

M I N U T E S

of the

Joint Meeting of the Administration and Service Committees of the Legislative Council

June 28, 1983

The joint meeting of the Administration and Service Committees of the Legislative Council was called to order by the Administration Committee Chairman, Representative John H. Connors at 1:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 28, 1983, in Committee Room 22 of the State House, Des Moines, Iowa. Administration and Service Committee members present in addition to Chairman Connors, were:

Senator C. W. Bill Hutchins, Chairman, Service Committee
Senator C. Joseph Coleman
Senator Donald V. Doyle
Senator Merlin D. Hulse
Senator Calvin O. Hultman
Senator Lowell L. Junkins
Representative Dale M. Cochran
Representative Jean Lloyd-Jones
Representative Lester D. Menke
Representative Delwyn Stromer

Also attending the meeting were:

Senator Arthur A. Small, Jr.
Representative Lowell E. Norland
Representative Betty Hoffmann-Bright
Mr. Gary Kaufman, Legislative Service Bureau
Mr. Bill Grover, Sperry Corporation
Mr. Jerry Suther, Sperry Corporation
Mr. Rod Kumm, Sperry Corporation
Mr. Ed Hoobin, Sperry Corporation
Ms. Roberta Royce, Legislative Service Bureau
Ms. Cynde Clingan, Iowa Senate
Ms. Jean Wyer, Legislative Service Bureau
Mr. Kevin S. Vinchattle, Iowa House
Mr. Clifford Derby, Sperry Corporation
Mr. Ray Knapp, Legislative Fiscal Bureau
Mr. Greg Nichols, Iowa Senate
Ms. Marie Thayer, Iowa Senate
Mr. Peter J. Coniglio, Iowa Senate
Ms. Chris Fisher, Legislative Service Bureau
Ms. Sarah Craig, Legislative Service Bureau
Mr. Jerry Stephens, Honeywell Corporation
Mr. William E. Shoultz, Honeywell Corporation
Mr. Geoffrey Sickler, Honeywell Corporation
Mr. B. N. Bearley, Honeywell Corporation
Mr. D. A. Williamson, Honeywell Corporation

Mr. Larry J. Swanson, Honeywell Corporation
Mr. Dennis Prouty, Director, Legislative Fiscal Bureau
Ms. Diane Bolender, Senior Research Analyst,
Legislative Service Bureau
Mr. Serge H. Garrison, Director, Legislative Service Bureau
Mr. Burnette E. Koebernick, Senior Legal Counsel
Legislative Service Bureau

Chairman Hutchins noted that Chairman Connors and he have reviewed alternative procedures to be used for the conduct of this meeting and if it is agreeable to the other members of the Administration and Service Committees, it is suggested that the Sperry Corporation and Honeywell Corporation be allowed to make their presentations to the Committees this afternoon with only representatives of the one company in the room during the time of the presentation by that company. Following the presentations by the Sperry Corporation and the Honeywell Corporation, representatives of both companies will be requested to leave to allow the Administration and Service Committees to discuss the respective proposals. He also suggested that representatives of both vendors remain available for additional questions that may be raised at a subsequent meeting to be held at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, June 29, 1983. The members of the respective committees agreed that this procedure would be acceptable and representatives of the Honeywell Corporation were requested to leave so that representatives of the Sperry Corporation could make their presentation to the Administration and Service Committees.

Chairman Connors recognized Mr. Clifford Derby of Sperry Corporation. Mr. Derby introduced the other members of the Sperry team who would make presentations to the Committees. These persons included Mr. Jerry Vennard, Mr. Jerry Suther, Mr. Rod Kumm, Mr. Ed Hoobin, and Mr. Bill Grover. The Sperry Corporation presentation was based upon the needs of the General Assembly as determined by the Sperry Corporation and included the use of 1100/70 computers, MAPPER, SPERRYLINK, and the UTS 30 terminal. The Sperry 1100/70 computer is the mainframe, SPERRYLINK is the office automation system, MAPPER is the primary software product to support complete data base management, recovery, and historical access capabilities, and the UTS 30 are the micro processor terminals which would be part of the system. A copy of the Sperry Corporation presentation is on file in the offices of the Legislative Service Bureau.

Upon completion of the presentation by the Sperry Corporation representatives, Chairman Connors asked the members of the Committees for questions.

