Utah Transparency Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
August 19, 2013
State Capitol Building
Room 415 – 2:00 p.m.

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
Representative Steve Eliason, Utah State House of Representatives
Mark VanOrden, State CIO, Utah Department of Technology Services
Patricia Smith-Mansfield, Utah State Archivist
Gary Williams, City Attorney for Ogden City
Lex Hemphill, State Records Committee

1.   Welcome and introduction of board members.

Senator Henderson welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the board members.

2.   Review of July 10, 2013 Meeting Minutes.

John Reidhead moved to approve the minutes from the meeting held on July 10, 2013. There was a second to the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

3.   Nominations and election of two additional board members.

The Board reviewed the résumés from Jason Williams, Christopher Bleak, Phillip Windley and Stephen R. Bagley. These are the candidates who were interested in filling the two vacant public board positions.

Senator Henderson thanked the candidates for their willingness to work on the board, and proposed that the Board vote Jason Williams and Phillip Windley to fill the two vacant public board positions. Representative Eliason seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

4.   Proposed Modifications to Transparency Website:

- Combining all K-12 schools under one large entity to allow for easier comparison between schools.

Michael Rice from Utah Interactive explained to the Board the way the website currently worked. He said a user would select a level of government like K-12 Education, and before they would see any data, they would need to select a single entity such as; Alpine School District and then select the type of data they were looking for and a fiscal period. The data would then show the individual school district.

The original request was to show all the school districts at the same time on the website, not individually. Michael Rice presented three options to combine all k-12 schools under one entity.

Option #1 is a manual merge. In the dropdown area on the website a new master entity called All School Districts would be created. This would be the master entity for all school districts. All school districts would have access to this new entity and would upload their data to the master entity, rather than the individual school districts.

 John Reidhead moved to discuss the option for K-12 schools under one entity until later in the meeting when Jonathan Ball had arrived. A vote was taken and passed. (The Board moved to item #5 on the agenda, Dianne Meppen's presentation *Smarter eGovernment: The Benefits of Online Services for Utah Businesses and The Economics of Online Services in Utah,* the study the Center for Public Policy & Administration, at the University of Utah, conducted on Utah.gov and the benefits of online services, p ages 4-7 of the minutes.)

Jonathan Ball arrived to the meeting, and the Board proceeded with agenda item #4. Michael Rice reviewed option #1 again, before continuing on to option 2 and 3.

Senator Henderson asked Michael Rice if the change to the website would require the school districts to perform an extra step to upload their data.

Michael Rice said that they would need to change their process. They would upload their data to the master entity.

There would not be additional programing time for this option, unless UI copied the old data into the master entity.

If all the entities did this for their 2014 data, their previous data would be split into their individual entities, instead of the master entity. UI recommends that the old data be changed and copied into the new master entity so users would be able to access all the data through the new entity.

Option #2 would be the same as option #1, but would require some programming in advance. When an entity uploaded their data the way they had in the past, then UI would post the data into the master entity. The user experience would be the same, but it would simplify the process for each of the entities. UI recommends with this option that UI convert entities' old data into the new master entity.

Option #3 would change the user interface; all entities would show as a new tab into the Transparency site. All the school district data would be together, but the management of the data would be in individual school districts.

Michael Rice explained how this option would show on the website. He said the benefit of this option is when you click on organization it would roll-up all the school districts together.

Patricia Mansfield-Smith asked if the option would allow a user to view an individual school's data, and if it would show Charter Schools.

Michael Rice said that you would be able to view individual schools data. Currently, all Charter Schools show in the K-12 tab.

This proposal would allow users to look at all the schools combined or at the individual school district. There would not be a change to the way the schools upload their data.

Michael Rice said that once the site is programmed, if cities and towns had a standard chart of accounts, they could be given the "all" option and it would already be built in the system. With the "all" option UI would batch up the main numbers at the point of the upload for an individual entity. Then they would use that batch to create their master entity.

Senator Henderson asked Brenda Lee what option the Division of Finance would recommend because they would be in charge of the funding for this change to the website.

