MINUTES OF THE

MEETING OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION'S

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMPUTER APPLICATION

TO THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

February 24, 1998

A regular meeting of the Legislative Commission's Subcommittee on Computer Application to the Legislative Process (SCALP) (NRS 218.682) was called to order by Jack D. Close, Sr., at 11:40 a.m., Tuesday, February 24, 1998, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada and was simultaneously video conferenced to the Grant Sawyer Sate Office Building, Room 4412.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Jack D. Close, Sr., Chairman

Senator Bob Coffin

Senator William R. O'Donnell

Senator Dean A. Rhoads

Assemblyman Lynn Hettrick

Assemblywoman Ellen M. Koivisto

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Bernie Anderson

LEGISLATIVE COUNSELS BUREAU (LCB) STAFF PRESENT:

Lorne J. Malkiewich, Director

Steven J. Watson, Chief Deputy Director, Administrative Division

Brenda Erdoes, Legislative Counsel

Monte Walters, Supervisor, Media Services

Ron Nichols, Manager, Information Systems (IS)

Marilyn Maxfield, Documentation Librarian, Information Systems

A packet was provided to the subcommittee members and is attached as Exhibit A.

Item I--<u>Approval of minutes from meeting of January 8, 1998</u>.

        SENATOR COFFIN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING

HELD JANUARY 8, 1998. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN HETTRICK AND CARRIED. SENATOR O'DONNELL WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE VOTE.

Item II--<u>Review and approval of LCB Software Use Policy</u>.

Mr. Nichols requested approval of the software use policy.

> **ASSEMBLYMAN HETTRICK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE SOFTWARE USE POLICY. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR RHOADS AND CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Item III--<u>Review of the Laptop Use Survey results</u>.

Mr. Nichols reviewed Exhibit III.

Mr. Close stated:

> This is the first time I have seen this survey and it would be helpful to go through it and come up with a consensus or impression of whether or not we are getting the best bang for our buck, which is why it was important to do this survey.
>
> These are the categories to extrapolate are:

· The utilization of the computers during the session.

· The utilization of the computers after the session.

· Are the legislators using them?

· Are the computers helpful during the legislative session?

· Do the legislators use them after a session?

· Do they use their home computers instead?

Mr. Nichols continued:

> I found the first five items interesting. Over half the respondents, which is over half the membership, said that they used their laptop during session and most of them found it to be useful. In question 3, almost everybody said they used their e-mail during session, but in question 5, half of them do not use the laptop to retrieve e-mail now. This tells me is that a number of people have an alternate means for retrieving e-mail, other than the laptop. In some cases, we forward a legislator's e-mail to their individual accounts. There are several of them with other Internet service providers or they may have it at their office. So there are people using e-mail, however a number of them are using another service other than the LCB to actually retrieve it. We have to be careful when looking at laptop usage, verse's e-mail usage, because people are using other methods of retrieving their e-mail, other than the laptops.

Senator Coffin pointed out:

> There might be some people who did not respond who are in fact using the system. Through the server, you know who is and who is not on it. So could you then add to this?

Mr. Nichols replied:

Yes, I could correlate the survey respondents to those who have actually logged onto the system.

Mr. Close

An important component is that e-mail is not the only purpose of these laptops. We had anticipated having access to the bills, but we didn't. That was a significant factor and we might have had different results if we had been able to bring up the bills during the session. This was the first trial of the laptops and e-mail was one of the big things in getting people to even use the computers.

Some people say they are never going to use computers, which is OK. It is for those who want access to NRS, et cetera, that are going to see a greater use for them. E-mail is one component, but not the only component.

Mr. Nichols agreed.

Originally we were going to have the CHASY system that would have allowed bill retrieval and NRS search, et cetera. People came in with the expectation that they would use the laptop in that manner. When that didn't happen, many of them just bagged it and said it doesn't work, so I'm not going to learn e-mail or anything else. Next session all of that will be working, so when we provide pre-session orientation training there will be a reason for them to learn to use the laptop. What we have seen in the survey results is a disparity between how they would use it during session and how they would use it in the interim.

Question 6 shows many respondents have a computer at home. This is interesting, because people who have a computer at home are more likely to give the laptops another try, because they are more familiar with computer operation than those who don't have computers. A reason I asked question 6 was to know if we were to take action regarding the laptops, do people have some other method of access to the Internet and e-mail. Ten out of 44, or a quarter of the people said no. The laptop is their only mechanism for connecting to e-mail and to the Internet.

Mr. Hettrick commented:

Question 7 says " . . . connect to the LCB network." I wonder how many are not connecting through the LCB, but are connecting through a computer at home or work and getting their e-mail. We may be under estimating the number who are actually using the technology because the question asks specifically the LCB network.

Mr. Nichols said:

If e-mail is forwarded, it can be retrieved without logging onto the LCB network, but we have to program the server to make that happen, which we have done that for a couple of people and we know who they are. The majority of people want to use e-mail, but would like it to be a simpler process during the interim.

As a point of reference, last week when I printed and mailed e-mail messages, it took almost three reams of paper. This is done every week and it will continue to be a service that we provide, because according to question 9, most people want that service. There are several e-mails sent to all of the members. Last week you as a group were the beneficiary of many e-mails from groups who wanted to give you an update on what had happened to them during the month of January, so we had the opportunity to replicate that 25 times, for the people we print for.

Interestingly enough, some legislators log onto the system and retrieve their private e-mail, but they still want us to print their public e-mail.

Mr. Malkiewich explained:

We do the exact same thing with legislators mail received during the interim. During session when mail comes in you get it immediately, and during the interim we continue to get regular mail from national organizations, constituents, et cetera. People still send mail to the LCB and we put it together and send to you. There is that same substantial delay, between when it arrives here and when it gets to you. So for those who are having us print and mail the e-mail it is not any slower or less efficient than what we are doing with the regular mail. Perhaps the types of communications that are coming in, legislators are finding is something that can wait.

Mr. Close pointed out:

There is a lot of wasted paper and time with the way we are doing this that could easily be rectified if legislators would just log on and retrieve their e-mail at least once a month as apposed to having Information Systems go through this printing and mailing process. I understand the regular mail situation, and there is hardly a way we can change that, but with the e-mail, we can look at it and decide how to best use that process. Maybe some of the information we are taking off this survey will help us make that decision.

Senator Coffin suggested:

For those people who think they are going to get an immediate response, they need to know that the legislator is fully intending to receive their message, but it is just going to be by a slower means. The legislator needs to use the pop-up device that gives the sender immediate feedback that says that this legislator is going to receive the message, but will receive it in writing by his own choosing. People can get very impatient if you don't respond right away. If they get an immediate response, the legislator will get some coverage and won't be unfairly charged of not receiving or reading their e-mail, if in fact, they are going to get it ultimately. That way the sender knows not to expect an early response.

