

**Utah Transparency Advisory Board Meeting**  
**October 9, 2013**  
**State Capitol Building**  
**Room 415 – 1:00 p.m.**  
**Public Meeting**

Attendance:

Senator Deidre Henderson – Chair, Utah State Senate  
John Reidhead – Vice Chair, Director, Division of Finance, Dept. of Administrative Services  
Evan Curtis, Utah Governor’s Office of Management and Budget  
Jonathan Ball, Legislative Fiscal Analyst, Utah State Legislature (absent)  
Representative Steve Eliason, Utah State House of Representatives (absent)  
Mark VanOrden, State CIO, Utah Department of Technology Services  
Patricia Smith-Mansfield, Utah State Archivist  
Gary Williams, City Attorney for Ogden City (absent)  
Lex Hemphill, State Records Committee  
Phillip Windley, Public Board Member  
Jason Williams, Public Board Member

1. Welcome.

Senator Henderson welcomed everyone to the Utah Transparency Advisory Meeting, on Oct. 9, 2013. She excused board member Gary Williams.

Representative Eliason has a prior commitment; he may join the meeting later. Jonathan Ball is also absent.

2. Review of September 17, 2013, meeting minutes.

Senator Henderson asked the board for a motion to approve the minutes.

John Reidhead moved to approve the minutes from the meeting held on Sept. 17, 2013. All board members present voted to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Presentation by the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) on their Transparency Project.

Lincoln Shurtz on behalf of the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) presented to the Board their Transparency Project.

He explained that 3 years ago the ULCT approached the legislature for an appropriation to deal with increased legislative requests to put more information online. Primarily GRAMA issues, and also requests that cities and towns are regularly asked to provide to the public. The cities and towns did not have a budget to do this. They requested a \$250,000 appropriation to create a streamlined process for cities and towns to collectively work on a process to provide GRAMA requests and public information to the public in a timely fashion. The ULCT on behalf of the cities and towns were successful in getting the \$250,000 appropriation. The appropriation went to the Division of Finance, and the ULCT pulls draws from them to fund this project. The first year was an exploratory year so they did a continuing resolution to fund last year at the

legislative session and to move the funding over to the current fiscal year. They currently have approximately \$150,000 of the appropriation to continue funding their project.

They created a common network where cities and towns can work collaboratively among the 245 cities. Everything is voluntary, the cities that want to participate can do so with the angle being, that they get a majority of participation from their member cities in the state. They are in the process of putting the collaborative network together and they are working on white label software packages for cities and towns to use.

The initial primary software package deals specifically with GRAMA requests. Many cities and towns do not have an online request form. This provides software for each individual city, with the GRAMA statutory provisions built into the software. It has a rate calculation so individuals can make a GRAMA request and pay for it online. The League of Cities and Towns has been using the draws from the state to underwrite the creation of the software and creation of the network the cities and towns will be using. The ULCT will be the owners of the software package, member cities and towns will be able to use the software service through the ULCT. They have used the appropriated funds provided by the state as well as resources allocated by the ULCT.

As the ULCT continues to work on this project they will be trying to provide services and software to cities and towns where there are gaps in terms of software providers, primarily to small jurisdictions. They are planning next to provide a document management tool so that smaller cities will be able to have easier access to records requested.

Mr. Shurtz said they will most likely ask the legislation this year for a continued resolution to roll the funds over from year to year.

Senator Henderson asked if the system was complete, and if not, about the parts of the software they are continuing to work on.

Mr. Shurtz said that it is not complete they are in the beta test mode with 20 cities who receive large amounts of GRAMA requests. They are testing different scenarios to make sure it will work with all different types of cities and towns. Their plan is to roll-out the software on January 1, 2014.

Senator Henderson congratulated Mr. Shurtz and the ULCT for this effort. She asked about the number of cities or towns that were not members of the ULCT.

Mr. Shurtz said that in Utah all cities and towns are members of the ULCT.