Brenda Lee said that Finance would not recommend option #1, because of the problems of entities uploading the data into a common entity. Option #2 is similar to Option #3, but more expensive. Option #3 is the option they would recommend. This option would also allow cities and towns in the future to be given the "all" option because it would already be built into the system.

John Reidhead said they want to make sure that it is a priority of the Board before these changes are made to the Transparency Website. The Board discussed the options UI presented.

Jonathan Ball moved to have the Division of Finance move forward with option #3. The motion passed.

- Require the CFO of each governmental entity to certify that data being uploaded to the Transparency Website is accurate and complete.

Michael Rice reported on the request to add a way for a CFO of an entity, to certify that their data is accurate and complete on the website.

Mr. Rice said to create this option there would be two parts. One part would be in the Administration Website where the entities are uploading their data. They could add an option for the CFO to certify that their data was complete for a certain time period. They could chose quarters, years etc. for the time period. Then they could display this certification information on the entity page on the website where it shows how often the entities upload their data. Once the CFO submits the certification it would show on the entity page for the public to see.

John Reidhead said that the Board needs to consider if this is something that needs to be looked into at this time. Senator Niederhauser made the request to add this option when he was on the Transparency Board. John feels some CFO's would certify their data and others would not.

Senator Henderson asked about adding some additional language to say, *to the best of their knowledge complete and accurate.*

John Reidhead said they could work with UI on the language.

Senator Eliason suggested using the language in HB 330 *Financial Reporting Amendments,* if the data is the same as in the bill.

John Reidhead explained that the data they would be certifying is not the same type of data that is in HB 330. The website data is raw data and is not summarized in a financial statement. It is a different level of certification.

Gary Williams has concerns about the certification. He said the data is not a end of year financial statement that has been audited. When a Financial Officer certifies data the data would need to be perfect.

Jonathan Ball said the request was intended to certify that entities are reporting everything, not that it is completely correct. He feels that Pres. Niederhauser wanted the CFO to certify their entity is reporting as required.

Mr. Ball asked if Mr. Reidhead would be willing to certify the Division of Finance's information.

John Reidhead (State Financial Officer) said that he would ask his staff how they gathered the information and if they felt that the information was complete. He stated to the best of his knowledge he would be willing to certify the information they were sending to the website was accurate and complete. Some information may need to be corrected at year-end.

Mr. Reidhead thought the State Auditor's Office was adding to their manual for the CPA firms that do local government audits to include the Transparency Website in their requirements for local government entities.

Mr. Williams feels that the issue could be resolved with the language. He would like to consult some Financial Officers from various cities for their opinions.

Rep. Eliason said if it is raw data that is being certified, and not the financial report, the issue could be resolved with the suggested language. He would like to show the date the information was certified.

Gary Williams made a motion to add the certification update to the website, and have the Board approve the language before it goes live. The motion passed unanimously.

5.   Presentation of studies:

Smarter eGovernment: The Benefits of Online Services for Utah Businesses and The Economics of Online Services in Utah

Dianne Meppen, Research Associate with the Center for Public Policy & Administration, at the University of Utah, presented the study they conducted on Utah.gov and the benefits of online services.

Ms. Meppen reported when Utah.gov was launch in 1999, they had one service and now have more than 1,000 services available online. Utah citizens are increasingly using this portal. Last year there were 31 million transactions processed on Utah.gov. It has made it easier for businesses and citizens to access state government 24 hrs. a day, 7 days a week using various electronic devices. The growth of the online services and the number of visitors to Utah.gov

make it valuable for the State to determine the financial benefits to state agencies and the impact on the business community.

Two years ago the center for public policy started two studies to show the benefit to the State and the benefit to E-Government businesses.

Phase 1 of the study focused on financial benefits for State Agencies. This study showed where costs were avoided by having services available online. The study selected 25 services with the highest transactions in 2010 for the study. They collected data from 19 of those services. Some the services studied were; tax payments, job referrals, campground reservations, hunting and fishing licenses, and one stop business registration.