Mr. Nichols added:

E-mail has a feature called out-of-office. If you are going to be gone you can activate this, then when somebody sends you e-mail they get an automatic response that says you are out of the office and will be back Tuesday. This helps set the expectation. This feature could be utilized for those members who choose to have their e-mail printed and explain that their e-mail is printed and mailed on Fridays and that response to the e-mail could be up to two weeks. That way the sender doesn't have any expectation of an immediate response. We can do that if you choose to.

Mr. Close asked the subcommittee if this is something those members should consider at this point in time?

Mr. Hettrick pointed out:

An issue we need to remember is that for the person sending the e-mail, it is free, where as if they were to mail that same document of 6 to 8 pages, they would have to pay postage. When they think it is free, we are going to get a lot more e-mail.

This pop-up box needs to address this even deeper than Senator Coffin has suggested. It needs to say that because of this particular legislators individual needs, he has chosen not to receive e-

mail, so mail directly to their address and provide the mailing address. What you will find is a couple of things. First, it removes the burden off the state to pay for forwarding e-mail. Second, many people who send large volumes, because it is absolutely free, will consider again whether or not they wish to send it to 25 people, because it is going to cost them the postage. It may not be quite as important if it costs them the postage instead of the taxpayer to forward their special interest mail. We have to consider that the taxpayer shouldn't have to foot the bill for forwarding some group's specific mail, which is what we are doing right now. If someone sends an e-mail to all of the legislators, can your system sort out the 25 who have their e-mail printed and mailed and give the sender the pop-up message?

Mr. Nichols answered yes.

Mr. Hettrick suggested that the Mr. Nichols consider this, because not only would it save the taxpayers money, but it would speed up the e-mail responses. Senders would understand, after at least one go around, what the situation is and how our system works.

Mr. Close asked Mr. Nichols to prepare a recommendation with the pros and cons, so they can decide at the next meeting.

Mr. Nichols continues:

> Question 10, shows that we would need to provide access for those who don't have another desktop or laptop to use.

Mr. Close questioned:

> Does this really get into the use of the computer now? Doesn't the essence of this suggest that people are fearful of using it for personal reasons, or that they have other programs on their own system? So the question becomes whether or not the legislators should be allowed to use this computer for things other than legislative business?

Mr. Nichols replied:

> I have broken these comments into three areas:

>> 1. People are unsure of the real use of the laptop. Can they use it or are they going to get busted for using it for non-legislative business?

>> 2. Many people are more familiar with their computer at home or at the office, so they prefer it.

>> 3. Software, not only for operational use, but product familiarly. WordPerfect is mentioned a couple of time, and also some other packages by name. Those who use WordPerfect want to continue using it, as opposed to switching to Word, which is on the laptop. As a result they just use their computer at home.

> These three general classifications fit right into our laptop use policy discussion.

> Question 11 shows that people used their laptops for e-mail and the Internet. They didn't use them because they weren't convenient, either because they didn't know how to use it, it was too heavy, they have another machine at home, or they were not trained.

> Question 12 again relates to training. Most said they needed more training. Those who don't we

can correlate back to those who already have machines at home and are familiar with it, so a laptop to them is just another piece of equipment. The second part of question 12 is, if we did beef-up training how can we get it to you, and far and way, one-on-one was the preferred method of instruction.

Mr. Close asked:

Is that reasonable and feasible for you? Thinking back to the training that we had, there were general classes, then we had one-on-one afterwards. How would you do it differently?

Mr. Nichols replied:

The staff would make appointments and go out for one-on-one training, if that is the way people prefer to get instruction. It is the way that people can ask the questions germane to them without having to sit through hours of classroom lecture that they don't find useful. Most of the people say they want to come in have you tell them about the laptop, how to retrieve e-mail and how to use word processing. That is the preferred method and as a service provider that is how we have to do it. Traditional classroom setting is of marginal use and efficacy.

Mr. Close added:

Part of this also is, especially for those who have never used a computer, they don't want to ask the questions in front of other people that would make them look, shall we say, non-literate with the computer process and there is more of a comfort zone in a one-on-one setting.

Mr. Hettrick agreed, adding that while a one-on-one sessions may be more difficult to provide, may actually be shorter, more productive sessions.

Mr. Nichols also agreed.

With one-on-one instruction you can deal with it in more of snippets. If they want to learn about e-mail then you can spend a half an hour on that, or if they want more on the scheduling package you can spend 10 minutes there. While you have more one-on-one contact, as for the actual hours spent, it may not be more than a traditional classroom setting. No one is embracing the traditional classroom setting. So, if we are going to provide a service, we have to put it out there in a way that they are going to accept it.

We will encompass a how-to manual into a cheat sheet format to show, for example, the ten things they will need to know to send or retrieve e-mail, or the five things they need to know to schedule an appointment, so that they can get to things quickly. That is the essence of question 13.

Senator Coffin inquired:

Since the new system has not been field tested by anyone, before we put it into service couldn't we begin doing this now, and we [the subcommittee] can test the cheat sheets and everything you are talking about, as you evolve them?

Mr. Nichols replied yes.

Question 14 was a catchall and it really ran the gamut. People wanted more printers, training, speed and ease of use. They are looking for simplicity. The instruction here is for us to put a veneer on things, so it is real easy, and that is what we are working on in the legislative system

for next session.

The response to question 15 I was somewhat surprised by, which gets back to opening up the machines a little bit more for non-legislative use. We still have a number of respondents that said no, they wouldn't use it anymore. My expectation was that people would want to use it more if some of the restrictions were limited, but apparently not. So even if you open it wide they still wouldn't use the laptop anymore than they are now.

Senator Coffin interjected:

Still, we have to cross tab those answers. Unless you check and see where the answer came from, correlated to the person who doesn't use it now, or the person who uses it a lot now, are they going to use it more? The answer might be no because they are already using it.

Mr. Nichols responded:

That is true. We haven't done any of the correlation or the regression analysis on the data yet, but the point is valid. We know who responded how, but we haven't correlated one to the other yet. We just haven't had the time.

Question 16, again asks about software and they are interested in WordPerfect and some kind of presentation software.

Question 17 is an all encompassing kind of question. A number of people said, thanks very much for providing the laptops, they found it useful. Another group said they didn't use it, which is why they have a secretary. Some said keep up the fight, relating to the laptops and that over time they will be a useful thing for legislators to have and they don't want us to give up.

Mr. Close summarized the survey results.

· During session the majority of legislators utilized it or are in support of utilizing it and did find it helpful.

· The major purpose of use was for e-mail.

· Most of the legislators have a computer at home which they use.

· We are not sure if for e-mail and other communication, they use the laptop or their own personal computer.

· They need more training.

· The training has to be one-on-one.