Patricia Smith-Mansfield asked if this program allows each individual city to put in their own timelines and a tracking for timeframes, and if the system will be adaptable and able to be modified so that each individual city will be able to put in their own individual requests.

Mr. Shurtz said that was correct, he explained that they have been working with the individual cities that have different timelines that are established. If someone made a request to a city the tool would automatically recognize the city, and then input the entire timelines specific to that city. Then it will create a workflow tracker, so the person monitoring on the municipal side knows how long they have to respond. It will also provide a notice to the individual that has

made the request about the date they should receive the information, and the cost associated with it.

Senator Henderson asked what cities will be the first to use the software.

Mr. Shurtz said they have used small and large cities for the testing to get a wide range of perspective. They have also worked with the clerks and recorders association to get their input.

John Reidhead asked Mr. Shurtz what the most requested records were for the cities and towns. Police records are the most requested documents, along with personal correspondence. West Valley City receives 2,000 requests a month for records. Cedar Hills had a request for every document that had been created in the city over the last year; it was 35,000 pages of information. They plan on asking the legislators who should be responsible for paying for these huge requests.

#### 4. Discussion regarding posting of cities and towns ordinances online.

Lincoln Shurtz said they are looking at software companies who deal with codification of ordinances. Codification is the process for updating and taking policy decisions that take place at Council meetings and integrating them into their actual code. They would like the cities to be able to do this rather than send them away to a codification agency. Sterling Codifier allows for online access to the code, they will work with the cities that work with Sterling Codifier to make sure it is posted on the city's website and find a way to also have centralized access to this information. They have found some smaller vendors, who make it easier to update and provide the code online, and can easily be posted on individual cities' websites or hosted at a central location. These technology opportunities the ULCT is looking at will provide greater transparency in GRAMA, codes, financial transparency etc. They have used the procurement policy of the State to procure the hardware and software. They are hoping to have this online sometime next year.

Senator Henderson asked if there is any hesitation from some cities and towns to have the ability to use this software.

Mr. Shurtz explained that Sterling Codifiers has a group of attorneys that legally review the changes to the code. The smaller software package requires the cities and towns to have their legal departments review the code for any discrepancies. The smaller codifier companies are a lot cheaper than Sterling Codifiers. The small communities that are not codifying at all, or not on a regular basis, are interested in this cheaper tool.

Evan Curtis feels that it is important to have this information available online.

Kenneth Bullock from the League of Cities and Towns said that all cities and towns are interested in transparency, but there needs to be a realistic view as to when the smaller communities can get there. Transparency is an expectation and a policy; it is good for the public to know what is going on.

Jason Williams asked what the software lifespan would be. The ULCT is looking at annual updates on the software.

5. Report on search results on Utah.gov. What information is the public looking for online that is currently not available online?

Dave Fletcher, Chief Technology Officer with the Utah Department of Technology Services, reported that his department has been working for 20 years to identify services and information that citizens want and need to be able to access online. [Utah.gov](http://Utah.gov) has around 30 million pages of content and over 1,000 services available online. They have a large number of visitors that access the [Utah.gov](http://Utah.gov) domain. In 2013, they averaged 1.3 million visitors each month, with the last 3 months having 1.5 million unique visitors to the site.

The central functionality of [Utah.gov](http://Utah.gov) is focused around Smart Search. Google is also part of their overall search structure. The “smart search” portal which processes millions of searches begins with an online services search. When people come to [Utah.gov](http://Utah.gov) they want to renew a driver’s license, buy a fishing license, or get different professional licenses renewed, etc. All the services are search driven. [Utah.gov](http://Utah.gov) also provides a media search as well as a forms search. There are around 50,000 different forms on [Utah.gov](http://Utah.gov). They are automating a lot of the forms so people are able to use them as an online service.

They also use a Google custom search which is one of the tabs on the “smart search”. This allows a user to search not only [Utah.gov](http://Utah.gov) but all of the sites associated with it, which includes state and local governments. There is a refinement to the search engine which allows someone to drill down in the results and find things such as maps, presentations, reports, codes, etc. There is also an agency search, social media search and a data search. In [data.utah.gov](http://data.utah.gov) they index a lot of data sets that are available in the state. When a user uses the “smart search” it will pull up those results as well. The majority of the external search engine referrals come from Google. The historical total of external links to [Utah.gov](http://Utah.gov) totals over 100 million.