They analyzed the data from FY 2007-2011, to see what costs were avoided by having a service online and offline and the additional costs saved by having a self-funded model. The study defined cost avoidance as having an accumulative difference in costs providing the service online and providing the same service offline. As an example, if a service had 2,000 transactions and the difference between providing the service online or offline was $10.00 the difference over all would be $20,000 cost avoidance. Nine services provided enough information to calculate the savings; the analysis was a savings of $46 million in a 5 year period in cost avoidance.

The study looked at 13 services that provided online and offline services, 9 services offered lower online costs per transaction, 5 services offered slightly higher online costs per transaction. The average cost to the agencies was $17.00 per transactions offline, and $4.00 online costs, with a $13.00 difference per transaction using the online format.

When using a self-funded model to provide e-services, it saved the State an additional $15 million in cost avoidance in a five year period.

They studied Utah Interactive (UI). They provide more than 600 services through Utah.gov under the self-funded user fee model. UI incurs direct costs for building, maintaining and managing those services. This funding does not require appropriated taxpayer dollars. UI estimates the costs avoided to provide these services were approximately $15 million for this period.

The combined costs avoided by the State for the five year period was $46 million, plus the $15 million from U I, for a total of $61 million. This shows the economic benefits to the state for online services.

Phase 2 of the study was the impact on businesses.

A telephone survey was conducted to understand customer's needs and get the opinions Utah.gov business subscribers.

They interviewed by phone more than 900 customers that were frequent users of the seven different high volume Utah.gov digital government services. The results of the study showed high overall satisfaction on the online services provided to the business subscribers, 85% of the

UI business subscribers that were contacted agree that the State's online services make Utah a business-friendly state. Customers were satisfied with Utah.gov and the ease of use, speed of delivery, reliability, and cost. 86% said that Utah.gov made it easier to do business in Utah. The businesses want a dependable system that is user friendly.

Approximately half of customers say that their financial bottom-line is better because they use Utah.gov services, 3% said their financial bottom line was worse, and 42% were financially neutral. 91% said that Utah.gov was saving them time. Some customers would like to see services available on smart phones and more information in the searches they were looking at.

Comments about Utah.gov were positive.

Some of the online services that were looked at in the original study are:

Transparency Website	Campground Reservations
Business Entity Search through Commerce	Title and Lean Requests
Continuing Education for Contractors through Commerce	Tax Express
One Stop Business Registration	Tax Payments
Professional License Verification	Vehicle License Renewals
Real Estate License Renewals	Express Lanes Transactions
State Construction Registry	
Vital Records	
Hunting and Fishing Licenses	

Ms. Meppen will send the Board the online services that the study used for their calculations. She will also send a list of services that were recommended by businesses to be added to the site.

Representative Eliason asked about the amount of downtime the services experienced. His concern was the Tax Commission's site that went down on April 15th.

 Ms. Meppen had not received complaints about the Utah.gov services being down.

Representative Eliason also asked Ms. Meppen what services she would suggest be added to the websites.

She will send a list of services that were suggested to the Board, but most of the suggestions she received were to improve the current services.

Mark VanOrden said that Utah.gov averaged 99.7% uptime across the board for all the state services. He explained that the Tax Commission's site was down because of human error. He also stated that there were 1.6 million visitors to the Utah.gov website last month.

Mark VanOrden asked why job referrals were not in the study. Ms. Meppen will look into his questions and report her findings to the Board.

Patricia Smith Mansfield asked about the cost of the self-funded model and if it included maintenance. Mark Van Orden responded that the maintenance was included in the cost. Jonathan Ball had arrived to the meeting, so Senator Henderson asked the Board to return to agenda item #4, *Proposed Modifications to Transparency Website.*

6.   Vision for a State of Utah GRAMA hub or app.

Senator Deidre Henderson discussed not only how we make public data more accessible to the public, but what data do we want to have accessible, and how to prioritize that data.

Senator Henderson would like to see a centralized GRAMA hub, where people would be able to put in their requests and it would filter to the correct dept.

Patricia Mansfield-Smith said that Archives has been developing a GRAMA option on their website. They have been working to get the information available online so people would be able access the correct records officer for their GRAMA request.