· They want cheat-sheets.

· We need to look again at the software.

We have discussed these items in the past and although we don't have any definitive or scientific data, this gives us some direction that we didn't have before. Mr. Nichols, are you going to do some correlation analysis?

Mr. Nichols answered:

That is the next level to put some meat on the bones about some of these number.

Also, a number of legislators asked that we distribute the results of this survey to them. May I do that?

Mr. Chairman replied yes.

Senator O'Donnell stated:

I think your analysis is correct. I can't speak too much for the Assembly, but I do know that there are quite a few legislator's that used the computer system and the laptop's during the session. I personally would like mine expanded and I would like to use more tools. My productivity went up, I made better decisions, in the future more legislators will use them. It is almost like we are in the age of when the telephone first came out, with the crank on it. My great-grandmother was afraid of it and didn't want to use it because it was a new gadget and she didn't want to learn how to use it. At this point there are many legislators in that same frame of mind. However, I think that what precipitated this whole survey was the fact that we wanted to find out whether or not legislators were using their computers during the interim and whether or not it would be wiser to adopt a policy that would allow us to turn in those computers back in during the interim and wait until next legislative session, then purchasing the next generation of computer and become faster, better and more efficient.

For decision purposes consider a policy that says if you are using your laptop during the interim you should be allowed to choose to keep it. If you choose to keep it then you must use that same laptop during the next legislative session. But if you choose to turn it in after the session and you utilize your own computer for your e-mail purposes and letter writing and so on, then come the next legislative session, if you are still elected, then you would be allowed to get the next generation of computer.

The reason I say this is because we have a budgetary process that you are very much aware of, and we have agencies that need computers. If on October 1st we give a computer that we have to a particular agency that requests computerization, then we can take that money that we would normally have allocated to that agency and put in back into the legislative budget to purchase the next generation of computer, thus recycling the computers through as we do our secretarial computers. That way there is no waste, the legislators that use their laptops during the session can continue to use them during the interim. If they don't want to use them during the interim, they can turn them in and we can use that money during the next legislative session to buy new computers and go on from there. That is what precipitated this whole survey, was to find out who is using them and who isn't and why they aren't. If not can they turn them in. I received phone calls, I received e-mail, I received letters, requesting, that when I turned my computer in, could that particular agency have it? There was almost a war on who wanted my computer first. There are a lot of individuals out there who need those computers. And yet, here we are, I have one in the house and the battery is so dead that I don't think it could even boot. I would love to turn it in, because I don't use it. I have three computers, two at home and one on my office desk. I don't need the laptop and yet there is no mechanism for me to turn it back into the legislature, so they can get it back out into the field for somebody in another agency to use it. Functionally, there is no way I can give them my computer because I am responsible for it. If it gets damaged or destroyed, I have to pay for it. That is where I am at with this whole thing.

Mr. Hettrick stressed:

I don't have a problem with the basic part of that proposal. But I do have a problem in saying that

if someone who chooses to keep their laptop during the interim that they would have to keep it for the next legislative session. I cannot see penalizing someone who uses the equipment appropriately for the next session, just because they choose to use the equipment to do their job. Other than that, I have no problem with the idea of allowing people to turn them back in for them to go to other agencies and to save money in providing better, more useful equipment the next time.

I use my computer at home and have it hooked up to logon to the LCB network. But I travel frequently to Las Vegas and I take my laptop, so I can connect to the network, pickup my e-mail, respond and do all those routine things. I appreciate the ability to do that very much and it saves a great deal of time and effort. I don't come back to 400 e-mail messages, instead I come back to people who have already received responses from me. So, I wouldn't want to be penalized for the fact that I use the laptop in the way it is supposed to be used.

Mr. Close said:

I agree in part with Senator O'Donnell's comments. Part of the reason I requested to have this survey done was not just for what has been utilized before, but to find out how many people used them during session. I looked at it as a twofold purpose, both with a significant purpose.

Hind sight is always 20/20 as we look at the maturation of the legislature into computerization. When Senator O'Donnell was the chair of this subcommittee, he took great strides for the state and for the legislature in making some very gut wrenching decision to create this process for us. The process that we got involved with anticipated that we would have more software on the laptops than we ended up with, like the CHASY system. We did not anticipate we wouldn't have that ability after session, nor did we anticipate that we wouldn't have all the information that was to be on the computer later on. We goofed a little bit on that, but again, hind sight 20/20 and how we need to look to the future.

Senator O'Donnell's comment is a wise one. We need to look at whether or not people are going to use them. If they aren't, they should turn them in. But I also agree with Mr. Hettrick and we should not penalize those who want to keep them. All the legislators should start on the same page when the legislative session begins if we are going to continue with this computerization process that is critical to this body.

Senator O'Donnell remarked:

Mr. Hettrick makes a good point. However, I was looking at it from the financial aspect. If we know how many computers are going to be turned in during the interim, then we would have a better handle on how many we could allocate during the interim to the other agencies. That could then be taken off the purchase dollars that we allocate to each agency in order to purchase computers. We would have a true dollar amount and would not be spending twice, and be trying to save some dollars by not having the agencies purchase a computer because we will be giving them ours.

If you are going to use the computer during the interim and are one of the heavy users, why should you be penalized. At the same time, how do we know. We will need some kind of buffer account, because there will be some individuals who just want a new computer at the end of the interim, then what do you do with the old one? There isn't any place for it to go, no agency has requested it that didn't get one. So it is a little bit difficult. I could acquiesce, I'm not stuck in stone on this for a policy, but I do think that we should have some kind of mechanism to turn the laptops in after the session is over.

Senator Coffin asked:

In the budgetary decision that was made when we purchased the laptops, were we locked into a four-year usage of these machines? I though that I had heard we had a four-year lifetime on them.

Mr. Malkiewich responded:

The assumption we had when we purchased them was that they would be used for two sessions. There isn't any commitment to keep them for four years, that was just our plan, since they were such expensive machines, that we would want to get at least four years of use. If we don't, Senator O'Donnell has briefly described the procedure we have used for many sessions for the secretaries computers. We purchase them, lease them for session, then they go to state purchasing. The LCB does not ear-mark them for individual agencies; we get them to the executive branch and purchasing distributes them to the other agencies. If we did the same thing with the laptops, two years into the cycle, or three and a half years if we waited until the end of the next interim, whenever we turn them over to state purchasing, they would still be able to distribute them and they will get many years of use.

Senator Coffin said:

I like what Senator O'Donnell is saying. We need to keep these computers moving. Those members who aren't using them could turn them in or even refuse to take them at the beginning of the session. That would solve that problem. We would know in April or May who is or isn't using them and we would also know who continues to use them after session because of their usage on the network. That is what Senator O'Donnell is suggesting, to make sure they are actually using them and not just taking the computer home and letting someone else use it for something else for the next year and a half.