The top search engine results that people are looking at are: simply searching for “Utah”; anything related to jobs and employment; maps; information about government and business entities; education; counties; courts; Governor; Utah Code; and 72 hour kits. These are some of the most popular results from external search engines like Google, Bing and Yahoo. They get searches for a Secretary of State, which Utah does not have, but they have created a page that lists all of the functions associated with the Secretary of State and pointers to get to the results. They have a master index that helps accumulate the results from all the different web properties.

Their most popular search results on the internal government search engine are: DMV; food stamps; jobs; unemployment; my case (system that allows people to get services from the Dept. of Workforce Services and Health Dept.); forms; voting; taxes; Division of Professional Licensing; driver’s license; Medicaid; and recovery services. The top search results from all internet traffic included some of the results listed above, but also included Utah State Parks, wildlife etc. If a request takes them to a federal site, the master index references them back to the government entity they are looking for in Utah, whether it is State, Local, or Federal.

Mr. Fletcher referenced the top searches that people are looking for in terms of data. There is a lot of data associated with each high profile search. He discussed some of the data that is not available on [Utah.gov](http://Utah.gov) such as some small cities and towns and special districts that do not have websites. There are not a lot of news feeds that are available as data from cities and towns. There may be some data from the State that is in a format that is hard to access. Medical

examiner reports are not available online. There are a number of things that are not available as live data feeds or API's. The Federal Government has been providing more automated access to live data.

Senator Henderson asked for a comprehensive list of things that have been searched for and is not available online.

Mr. Fletcher said that there is not a comprehensive list of information that is not available online because it always changes. He said that he duplicates the searches on [Utah.gov](http://Utah.gov) to see what is available, and then does additional searches to verify what is available and what is not. To make a comprehensive list could take years to compile

John Reidhead asked Mr. Fletcher if he finds something from an agency that the public wants that is not available online, if he contacts the agency about it. He also asked if DTS dictated a format.

Mr. Fletcher said they have a Product Management Council that meets and discusses this issue on a regular basis. They do not always contact an agency when they find something that is not available. He searches every day for new information on [Utah.gov](http://Utah.gov), as well as social media sites for content that needs to be accessed.

DTS does not dictate any formats, but they do have some standards for formats. They work with data in all different formats. There are constant changes, so they continue to look at new tools that are available to access their data, and to make sure their data is available and usable.

Mark VanOrden said that Dave Fletcher is a good resource; he works on this every day. They have over 1000 services that they provide transactions online. That is more than any other state.

He said that every year they meet with all the agencies to sign a service level agreement. Dave prepared a list of the agencies that had PDF documents online, which is not an efficient way to transact data. There are sometimes a PDF is the right way to post the document if there are only a few transactions done a year. Some of the agencies they visited did not know they still had PDF documents online. They also talked to the agency about making more applications available on mobile devices.

Phil Windley said that API's were listed as something that is searched for and often not found. He asked if the state had a registry or a search engine for API's, so people can find them

Dave Fletcher said that there is a search for API's, but there is not a lot in there. This is an area that they continue to work on.

Patricia Smith-Mansfield stated that the Board and DTS are focusing on online access, which is not necessarily what is needed for preservation of the electronic records. Archives has to go behind and fix some records that have been put in an online format that is not good for the preservation. She would like DTS to consider this issue as they proceed.

Mr. Fletcher said that with all the information that DTS is adding online there are still many things that Archives is working to put online that wasn't online originally.

6. Determine timeline of tasks needed to prepare report required by SB 283 by November 30, 2013.

Senator Henderson stated that the Board is required to present a written report to the Legislative Management Committee, and Kim Hood, the Executive Director of the Department of Administrative Services by November 30, 2013.

