MINUTES OF THE
LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STEERING COMMITTEE
Tuesday, September 14, 2012 – 8:00 a.m. – Room 450 Capitol Building

Members Present:
Sen. Curtis S. Bramble, Senate Chair Rep. John Dougall, House Chair Rep. Patrice M. Arent Mr. Jonathan Ball Mr. Ric Cantrell Mr. Michael E. Christensen Mr. Joe Pyrah Mr. John M. Schaff

Absent Members:
Sen. Patricia W. Jones
Sen. Kevin Van Tassell
Rep. Ronda Rudd Menlove

Staff Present:
Mr. Mark J Allred, IT Manager
Mr. Thomas R. Vaughn, Associate General Counsel Ms. Samantha Coombs, Legislative Secretary

Note: A list of others present, a copy of related materials, and an audio recording of the meeting can be found at www.le.utah.gov.

1. Committee Business

Chair Dougall called the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m. Sen. Jones, Sen. Van Tassell, and Rep. Menlove were excused from the meeting.

MOTION: Rep. Arent moved to approve the minutes of the August 14, 2012, meeting with the change of "Absent Membersº to ªExcused Members.º The motion passed unanimously.

2. Communications/Phone System

Mr. Vaughn explained the differences between a hosted and nonhosted VoIP system. He described the vetting process used by legislative staff to review the vendors who responded to the Request For Proposals (RFP), and indicated that staff had narrowed the responses to two providers: ProTel as the provider for a nonhosted system and 3D Communications as the provider for a hosted system. Mr. Vaughn explained that after analysis of the costs, benefits, and functionalities of the two providers, staff recommends the nonhosted system as the solution to be adopted by the Legislature.

Mr. Bryant Howe, Assistant Director, Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel, distributed and presented, ªComparison of Bids and Other Cost Estimates for Land Line Phone System: Hosted Solution, Nonhosted Solution, and DTS Solution.º

Chair Dougall invited the representatives from ProTel and 3D Communications to explain to members of the committee why a hosted or nonhosted solution would be preferred over the other.

Mr. Dave Glissmeyer, CEO, ProTel NetWorks, explained that as the current provider, ProTel has already established a reliable working relationship with the Legislature. Mr. Glissmeyer said

there is not a noticeable amount of savings in staff time spent to set up a new system, whether it be a hosted or a nonhosted system. He explained that a hosted system is designed to work for a smaller company, whereas a nonhosted system would be a better fit for the Legislature, because it is more secure and the storage would be in-house.

Mr. Chase Harrison, 3D Communications, said that some of the benefits of a hosted system include reliability and scalability. He explained the infrastructure of a hosted system to members of the committee.

Sen. Bramble expressed concern regarding security and asked the representatives from 3D Communications to further explain the security features of a hosted system.

Mr. Harrison responded that providers are being attacked by hackers on a daily basis and that there is always a chance of the network being hacked.

Mr. Carl Cornista, Telesphere, explained that no provider is 100% secure from hackers, but explained that Telesphere has a robust backbone and if one center has a failure, another center would be able to immediately pick up where the breach occurred.

Mr. Kirk Broadhead, LAN Administrator, Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst, recommended the nonhosted system, because it was more cost effective and it is software-based which would provide comparable features to the hosted solution.

Ms. Chris Calcut, IT Staff, Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel, said that the small size of the chamber phone, provided by the hosted solution, was an advantage because it would fit better on the small chamber desks. She explained that a nonhosted solution would provide staff with more control over the system, which would result in better service provided to the Legislature.

Mr. Pyrah asked what options were available to the Legislature if either ProTel or 3D Communications were to go under for financial reasons.

Chair Dougall said that if the hosted solution were to go under the contract at that point would be void and the Legislature would then be able to choose another option.

Ms. Calcut and Mr. Broadhead explained that if the Legislature were to be on a nonhosted system and the provider went under, then the Legislature would be able to keep the system running until the Legislature was able to select another provider. They continued, that an emergency decision would need to be made if the Legislature did not own the hardware, as would be the case if the Legislature was on a hosted system.

Mr. Howe added that if the Legislature chooses a hosted solution, the bid is predicated on a five-year contract, thus limiting the options and flexibility if the hosted solution does not meet the needs of the Legislature.

Mr. Greg Johnson, IT Staff, Senate, said that 3D Communications offers a wide range of features, but acknowledged that there are additional costs for some of those features.

Sen. Bramble said that while additional features are great they are not always necessary. He suggested the committee recommend a solution that would provide the features necessary for the Legislature to function at its best at the lowest cost.

Rep. Arent inquired which solution would best serve legislative staff and their needs. Mr. Christensen explained that both the hosted and nonhosted solution would provide the services needed to support staff and suggested the committee select a system that would best serve the legislators. Mr. Ball explained that he supported the analysis presented by the IT staff and said that the cost factor was primarily driving his decision.

Mr. Schaff agreed with the recommendation presented by staff.

Ms. Sandy Tenney, Chief Clerk, House, said that it was important to spend tax payer dollars wisely and efficiently for a product that will provide the service needed. Ms. Tenney explained that it may not be necessary to pay for all the features available when only a few are needed to the job. She suggested that ProTel would be able to provide the necessary features for the best price.

Mr. Pyrah inquired about the average response time to resolve an issue from a hosted provider.

Mr. Cornista explained that Telesphere has the ability to respond within seconds to minutes if the system were to go down.

MOTION: Sen. Bramble moved that the committee recommend to the Legislative Management Committee that the Legislature adopt a nonhosted VoIP solution. The motion passed. Mr. Cantrell voted in opposition.

3. Other Items / Adjourn

MOTION: Sen. Bramble moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Dougall adjourned the meeting at 9:39 a.m.