Perhaps a lease arraignment for session. We could lease the machines so we can stay with the newest technology, then turn back those that don't get used in the interim period to our own agency or to other agencies. Or have a contract where we continue to lease or whatever makes the best sense economically. Buy, if that makes sense, or lease for the year and a half after session so that we can cut our costs considerably. Whatever works out best financially. That way, no one can say they have been wasted, because they really haven't been. It has been portrayed that way, because of the inadequate use, but again, there are a lot of reasons for the inadequate use. This is something we need to do, because it makes sense for the next session. This would allow us to then get newer, lighter machines. Some of the complaints on the survey are good reasons why we should buy a cheaper, lighter machine next time, without touch screens which would save us a lot of money.

In the budget committees we could make decisions based on how many computers we are going to dole out to the state agencies, and could reduce the amount the agencies originally budget for new computer purchases by the amount they are going to receive in computers distributed from the LCB.

Mr. Close said:

The money committees spent a lot of time discussing who was going to get laptops and who wasn't. If all 63 members were to turn in their laptops, they would find a home. If you build it, they will come. There is no question that these laptops could be used by other state agencies, not as fluff to the agency, but as a request. As Senators O'Donnell and Coffin have talked about instead

of having that expense in their budgets, that could be omitted and put into another budget for purchasing new computers for the legislators. We need to continue focusing on the importance of computers for the legislators during session. This is a critical factor for our legislators to be more efficient.

As far as this subcommittee is concerned, we will make recommendations to the Legislative Commission, leadership and to both houses so they will have an interpretation of how we feel regarding this matter.

Any member of this subcommittee who wants to provide some recommendations can do so. Mr. Nichols, please develop something along these lines as an agenda item for our next meeting, so we can come up with some recommendations.

· How to best utilize the computers during and after session.

· How to make it most economical for the state in both areas.

> · We do not force a legislator to use a computer that they do not want to.

Senator Rhoads asked Mr. Nichols if there a policy right now that says a legislator cannot give back their computer?

Mr. Nichols replied no. They can turn it back into Information Systems and we will warehouse it for them. However, that laptop is still assigned to that legislator.

Senator Rhoads asked if it can be given to a state agency?

Mr. Nichols replied no.

> We recently lent some computers to the State Board of Nursing for a trial they were conducting, but in order to do that, we had to get Legislative Commission approval, because the laptops are still LCB property and assigned to a particular legislator.

Mr. Nichols explained the lease/purchase arrangement with State Purchasing for the session secretaries' computers:

> The State Department of Information Technology (DOIT) mandates a minimum hardware configuration that can be used by state agencies. If, for example, the Nevada Department of Transportation wants to buy a machine they would contact DOIT with specifications. When the LCB purchases session secretary machines, they are over configured for what they will be used for here. However, we have to do that because we are leasing them from state purchasing. State purchasing actually foots the bill, and we pay state purchasing a lease rate of six points per month for the equipment. For the duration of session, the present value of the equipment is 50 percent of what it was at the time it was purchased. The legislature eats 50 percent of it and the receiving agency pays the rest to State Purchasing. They get a current machine that is eight months old for half price. As you would expect, the state agencies are three deep for that deal. The same thing can be done for laptops. State Purchasing would buy them, we would lease and at the end of session make the decision of whether we want to keep them or turn them back over to State Purchasing.

> Compaq, Dell, IBM and other manufacturers have lease programs that have built in technology upgrades. However, you usually have to commit for a number of years and it is not available on a month-to-month lease. There are a number of options out there if our goal is to keep the

machines on a current technology focus. I'll research this and present it at the next meeting.

Responding to Mr. Hettrick's question, Ms. Erdoes said:

> It would not take a change in the law, but would be a matter of writing a policy so when a legislator returns their laptop to Information Systems they would be released of the responsibility. It would be the Legislative Commission who would approve this kind of policy.

Mr. Hettrick suggested:

> One of the cheat sheets you put together Mr. Nichols, needs to be on the use of sticky notes in the Executive Budget document that is on each money committee member's laptop. I don't think that they understood that by simply clicking on any item it would open a pop-up window and they could type anything they wanted, comments, notes, anything at all, and that note is permanently attached to that budget item. I know the chairman used the sticky note's feature. It is a powerful tool, because anytime you went into that budget instantly the sticky notes popped up in bright colors that you couldn't miss. You didn't have to go through volumes of books, trying to search for scratch-paper notes that you made, that is illegible and makes no sense to you now, because you don't remember what it was you were trying to do. More people would use it if they understood how to, so that needs to be one of your cheat sheets.

Mr. Nichols said he would create that cheat sheet.

Item IV--<u>Review and approval of LCB Laptop Use Policy</u>.

Mr. Nichols stated:

> The laptop use policy presented to you at the last meeting restricted the laptops to legislative use only. In the ensuing decision I received some direction and this is a revision of that policy. What I did was go 180 degrees in the other direction, stating that the primary function of the laptop is for legislative business and as long as you don't interfere with that prime directive, you may add other software or hardware, and have the ability to customize your computer. Understanding however, that when it was issued to you it functioned fully and completely - it retrieved e-mail, it had all the required applications loaded, it supported the hardware and did everything it was supposed to do. If you decide you would rather have WordPerfect as opposed to Word and you install WordPerfect, according to this proposal, all you have to do is make sure it is properly licensed. The onus of installing WordPerfect and making sure it works, would be yours. The same would apply to removing software. You can do that, as long as the computer is still able to fulfill the objective of legislative business. If you break it you have to get it fixed and one way of doing that is to bring it to Information Systems for diagnosis. If we find that we messed it up, we will fix it, like we do now. However, if you added hardware or software and now it doesn't work, we get into the issue of using state resources to trouble shoot your problem.

> We could become a diagnostic facility, just like Computerland or Microage, that requires you to pay a fee for the analysis and diagnosis of your computer. That way you would reimburse the state for our time by paying for it.

> There is a finite limit as to how much disk space and memory is on the computer. We are not going to add a bigger disk or more memory, simply because you decided to add more software.

Mr. Close commented:

> In the information you sent to us that identify what other states do, Utah, requires that the

members get insurance policies on their computers. Is that something we should have in addition to the requirements that they have to pay for anything that is damaged?

Mr. Nichols replied that all of the laptops are already fully insured through RISK management.

Mr. Close added:

> North Dakota states that users may not install software or assign hardware unless a copy of the license agreement for that software is filed with the Legislative Counsel. Do you think it would be beneficial for you to have on record the licenses? Even though you have taken the onus off the LCB by stating in the policy that the person has to make sure that they are properly licensed, wouldn't that extend our protection to make sure that every legislator had a license to use other software besides that which was installed by you?