She would like to develop some working groups and then have the working groups report back to the board. The working groups can meet whenever they want, no official action will be taken at those meetings.

Senator Henderson suggested scheduling additional board meetings to review what is discussed in the working groups and to prepare for the report.

November 7, 2013, at 8:30 a.m. and November 19, 2013, at 3:00 p.m. are the dates that were decided for the next board meetings.

7. Determining Working Groups within the Board.

John Reidhead made a motion to form the following working groups: Portal, Standards, and Prioritization. He would also like a working group set up for Financial, but not functioning at this time, as they prepare for the Nov. 30<sup>th</sup> deadline.

Senator Henderson asked for discussion to the motion.

Senator Henderson stated that the board was to come up with a recommendation for a one-stop searchable data portal. She feels the Portal Working Group needs to decide what the main objective is with the portal so that we are not duplicating efforts and tools that are already available. That is one of the recommendations for the report. The Prioritization Group would target city codes, meetings, and minutes, things that are not yet available online. The Standards Group would decide what formats or standards the board wants to use to put information online.

Patricia Smith-Mansfield would like distributed to the Board, a list Archives compiled for an open records bill a couple of years ago, of government business information that could be put online. Archives also compiled a list of other states that had open records at that time that could be distributed as well.

Senator Henderson proposed in a separate motion from Mr. Reidhead's, that each working group have an appointed Chair.

Jason Williams asked if the web portal working group could decide on a portal and then move on to discuss including API's, and live feeds etc.

Senator Henderson said if the statutory requirements are met, the working groups can do what they think is necessary, and report back to the board on what they recommend.

A vote was taken on the motion to form the Portal, Standards, and Prioritization working groups. All board members present approved, motion passed unanimously.

Patricia Smith-Mansfield would like to involve her people in all of these working groups.

Senator Henderson stated that the chairs in each working group can decide who and how many they would like to involve in their working groups.

John Reidhead moved that Phil Windley be the chair of the Standards Working Group.

Patricia Smith-Mansfield, be the chair of the Prioritization Working Group.

Mark VanOrden, be the chair of the Portal Working Group.

There was no discussion to the motion to appoint the chairs. All board members present voted, motion passed unanimously.

Senator Henderson asked board members if they have an interest in any of the working groups, to email the chair of the group and her.

Lex Hemphill asked who would draft the report.

Senator Henderson stated that the Committee will come up with the recommendations, and then staff will draft the report. More information will be decided on this issue at another meeting.

#### 8. Update and Status

- Usage statistics

Michael Rice from Utah Interactive reported on the statics of the Financial Transparency site. He said the site has been live for 4½ years. September's usage stats show an 18% positive growth for the last few months. Most visitors come from the State of Utah network. Users spend an average of 10 min. on the site

- Website inquiries

Darrell Swenson said there have been 5 inquiries to the transparency website since the last meeting. One request was for U of U employee compensation that has since been posted. Two requests were from out of state researchers asking the number of website visitors, they were referred to UI. The last request was for certain state budget reports; Brenda Lee referred them to staff at the Governor's Office of Management and Budget. There was also request for the date and time of this meeting and there was a request for help with the name search on the website.

- Status of Participating Entities

Mr. Swensen reported that most of the status of participating entities is the same as it was at the last meeting, but Utopia is now online with revenue and expense data and employee compensation.

He has contacted the 2011 entities about the uniform chart of accounts field that the State Auditor's wanted. He will also be contacting the public education entities about Senate Bill 128. Public education entities will be required to submit their information to the website in accordance with the USOE chart of accounts. He feels this will bring everything up to date.

- Status of Gunnison Valley Hospital & other hospitals

Mr. Swensen reported that Gunnison Valley Hospital has their employee compensation and their financial data for the most recent fiscal year posted to the Transparency Website. He is continuing to work with the other hospitals to get their data posted.

9. Public comment. There was no public comment.

10. Next Board Meeting: November 7, 2013. 8:30 a.m.

Patricia Smith-Mansfield made a motion to adjourn. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.