On Archives site under Records Ombudsman you can access all the forms for a records request, the list of certified records officers, and entity to whom someone would make a request to. You can also access the laws for GRAMA. You cannot submit the request to the government entity online, but you could submit the request to the records officer online.

Gary Williams said that the League of Cities and Towns have been talking about making some documents available to the public on their websites without having to file a request. He would like to have information that is always public available online.

7.   Draft survey to local government's asking for a list of the most common GRAMA requests they receive.

Senator Henderson would like to determine what the most useful information would be to make available online, starting with the most requested information.

Senator Henderson asked Brenda Lee to discuss the draft survey.

Ms. Lee said the draft survey asks what specific GRAMA requests does their entity receive most often. She said they plan to send this out through Survey Monkey to all the local governments. The survey also asks if the information requested is available online, and what barriers the entities see with posting the information online. The survey asks what local governments recommend should be made available online.

Patricia Mansfield-Smith would like to see on the survey not only specific GRAMA requests received, but would like to have the subject, content matter or type of records that are requested. She said the survey should also ask what public information is requested that is already available.

Evan Curtis said the survey should ask if it may be cheaper for some smaller entities to go through the regular GRAMA process, rather than putting the information online.

Ms. Mansfield Smith said that Archives can help a smaller entity that does not have the ability to put the information online with the process.

Patricia Smith-Mansfield will work with Brenda Lee to on the questions and language for the survey.

There was motion to allow Brenda Lee and Patricia Smith-Mansfield to make the final decisions for the GRAMA survey and to send it out to all local and state governments. The motion passed.

8.   Update and Status

- •   Usage statistics

Michael Rice reported that the Transparency Website has been up for four years. He showed the visits to the site over that time period and said there was a spike in visits after a press conference and articles in local papers about the site. There are approximately 100 users per day and around 2,000 per month.

The number of daily visits in June was just over 100, this number drops on the weekends. There was a spike in visitors around the time of the last board meeting in July and the visits have remained above 100 a day.

The average user stays on the website around 10 min. The majority of users visiting the site come from the State of Utah network and Comcast.

- •   Website inquiries

Darrell Swensen reported that said there have been nine inquiries to the Transparency Website since the last Board Meeting. Most the inquiries were from entities asking questions about posting data and how to access the administrative website. There were a couple of inquiries about missing data.

Jonathan Ball would like to make it easier for people to submit requests or comments to the website. He would like something upfront on the website to make it easier for users to submit comments and suggestions. This is something to look into at a later date.

- •   Status of Participating Entities

Mr. Swensen said that the majority of the entities have complied and have posted their data to the website.

- •   Status of Gunnison Valley Hospital & other hospitals

Mr. Swensen is working with Canyonlands Health Care to get all their data posted. Gunnison Valley Hospital has uploaded their financial data. Kane County Hospital is close to uploading their data. San Juan Healthcare is working to get their data uploaded. Darrell feels that within the next few months they will all have their data uploaded to the website.

9.   Public Comment

Laura Howat a controller from the University of Utah said that they want to get their financial information to the public or any constituents that maybe interested. She explained that they do this by sending their financial statements to the State Auditor's Office. Ms. Howat said her office

issues their audited financial statements, and try to get that out to as many people as possible. She said there is a cost to getting all this information posted to the Transparency Website for the University as well as the other entities. She wondered if now that the website has been live for four years if the cost should be analyzed, to see what it costs the entities to produce their information, and if this information is what the public wants.

Senator Henderson said it is important and beneficial to have the financial information online. She feels it is important to have the entities that use taxpayer money be accountable. Moving forward the Transparency Advisory Board will need to prioritize the information that will be required by entities to post to the website. They are open to suggestions from entities on this information.

Jonathan Ball is curious about the time and costs to the entities that post to the website. He feels the benefits are not just to the people who use the website, but also the accountability of entities is beneficial. At some point in the future he would like to know what the costs have been to the entities.

John Reidhead suggested they add this to the survey that is being sent out and ask the entities what their costs have been.

10.   Discuss Next Board Meeting Date

The date for the next meeting is September 17, 2013, 10:00 a.m.

Meeting adjourned at 3:42 p.m.