Mr. Nichols said:

> Frankly, I am not sure. But by you signing the software use policy that says you won't install software unless you are properly licensed, I don't think I need a copy of your software license.

Mr. Hettrick agreed.

> We ought to leave it with the onus on the user to have a license. Otherwise, we put the onus on the state to make use that the user has a license and I don't think we should do that. They should have the responsibility, not us.

Mr. Nichols responded to Senator Coffins inquiry:

> If it is software provided by the LCB, Information Systems maintains the software, assure there are adequate licenses and everything else related to that piece of software. We also support it. There is no difference between Word and the e-mail package or BASN or any of the others that are LCB supplied software.

Senator Coffin said:

> I brought this up because of my experience with having Real Audio on my computer. I didn't know we had it until sometime during session when I found out that we were paying a license fee, so it made sense to use it. After session was over Real Audio came up with an upgrade. I was advised by IS staff not to put it on the computer yet. They tested it and a couple of months later said it was good, it works, it is advisable, go ahead and upgrade it. I went to the Sawyer Building and upgraded it via the Air LAN, which worked really well. So that is an example of what I am talking about, where this subcommittee can service as a conduct for getting new software available and recommending people use it. And if we do that, we have to service it.

Ms. Erdoes responded to Mr. Close's question:

> We do not have a legal definition for the term 'impropriety'. The definition that will count is what the Ethics Commission is going to tell you that it means. We have old opinions issued by the Ethics Commission and we can give you good guidance as to whether we would think that the Ethics Commission, based on their prior decisions, believed that something is improper or not. But the ultimate way is to pose it to them as a question - is this improper or would this have the appearance of impropriety?

Mr. Close asked:

So, it would be on a case by case basis then, if something were brought forth as an impropriety, or should we have a definition before such time?

Ms. Erdoes replied:

Because of the complexity of the things that people do, it would be very difficult to come up with a one-fit user definition of impropriety. We could certainly try, but it would be a more meaningful definition from us to give it to you each time you had a question about doing something.

Mr. Hettrick stated:

I would like to change some of the language. One page 1, second bullet, second sentence, change to read, *Members may add or delete software or hardware to the laptops so long as the changes do not interfere with this objective*. It is important to say the word 'may', because with the current wording 'can be' someone is going to look at that and instantly say I can't do it and they will give it up.

Move the third bullet under the fourth bullet, then add the forth bullet to the first one, and delete the sentence [Members may add software . . .] because it is redundant to what is already in the first sentence.

In the last bullet on the first page, it says ' . . . the members will be charged a diagnostic fee of $50 per hour', change that to, *The member will be charged a fee of $50 per hour for diagnosis or repair.* It makes no sense that if they are in there and see what is wrong, having already paid for diagnosis, not to fix it, if they know how to fix it, instead of making someone go out and have to hire someone again to pay for diagnosis to get it repaired. That wouldn't make any sense because they would be in there and involved already.

Mr. Nichols said he would make those changes.

Senator Coffin commented:

The diagnostic fee of $50 an hour sounds like a lot of money. I don't know that it really costs us that much to do it, since our staff is already on salary. You have to amortize that out based on the quality of the personnel and how much time they send and come up with a fair amount that can be charged. One could quickly run up a bill equal to the value of the computer because one person will take more time to work on a computer than another.

Mr. Nichols responded to the Chairmans question stating that when he was in a computer shop about three weeks ago, the posted rate was $45 an hour.

Mr. Close concluded:

If a malfunction has been caused by a member adding hardware or software then they should be responsible for that extra fee to fix it. It is their own fault, they are liable and should pay whatever that going rate is.

Senator Coffin said:

I have no quarrel there. I just wanted to make sure we went over the charge because if we have to add staff that might not even be enough.

Mr. Hettrick interjected:

I don't have a problem with the $50, because this says right in the last sentence, that the member may elect to have this service provided by any other shop. If the member wants to bid it out and finds some place cheaper and think that they are just as good, better or faster than IS staff, then let them do whatever they want. I don't think that Information Systems job is to be repairing equipment that someone decided to modify for their own benefit. So I think that $50 is appropriate.

Senator Coffin inquired:

Page 2, the first bullet point, saying that we will not expand beyond that supplied by the LCB, why not? If upgrading provides more speed, since they are already quite slow, why not go ahead and upgrade them here in-house. Instead of saying supplied, could we say approved? That would go along with our philosophy whereby we approve software and hardware changes.

Mr. Nichols explained:

The intent of that statement is that if you decide to add more software to your laptop and in adding that software you run out hard disk space, we won't upgrade the hard disk just because of that. I am trying to distinguish between normal upgrades that the LCB would provide as a course of business, as opposed to you adding a photo package that is very CPU intensive and requires a faster CPU.

The laptops can be upgraded, we can add 16 more megabytes of memory for about $300 per laptop. We could decide to upgrade the processor or add more hard disk space. However, if we did it this it would be as an entity and it would be done to all of the laptops.

Keep in mind that during session bills and a lot of other information will need to be downloaded to your PC. What I don't want is to be in the middle of session and have somebody run out of disk space, only to find that the reason is because they added five different programs that are taking up all the disk space. Now what do we do, add more disk space? There is a fine line here between saying we will add it because you decided to add additional software. It gets back to you being responsible for what you add or take off the machine. If you add more software that causes you to run out of disk space, then you ought to be responsible for going out and getting more disk space.

Mr. Nichols addressed Senator Coffin's concerns about deleted e-mail not being removed from the system.

There is a distinction between deleting and shredding. You can delete your e-mail, and it is in your list of deleted e-mails. It does not mean that e-mail does not exist on your hard disk anymore. There has been an industry put together for retrieving information that you have deleted. That is the difference between deleting and shredding.

Senator Coffin asked:

I can delete a letter, then delete it from my deleted box, and you are saying that somewhere in my hard drive it still exists?

Mr. Nichols replied:

Potentially, and that is because there are things that are deleted and things that are shredded. There is a way that you can make sure that it is erased, but simply deleting a file doesn't erase it. You need to be aware of this.

Senator Coffin said:

> I am very concerned about this and I need to find out how to fix it. I get confidential e-mails from state agency people, some of them subordinates to someone whom they think may be doing something wrong. I want to feel like my constituent has privacy and my conversation with the constituent was truly private. I deleted it from my computer, because I know that someday that computer is going into be in somebody else's hands, but how you say it isn't deleted.

Mr. Close interjected:

> The point of this document is to say it can be. What you are suggesting is another item to look at down the road. Let's just discuss this document.

Senator Coffin reiterated:

> The last bullet has that same point. I understand why you put these in here, because the realm of possibilities is incredible about what can be retrieved. You state ' . . . under the right set of circumstances', and only you know the right set of circumstances. I think that anything you delete, should be deleted, documents or e-mail. Where a member has gone on the Internet or with e-mail should not be disclosed or retrievable.

