



MEETING MINUTES

State of Louisiana LaGov Project

PMO-BP-003 – Capital Outlay Validation - DOTD

December 4, 2008

DOTD War Room 2nd Floor

Attendees:

No.	Name	Invited?	Attended?	Comments
1.	Hodges, Beverly	Y	N	LaGov
2.	Thigpen, Drew	Y	N	LaGov
3.	Fernandez, Paul	Y	N	LaGov
4.	Jacob-John, Manoj	Y	Y	LaGov
5.	Montes, Rene	Y	Y	LaGov
6.	Hodnett, John	Y	Y	LaGov
7.	Elliott, Mary	Y	N	DOTD
8.	Lellig, John	Y	N	LaGov
9.	Oglesby, John	Y	Y	LaGov
10.	Vaught, Sylvia	Y	N	LaGov
11.	Hofstad, Larry	Y	Y	LaGov
12.	Bunch, Stephen	Y	Y	LaGov
13.	Romeo, Robin	Y	N	DOTD
14.	Burges, Eric	Y	Y	DOTD
15.	Kelly, Will	Y	Y	LaGov
16.	Schexnaydre, Debbie	Y	Y	DOTD
17.	Calihanna, Michelle	N	Y	LaGov
18.	Lee, James	Y	N	DOTD
19.	Stringfellow, Mary	Y	N	FHWA
20.	Collins, Sarah	Y	N	DOTD – Susan Zhang attended
21.	Sanders, Trini	Y	Y	DOTD
22.	Schiro, Mike	Y	N	DOTD
23.	Cali, Dom	Y	Y	DOTD
24.	Humm, Lori	Y	Y	DOTD – Dye Mgmt.
25.	Parish, Jan	Y	N	DOTD
26.	Sampson, Lauren	Y	N	DOTD
27.	Sessums, Kathy	Y	N	LaGov
28.	Faldetta, Sal	Y	Y	DOTD – Dye Mgmt.
29.	Gerhart, Steve	Y	N	LaGov
30.	Duncan, Marsha	N	Y	DOTD – Dye Mgmt.
31.	Zhang, Susan	N	Y	DOTD – Attended for Sarah Collins

	<i>Agenda Item and Notes</i>	<i>Owner(s)</i>	<i>Action Items & Assignments</i>	<i>Comments / Follow-up</i>
1.	Purpose	John Hodnett	• None	
2.	Work Session Recap	John Hodnett	• None	
3.	TO-BE process by topic	John Hodnett	• See action items & assignments below.	
4.	Supporting Master Data	John Hodnett	• None	
5.	F.R.I.C.E. – W objects	John Hodnett	• None	
6.	Conversion Strategy & Interim Solution	John Hodnett	• None	
7.	Organizational Impacts	John Hodnett	• None	

Action Items

1. Obtain data supporting the decision for project creation at Stage 1
2. Also follow up on TOPS replacement by SAP (PS & BI)
3. How to capture Apportionment balance FMIS-SAP interface
 - a. ties in with Demo
4. Follow up on functional class from TAND
 - a. Data also in TOPS reconcile/data cleansing TOPS/TAND
5. Obtain copy of cash report projection of TTF (Larry/Sal) (Fin Services-Monica)
6. Procedure for closed projects for legacy but need to be re-opened
 - a. To be covered in conversion

- strategy
 - b. e.g. Hwy project with railroad project
 - c. cover in close out procedure
 - d. adjustment in previous fiscal year
 - e. take care of federal projects
7. "Take up" projects – transfer of costs, trailing activity in legacy conversion.
 8. Check FHWA/PS enhancements to be reflected in BI enters and reporting.

Key Decisions

1. Projects to be created in Stage 1 of the Highway Program

Parking Lot

1. Bridge Program, with construction project number
 - a. Within LETS
 - b. Bridge Numbers
 - c. DB2 Access (Ray Murphy)
2. Are agile assets reports to be developed in BI reporting?
3. Check for cash implication of moving budget from lump sum to individual projects

Organizational Impacts

1. Need to review resources in project finance section with respect to new SAP – FM budget movement from Non-consumable to consumable budget
2. Expanded timeline for project financing
3. LETS is not the Project Mgmt but instead will be in BI.

Integration Points

- 1.

F.R.I.C.E.- W

1. Reporting by political district
 - a. Congressional
 - b. Legislative (federal/state)

Discussion Points:

The following was discussed in the validation session:

- Project Creation - There was ongoing discussion about the stage at which projects would be created. Dom Cali said that a decision had been made to create projects at stage 1 (one) and an action item was captured to follow up on the details and/or data in support of the decision. Dom said that the decision to create the project at stage 1 would allow for the early capture of project expenditures. The discussion was based on the action item in the validation slide deck to find out which environmental projects 'die' in stage 0, and don't go on to become projects. Larry Hofstad and John Oglesby pointed out that costs are generally incurred at the pre-project stage (stage 0) for multiple projects; making it was difficult capture project costs at inception. It was proposed to capture these costs in a summary WBS element. It was mentioned by Larry Hofstad and John Oglesby that pre-project costs could potentially be allocated to projects from the summary WBS element
- LETS Replacement – Susan Zhang said that the bridge structure number in LETS was being used by Ray Mumhrey and should be considered/mapped in the replacement of LETS. John Oglesby added that functional classification field should be taken into consideration as well.
- FMIS interface – John Oglesby asked if the interface to FMIS would incorporate changes; because sometimes changes that are put in to FMIS are incorrect. It would depend on whether the interface was bi-directional. The subject required discussion outside of the validation session between Larry Hofstad, Eric Burges, and John Oglesby.
- Data Conversion – Dom Cali said there was a different impression of the state's responsibility for data conversion. Dom said that the state would validate the data but not actually convert the data. It was explained that consultants would develop a conversion strategy and programs to convert the data and the state would ultimately convert the data, after programs and data were tested in the development and QAS regions by the consultants.
 - Project Close Outs – Eric Burges said that projects are currently being closed out; he said however that there are many people that have access to re-open projects, so it is going to be challenging to keep projects closed. An example of projects that involved railroads was cited; projects could be open for many years pending the action of the railroad. 'Take Up' projects were also discussed as an option to close projects and settle any remaining costs to one 'Take-up' project.
 - DOTD Retention policy – John Oglesby said the DOTD retention policy needs to be reviewed since it was probably badly out of date.
- Project Systems: It was noted that any enhancements made to the project systems would potentially have to be made in BI-IP (Budget Prep. module).