this point).

Adjournment

A motion was made to adjourn by Goff, seconded by Kite and approved unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:25 pm.

Minutes submitted by: Duncan Friend