Senator Hultman inquired as to whether the system could be tied into the Central Data Processing system for obtaining information and noted that if it is possible to change that information, some problems could be created for the executive branch of government. Mr. Suther responded that Central Data Processing will have to make arrangements for access to the data that is available through CDP

and whether or not that data could be changed would be a determination to be made by Central Data Processing. Senator Hultman asked as to whether strike-throughs and underscores could be used and would be appearing on the screen of the terminal. Mr. Suther answered in the affirmative. Senator Hultman asked further whether the system would be responsive to the Code publication needs of the General Assembly and whether Iowa would be able to retain a tape of the Code of Iowa on the premises. Mr. Suther responded in the affirmative.

Representative Menke noted that the need for computers is to save additional time and inquired whether the use of these computers would reduce the need for proofers by the General Assembly. Mr. Garrison responded that with either vendor, proofer needs would be reduced.

Senator Hulse inquired as to the life expectancy of the Sperry Corporation mainframe. Mr. Grover responded that the life expectancy of the mainframe is approximately eight years. Senator Hulse asked what would happen if the system were down and inoperable and required maintenance work. Mr. Grover responded that there is a local maintenance staff which would respond to the needs of the General Assembly. Representative Lloyd-Jones inquired as to what will happen with the information on the current system and whether this information can be transferred to the Sperry Corporation product. Mr. Grover responded that any information or data currently on the computer system would be immediately transferable to the Sperry Corporation system.

Senator Coleman inquired as to whether the Sperry Corporation provides its own software. Mr. Grover answered in the affirmative. Senator Coleman inquired as to whether this software is adaptable to software provided by other vendors. Mr. Grover responded that it could be compatible if the programs are properly written to make it compatible. Mr. Vennard also indicated that in using software provided by a third party, if anything is wrong with that software, the third party is responsible for the software.

Senator Doyle noted that when the voting systems were installed in the House and Senate, the vendor indicated that the voting machine could be interfaced with computers and inquired as to whether the Sperry Corporation system could interface with the House and Senate voting machines. Mr. Grover responded that the Sperry Corporation representatives have not reviewed the possibility of doing this but would be happy to do so.

Representative Cochran inquired as to whether the Sperry system could be used for compilation of the House and Senate journals. Mr. Grover responded in the affirmative. Senator Hutchins inquired as to whether the Sperry Corporation currently has legislative systems in other states. Mr. Grover responded that Sperry does have systems in other states and has expanded those systems. Senator Hutchins inquired as to how many state legislatures used the Sperry system. Mr. Derby responded that only Maryland currently uses the system and only for fiscal purposes.

Representative Cochran inquired as to whether the system would be strictly a legislative computer system and there would be no access to that system by other parties. Mr. Grover responded that the computer system would be strictly a legislative computer system and that other agencies would be allowed access to that system only if the General Assembly determines that that agency should have access and provides the access.

There being no further questions, Chairman Connors recessed the Committee meeting for a period of ten minutes and announced that the Committee would reconvene at 2:30 p.m. to hear the presentation provided by representatives of the Honeywell Corporation.

Upon calling the meeting back to order, Chairman Connors recognized Mr. J. Petersen of the Honeywell Corporation who introduced the other members of the staff who would be making the presentation on the various aspects of the Honeywell proposal. The presenters for Honeywell included Mr. Dave Williamson, Mr. Bill Bearley, Mr. Geoffrey Sickler, and Mr. Larry Swanson. The presentation covered the CP6 computer program which would be used for text editing and the IRMS system which is the fiscal aspect of the program. Copies of the proposal presented by Honeywell are available in the offices of the Legislative Service Bureau. Upon completion of the presentation, Chairman Connors called for questions.

Senator Hultman inquired as to whether a member of the General Assembly would be able to use the system. Mr. Swanson responded that the system is user friendly and with some modifications would be available for use to all members of the General Assembly and easily used by those persons. Senator Hultman asked whether there are any problems with interfacing with the Central Data Processing unit of the State Comptroller's office. Mr. Swanson responded in the negative noting that Honeywell has already ran several tests with Central Data Processing to determine whether a hookup could be made and the tests were satisfactory. Senator Hultman inquired as to whether the bill drafting program developed by Honeywell is ready for implementation. Mr. Swanson responded in the affirmative noting that Mr. Sickler has indicated the desire to do some additional programming to provide a faster response time.

Representative Menke noted that the mainframe might be located in the Hoover Building and wondered whether that will create any problems. Mr. Swanson responded in the negative. Representative Menke noted that during the presentation, reference had been made to the dictionary functions of the computer system and asked the representatives to further explain the dictionary capability. Mr. Sickler responded that dictionary capability simply means that the computer has the ability to correct misspelled words. Representative Menke inquired as to whether service would be available in the Des Moines area in the situation of a breakdown of a part of the computer system. Mr. Swanson responded in the affirmative noting that a number of Honeywell personnel are located in Des Moines.