Mr. Nichols assured:

> When any legislative computer or laptop is turned back to state purchasing, they are completely wiped, so they are in my parlance, shredded. When they leave here there is nothing on them at all relating to what transpired during the legislative session.
>
> There is a shredder step that we can add to the laptops, if you are concerned about it. I just wanted to make sure that you understood that there is a distinction.

Senator O'Donnell inquired:

> Mr. Nichols, am I under the impression that when the e-mail arrives at the server, it is inside the firewall. Then at some point it is transmitted from the firewall to the individual laptop computers, if they have e-mail access. Is it not the copy of the letter that is sent to the laptops? In other words, it goes to the server and is then copied to the laptop and the original letter is still on the server. Is that not correct?

Mr. Nichols responded:

> No, Senator. For members of the legislature, when e-mail reaches the mail server it stays there until somebody retrieves it. When you logon and retrieve your e-mail it is actually moved from the server to your laptop and it no longer exists on the server. However, we do system backups nightly, and that mail could be on a backup tape, depending on when that mail was received by our mail server. The backup tapes get recycled every 30 days or so, so it is not there in perpetuity. Depending on when it was received by the server and when it was retrieved by you, it could be captured in a backup. This is not the case for LCB employees.

Senator O'Donnell asked what is the case with LCB employees?

Mr. Nichols answered that their mail stays on the server.

Senator O'Donnell said:

Senator Coffin brings up an extremely good point and I believe that nowhere in our state statutes do we address the privacy aspect of e-mail because it is still new. We have wiretap laws that protect peoples privacy. Those wiretap laws have been upheld in the pellet courts and the supreme courts. If we are to appreciate any level of communication ability between legislators, legislator and press, whistle blower and legislator, between whistle blower and press, anywhere, I think that this subcommittee should be the one to make a recommendation to the next legislature regarding what needs to be done to protect the privacy of this communication.

This is a very sensitive area, and there is a lot of damage that could be done to individuals who innocently send e-mail messages to one another under the guise of having some kind of security. If those people are damaged or hurt, then I think we will only have ourselves to blame. I couldn't agree more with Senator Coffin. There is that telephone communication type of philosophy that goes on with an e-mail message and if anyone sends an e-mail message they feel it is almost under the guise of a wiretap law. You know how strict we feel about wiretap laws. We have laws now that precludes somebody from faxing someone that doesn't want to be faxed. This is another area that we need to address in the next legislature, privacy of e-mail messages.

Mr. Hettrick agreed.

The wiretap law should apply to both ends of the servers. That is just a method of transportation to get it where it needs to be. Anything that comes off the server shouldn't be available. If I choose to save it myself, print it out or keep it on a hard disk, that is different. I think that makes sense.

If I delete and then defragment my disk, does it take out those kinds of things?

Mr. Nichols replied:

If there is a substantial amount of disk that is actually re-written, yes, it will write over the top of it. When the hard disk gets full isn't used efficiently, so there will be pieces of file all over the disk, which is called disk fragmentation. When the disk is defragmented, the system writes the file together in one contiguous location, which results in the more effective use of the disk and faster access. Then it rewrites parts of the disk as files are moved around and things could be overwritten, but it may not. Remember, whether it is a file or e-mail or anything else, it is just data out there on a disk and it is illegible to be reused, at the discretion of the operating system, unless you physically go and shred it.

Mr. Close concluded:

Senator Coffin has brought up an area of concern that we should consider. Mr. Nichols, if you would look into how we can ensure the confidentiality and privacy of e-mail and communication from our computers and come up with some ideas developing this and put that on the agenda for our next meeting.

SENATOR RHOADS MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSED LAPTOP USE POLICY AS AMENDED. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN HETTRICK AND CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Item V--Review SB 72 - Information Systems Supplemental Appropriation.

Mr. Nichols reviewed Exhibit V.

Mr. Malkiewich responded to Mr. Close's question on a timetable for Item 3, printing on 8½ x 11 paper.

> When the Committee to Consult with the Director (CCD) met we ran late and had a number of policy items that we had to hold and we just briefly went through them. At the next meeting we will schedule a longer period to get to a number of items of this type that we need to have decisions on. The next meeting will be late March or early April, either shortly before or shortly after the next Legislative Commission meeting; we will be scheduling it soon.

Senator Coffin asked:

> Does Item 8 relate to how we see our budget in the computer?

Mr. Nichols replied:

> No, sir. The development is complete and is being tested by Fiscal Division, and they are satisfied with the prototype.

> Item 13 concerns providing changeable services on the Internet. I have provided information on what we can put out there and how much can we charge. This subcommittee needs to decide if that is what we are going to do.

Mr. Close asked that this be an agenda item for the next meeting.

Mr. Nichols continued the review, requesting that Item 15, the training room, be dropped because given building space constraints, the crucial item is space for six staff members.

Given no objections from the members, the Chairman agreed.

Mr. Nichols continued:

> There is $90,000 in Item 18 for workstation software. Software gets enhanced with frightening frequency and I am not of the opinion that we need to chase an upgrade strategy. Just because Microsoft upgrades software doesn't mean we have to. When there is a compelling reason, we will. After we receive some of the spring announcement from software vendors, we will decide by May and implement by the end of the summer, so everything will be in place by September.

> Upgrading software is not a unilateral decision on my part. It is done in consultation with all the divisions. The Legal Division tells me that they don't want to upgrade because of software applications they have written, so there isn't a compelling reason to upgrade Word, and spend that money. We are going through our list of software to decide whether or not we need to upgrade and will then make a recommendation.

> On the last page is the function for laptop interface, which is pending based on what we are going to do with chamber displays. A lot of that information can be driven to the laptops, so you can see agendas, what is on general file and that kind of information. We have that technology and will have to do a little programming, but we don't have to invent anything. However, the need for that is obviated if you have displays in the chambers. If we are not going to have displays in the chambers, then I need to get hot on the laptop interface.

Mr. Hettrick stated:

> It is important that we make the decision to move toward the laptops. It is very convenient to come in in the mornings and be able to pull up what is going to be on file that day or if a chairman

turned in a bill and you didn't know it and it is going to be heard today, information that you have no way of knowing unless you walk into the chambers, if all we are going to do is put it on the board in chambers. I think that it is important that this be on the laptops.

Mr. Malkiewich stated:

Mr. Walters wanted to raise this issue before he left, but I felt it more appropriately came under this item. You will note in Mr. Nichols' bottom line financial summary there is $1,001,290 in the budget forecast, the largest chunk of which is about $180,000. When we had the bill drafted, we were looking to purchasing the source code for the old computer system. After an audit of that system was conducted, based on the auditors recommendation, we decided not to do that. As a result we have $180,000 that was appropriated and is not allocated.