Senator Small noted that a charge of \$100,000 for customizing the system is listed in the proposal and inquired as to what these costs involve. Mr. Swanson responded that the \$100,000 is basically for site preparation and customizing.

Mr. Garrison inquired as to how many computers are compatible with the CP6. Mr. Swanson responded that approximately 100 can work directly off of the system now but that there is virtually no limit because of certain program modifications which could be made to other computers to make them compatible to the CP6. Senator Small inquired as to whether a person with a computer at home could, with proper commands, work with data within the system through the mainframe at the state complex without anyone's assistance. Mr. Swanson responded in the affirmative.

Representative Cochran inquired as to whether Honeywell has had any experience with other legislative bodies. Mr. Swanson responded in the negative and suggested that other legislative bodies are interested. He also noted that Honeywell has computer systems at the present time in the state department of public instruction, the department of social services, and the department of public safety. Representative Stromer inquired as to whether the use of this system by the general assembly would mean that the general assembly would become more dependent upon computers. Mr. Swanson responded in the affirmative. Representative Stromer noted that the general assembly has incurred a sufficient amount of down time through Central Data Processing and wondered whether Honeywell equipment would experience the same amount of down time. Mr. Swanson responded that some of the down time which is presently experienced with Central Data Processing relates to the number of users on the system and is not based upon equipment malfunctions or failures. Representative Stromer inquired as to whether Honeywell service is comparable to service provided by other computer firms. Mr. Swanson responded in the affirmative noting that it has local offices with technicians readily available.

Chairman Hutchins noted that Honeywell has indicated that it would be doing some of the trouble shooting on problems from another location and inquired as to how a software program or problem would be responded to. Mr. Swanson indicated that the appropriate personnel would be contacted locally who could respond to any software program.

Chairman Connors inquired as to whether any other members of the Committee might have any comments. Representative Menke suggested that the members of the Administration and Service Committees will never be ready to ask some of the questions which need be asked because of the limited knowledge of those members with computer systems and suggested that some comments are required from staff who are present. Senator Hultman noted his agreement and emphasized that the General Assembly recognizes the need for a new computer system but that these same persons are not sure whether they are prepared to make that decision at this time.

Mr. Garrison noted that the current system is outdated and that the antiquated system which is currently in use requires extensive maintenance. He pointed out that the General Assembly currently relies upon Central Data Processing for all computer services and that a new system would definitely be more cost effective. Mr. Prouty noted that the Legislative Fiscal Bureau does not rely upon Central Data Processing and has a mini computersystem of its own.

Representative Norland inquired as to the reasons for the amount of down time currently suffered with the present system. Mr. Garrison replied that Central Data Processing currently serves many different users and the amount of time available to each of those users is somewhat limited. Chairman Hutchins noted that the amount of money which can be saved means any computer system at this time would be a wise investment. Senator Junkins opined that there is little question that the investment in a computer system for the General Assembly is needed at this time. Chairman Connors indicated that the primary question at this point is whether the Administration and Service Committees want to proceed with a recommendation to the Legislative Council.

Senator Hultman moved that the Administration and Service Committees recommend that the General Assembly acquire a computer system for the legislative branch of government. The motion was seconded by Senator Junkins.

Representative Stromer suggested that the primary question in his mind at this time is whether funds appropriated under section 2.12 of the Code can be used for this purpose. He also indicated that the issue of the need is not questionable at this point. Senator Junkins also noted that the total cost of the computer system is a problem but that the General Assembly is fortunate that both vendors have indicated a willingness to adjust the financing plan for the computer system. Senator Hutchins suggested that Mr. Garrison again prepare the cost savings which could be achieved through acquisition of a computer program for the General Assembly.

There being no further questions or discussion regarding the Hultman motion, Chairman Connors called for a vote on the motion and it was adopted unanimously by voice vote.

Senator Hultman suggested that the members of the Administration and Service Committees need to talk with both vendors again regarding finances and asked Mr. Garrison to put the cost saving figures together for the committees to review again. Mr. Prouty was asked to review the data he had submitted to Committees regarding the respective costs as outlined by the vendors. A copy of this itemization is attached and by this reference made a part of these minutes. There being no further business, the joint meeting of the Administration and Service Committees of the Legislative Council was adjourned at 4:40 p.m. to reconvene on June 29, 1983 at 8:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNETTE E. KOEBERNICK
Senior Legal Counsel

7/12/83
ADM.SER./24