An issue that has come up a couple of times in this subcommittee and numerous times in my discussions with Senators, is the viewability of the screen in the Senate Chambers. This is an issue that we know that the Senate wants us to take care of. I would like this subcommittee to consider recommending that we spend a portion of that $180,000 for this purpose. We have looked into a rear projection systems that could replace it, costing roughly $60,000, plus some carpentry work to make it all fit in. This is similar to a number of other requests we have brought before this subcommittee, in that we need a lot of lead time. We don't want it to get close to November or December and then have them ask us to change that display. It is good to get this approved far enough in advance so that we can get done before session. I have already information the Interim Finance Committee that we will be reporting on this expenditure of money and then have the Legislative Commission approve it.

> **ASSEMBLYMAN HETTRICK MOVED TO APPROVE SPENDING A PORTION OF THE $180,000 TO REPLACE THE SCREEN IN THE SENATE, IN THE AMOUNT OF APPROXIMATELY $60,000 AND THAT APPROVAL IS OBTAINED FROM INTERIM FINANCE COMMISSION AND THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR COFFIN AND CARRIED. SENATOR O'DONNELL WAS NOT PRESENT FOR THE VOTE.**

Item VI--<u>Update on Legal Division's Bill Drafting enhancements and discussion of proposed change in manner of designating deleted text in legislative measures</u>.

Ms. Erdoes provided a handout that is attached as Exhibit C.

These documents are titled virtual codification, contains only existing law and then there is a copy of a bill. Looking at the copy of the bill, on page 3 you will see that in addition to bracketing the material that is to be deleted, there is also strike-through. We would like to ask your recommendation on whether to purse this or not. It is a drastic change from how bills looked in the past. The advantage is that many times legislators and others come to me and say, I asked you to take this out of the bill, why didn't you take it out. And I am constantly saying, because the opening bracket is on page 1 and the closing bracket is on page 3 and everything in between is deleted. We also we get requests to change something that is within the brackets, because someone doesn't notice it is being deleted. It is difficult for people to follow when a lot of material is taken out. This would help both in the printed bill and on the screen, because on the screen you get an even smaller bite of the bill and you don't know that something is being deleted.

I have talked with Frank Daykin and other people who were here back in that era when this was all coming about. They didn't use the strike-through initially because the line would have been too fat on printing and you couldn't read what was being deleted. Now technology is such that you

can read what is underneath it. Legal Division is suggesting that we adopt this. I ask of you a yea or nay on whether to go forward with it, then we can take it to the Committee to Consult with the Director. Another advantage that Mr. Lang has found in developing the codification program, is that it is much more accurate with this strike-through, as well as the brackets, when deleting.

Mr. Lang spoke at the last meeting about what virtual codification would be. The virtual codification of this bill shows you what it would look like if this was enacted. Everything that is in italics is switched over to roman text and then all the bracketed material is deleted. The document contains only existing law and is simply those NRS sections that are contained in the bill without any changes to them. You can go back and forth and see what changes are made where. It is harder to follow on the printed version than it is on your screen. On the screens all of the deleted material is in red and all the italicized material is in blue and the existing language that is not changed is in black, so it jumps out to you. With the strike-through it is easier to compare and together when they are on the screen.

I am very happy with the project enhancements. Mr. Lang has provided prototypes, that the drafters are constantly working with, which he is always improving and so far everything we have asked for he has been able to accomplish.

Mr. Close expressed:

This is exciting. You are dealing with a problem that has been there for not more than a thousand years and the beauty of it is that it was a simple solution. This subcommittee totally supports this and encourages you to continue.

Item VII--Review SB 196 - Providing for interactive video to Las Vegas, plus an update on chamber display devices and committee room upgrading for real-time recording of minutes.

Mr. Walters reviewed Exhibit VII, Item 22, support real time recording of committee minutes.

Senator Coffin asked if real time recording would recognize our voice, write it into the computer, then reproduce it in print?

Mr. Walters replied:

No, sir. Real time recording is digitally recording your voice. It would not be able to print it.

Mr. Close stated that this is more of a pilot study to see how it works for us.

Mr. Walters continued, reviewing Exhibit VII, Item 23, enhance chamber voting.

I recommend that we do not install a new sound mixer in the Senate this interim and spend more time with the Front Desk staff training them on now to operate the system to get them through the 1999 session.

Mr. Hettrick agreed.

If they get a little more training and understand how to use it, they will make use of it. If it were really a problem, and we were into the session in, how long would it take for you to order a mixer and how much work would it be to install it over a weekend?

Mr. Walters explained:

The biggest job would be the placement of the booth and the conduits to get from the sound room to the mixer booth. It could be a real problem because it would take more like a month to complete.

Mr. Walters responded to Senator Coffin's question stating that Jan Thomas and Linda Alden agree with this.

Given no objection from the members, the Chairman accepted Mr. Walter's recommendation.

Mr. Walters reviewed Item B, results of the meeting with Lantech.

Mr. Watson added:

Yesterday Mr. Malkiewich spoke to Speaker Dini who has agreed to provide space on the third floor for the control room, so we can tell Lantech that we have a location and we can move forward on this project.

Given no objection from the members, the Chairman instructed Mr. Walter's to move forward with Lantech to provide automation in the chambers and committee rooms.

Mr. Walters continued reviewing Item B, suppling floor session information for bill tracking.

If we go with the LED boards, they would need to be 4 x 16 feet in order to display all the information, all the time. The concern is if even that would be enough room, toward the end of session, for all the information that would need to be displayed. I am recommending that, for the 1999 session, the information be made available through the laptops and in hard copy, or else a chalk board type of display.

Senator Coffin inquired:

Are you talking about television sets or monitors? Monitors have a greater clarity, you can use smaller fonts and get more information on them. However, they will get in the way of what we have on our desks.

Mr. Walters explained:

A monitor cannot display the amount of information that you will want. It is just a straight composite video display, so whatever is on the front board screens is what you would see on the monitor. I looked at television's because you could either scroll or select. So there is a difference between to two.

Senator Coffin said:

I don't have enough information to make a decision today on this proposal. I am inclined to think that before we lot of money, bring back the magnetic boards and chalk boards.

Mr. Walters urged:

If there is any way we can somehow get through the 1999 session without buying any electronic's, wait until the 2001 session, then install the liquid gas plasma screens. That technology is growing and for the 2001 session, we would be able to buy the screens that we want, that would be able to display all the information we need.

Mr. Close added:

I would hate to see us go backwards, but this is not backwards - it is more of a strategic retreat to make sure that we are in the right position before taking the forward step. Sometimes we have a tendency to jump before we know where we are going to land. I think this is one of those things that might come back to haunt us if we go ahead and move forward now.

The recommendation is for us to figure out another mechanical system right now and hold this item in abeyance until the next session. Is that agreeable with the committee?

Senator Coffin stated:

I think that each house has to decide and our leadership has to tell us what they feel.

Mr. Close disagreed.

This subcommittee has to make the decision today as to whether we move forward or not. It is our staff's recommendation that we precede with whatever is best for each house, as opposed to using monitor's or television's on the desks.

Mr. Hettrick commented:

This subcommittee ought to agree not to move forward with this poor substitute for the kind of technology we would really like to have and have each house decide what they want to do.

Is it possible to get onto the laptops a file that we could pull up to see what is on the agenda and on the desk each day?

Mr. Walters replied:

Mr. Nichols and I have talked about this with Linda Alden and Jan Thomas. We can put the information on the laptops and put out hard copies for the legislators so they have it at on their desk at all times. The main concern, other than the legislators, is for the public to be able to view it at all times also. The solution would be to have monitors in the galleries and the hallway so they could view that information.

Senator Coffin asked if Jan Thomas feels that she can bring back the old stuff and not be embarrassed about it?

Mr. Walters responded:

She has recommenced that we drive the information that the legislators need to their laptops, plus produce a hard copy. At this point in time, no one wants to have chalk boards or anything else hanging in the chambers until the new technology is large enough to hang on the walls.

Senator Coffin said:

Now, that sounds a little different from what I understood earlier. I thought is was stated that for 1999 we would use the old method.

Mr. Walters explained:

We could, but they would rather put the information on the laptop and have hard copies. But if we have to, we can put chalk boards back in there.

Senator O'Donnell asked if Messrs. Nichols and Walters check into the free standing flat screens that are

available today? They come in huge sizes. I saw one over the weekend that was about 12 x 24 feet.

Mr. Walters answered, that is rear projection. You can get those any size you like.

Senator O'Donnell said:

> No, I don't think this was rear projection. I would like you to contact the people at the Anaheim Convention Center where I saw them over the weekend at the convention.

Mr. Walters said he would.

Senator O'Donnell remarked:

> As far as not moving forward, I'm not so sure it means anything what we do, because leadership is going to decide what they are going to do anyway.

> I am in favor of the television screens or monitor on the desktops. I think they should be smaller and more concise than what we have seen in the past. We do need something that will have enough dots per inch that the fonts look good. However, we could also use the same television screens on the desks to view other information by going to different channels. There is a lot of functionality and flexibility with monitors on the desks. I do not favor going back to the old boards and having somebody stand there and check off the different bills. I think that is archaic.

Mr. Close pointed out:

> Senator, I think you were out of the room when we were discussing this earlier. Mr. Walters said that the smallest TV or monitor he could get was 13 inches, and that increases not decreases the size, and the concern was that we don't have enough room on our desks right as it is and putting a 13-inch TV or monitor on them is going to make it even harder for us. That is why we were discussing that the best thing to do is to put the information on our laptops, which would be right there anyway.

Senator O'Donnell reiterated:

> You can get a generic, bare-bones laptop computer with the speed and capacity to take a full video screen and put it on the laptop, and that can be as much as 14 inches which is very small.

Mr. Walters said:

> I can do more research on the liquid gas plasma screens to see if somebody makes them larger, but right I have found that the largest is 55 inches.

Mr. Close concluded:

> Let's put this in a hold a pattern until the next meeting and then we can make the finial decision.

Mr. Walters continued reviewing Exhibit VII, Item 24, provide interactive broadcast quality video between Carson City and Las Vegas.

> We have spoken with Channel 5 in Reno to see what it will take to microwave from Carson City to Reno, then do a satellite link to Las Vegas. Mr. Watson and I have a meeting with them this afternoon, so I will have more information at our next meeting.

Mr. Close commented:

We have been getting some good press recently in regard to this, as far as accessability to the public. It will help our voters in southern Nevada who don't have as much exposure as those in the north. So keep it going.

Item VIII--<u>Review of off-hours support</u>.

Mr. Nichols reviewed Exhibit VIII, off-hours support.

Senator Coffin said:

> I would like to thank you for your quick reaction and solution to this problem. It is needed. So do we call 687-8200 from Las Vegas and explain the problem?

Mr. Nichols replied, correct.

> We now have active monitoring of the system. If a server goes down, I know that. The question was, what could I do about it from home, and the answer was, not much. We are going to implement a special pager that, instead of just beeping, it also tells me which server is down, or if the connection to the outside world is down, or if the phone switch is down or some piece of equipment that we are monitoring is down, et cetera. I will I know exactly what the problem is.

Item IX--<u>Review of approved software for laptops</u>.

Mr. Nichols reviewed Exhibit IX, supported software.

Chairman Close approved Mr. Nichols' request send to all legislators this list of supported software, Exhibit D, connecting peripheral devices to the laptop and the survey results.

Item X--<u>Update on legislator use of LCB network</u>.

Mr. Nichols said:

> This is the number of times that members have connected to the network, which means they dialed up and established a connection with the LCB network. Referring back to the survey results, we have to be careful and explain that this does not mean that people are not retrieving e-mail. Some of them have their e-mail forwarded, so they would not be listed as a connection. This is a 6-week period of time, there were 31 legislators connecting and out of that, if you take away people who have signed on less than 10 times, the number is down into the low 20's. I generated another list starting from mid December and had about the same number of people connecting. So our admonitions to sign on and use the laptops, didn't change the numbers significantly. Some of the logon's where from IS to make sure that the service was working on the legislator's behalf.

Mr. Hettrick said:

> I would like to comment on the number of times shown that I logged on, because you may wonder why in the heck I am on there all the time. I brought my computer in and Mr. Nichols set it up to do an automatic, remote e-mail recovery. It just turns itself on, dials up, retrieves my e-mail, sends my e-mail and turns itself off. It is very convenient. I also found I had a problem with my phone line. I would be in the middle of something and while I was connected, it would drop off and I have to reconnect. I would have to do that 10 and 15 times to do 10 minutes of work. This is something that just occurred, so I have an inordinate high number, but it is showing you that I do actually use it.

Mr. Nichols stated:

> I was asked to report to you the savings on using the call-back facility. The only data I have right now is regarding Senator Rhoads. We have established a call-back for Speaker Dini and Senator McGinness and I will see that reflected on the next phone bill. It costs 13 cents per minute for us to call back. For Senator Rhoads, over a two-month period, we spent $130 for 1,000 minutes, compared to $300 a month. Using the call-back facility levels the playing field for all legislators and we did it at a state rate which is significantly better. We have extended this offer to all seven outlying legislators and four have responded.

There was no public testimony.

This subcommittee will meet again on April 14, 1998 at 11:30 a.m.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Maxfield

Documentation Librarian,

Information Systems

Assemblyman Jack D. Close, Sr., Chairman