



MEETING MINUTES

State of Louisiana LaGov Project *Capital Budget Central Perspective*

October 2, 2008

DOTD East Wing Area 6-W

Attendees:

No.	Name	Invited?	Attended?	Comments
1.	Hodges, Beverly	Y	N	LaGov
2.	Hodnett, John	Y	Y	LaGov
3.	Dusse, Barry	Y	N	OPB
4.	Kelly, Will	Y	Y	LaGov
5.	Fernandez, Paul	Y	N	LaGov
6.	Jacob-John, Manoj (JJ)	Y	Y	LaGov
7.	Peak, Ashley	Y	N	LaGov
8.	Montes, Rene	Y	Y	LaGov
9.	Whyde, Janet	Y	N	LaGov
10.	Jones, Jerry	Y	N	FP & C
11.	Davis, John	Y	N	FP & C
12.	Knecht, Gene	Y	N	DOA
13.	Buchanan, Mariane	Y	N	DOTD
14.	Schexnaydre, Debbie	Y	Y	DOTD
15.	Stockstill, Susan	Y	N	DHH
16.	Hodges, Forest	Y	Y	OPB
17.	Rhorer, Skip	Y	N	OPB
18.	Milner, Marty	Y	Y	FP & C
19.	LeBlanc, Carolyn	Y	Y	FP & C
20.	Futch, Lynn	Y	N	FP & C
21.	Fontenot, Duane	Y	N	DSS
22.	Romeo, Robin	Y	Y	DOTD
23.	Elliott, Mary	Y	Y	DOTD
24.	Parish, Jan	Y	Y	DOTD
25.	Duncan, Marsha	N	Y	DOTD (Dye Mgmt.)
26.	Oglesby, John	N	Y	DOTD
27.	Bell, Cindy	N	Y	FP & C
28.	Whitmore, Simone	N	Y	FP & C
29.	Lee, James	N	Y	DOTD
30.	Burgess, Eric	N	Y	DOTD

<i>Agenda Item and Notes</i>	<i>Owner(s)</i>	<i>Action Items & Assignments</i>	<i>Comments / Follow-up</i>
1. Logistics, Ground Rules, & Introduction	John Hodnett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	
2. Workshop Objectives	Manoj Jacob-John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	
3. Business Process Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process Improvement Opportunities SAP Glossary SAP concepts & functionality Leading practices Business process flow Enterprise readiness challenges 	John Hodnett Manoj Jacob-John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See action items & assignments below. 	Hard copies provided - Future Budget Prep Sessions, , SAP Glossary (current and future terms), Master Data Integration, Business Process Flow, BP-FM Design: Versions
4. Action Items	JJ/John Oglesby/Robin Romeo	1. Check Federal Fiscal Year in STIP	
	JJ/Marty Milner/Will Kelly	2. Check Stars data including Bond data	
	Eric Burges	3. Provide copies of required forms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. one required by DA's office b. one to solidify that agency's desire for the money and intent to expend it 	
	JJ/John Oglesby/Robin Romeo	4. Federal Set Asides (Earmarks) Grants module within FHWA	
	Simone Whitmore	5. Provide statutory requirements for a Capital Outlay Request	
5. Key Decisions		1. Add option 5 – Option 3 (initial) + Option 4 (eventually) "Might need to setup interfaces to existing systems (TOPS, LETS) until full replacement can be arranged."	

6. **Parking Lot**

1.

7. **Enterprise Readiness**

1.

8. **Policy Impact**

1.

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

1. Possibility of rolling up
DOTD highway projects
into an eCorts
submission

Discussion Points:

- Process Improvements identified were as follows:

Debbie S (DOTD) – Identified the need for more project funding history, currently the eCorts capital outlay request system asks for prior funding history and it has to be recreated. Eric Burgess concurred with the need for funding history at the project level, the funding history post HB2. Will Kelly said that it would be a basic automation of the bond commission process. Eric elaborated by saying that it was a challenge to obtain what funding years made up a particular project so that when trying to fund a particular project with new money the funding history could be readily obtained if all the information was located in one place.

Marty Milner (FP & C) – Identified a need for timely information that captures the entire process from the point of request to the project closes out. Currently this is done manually in different systems and ISIS is not updated until sometime later. Currently any reporting from ISIS is not timely as there is a lag in its update; everything is manually entered in STARS. The manual update of STARS is time consuming. In general, process improvements were identified as the ability to capture greater detail in a timelier manner.

- DOTD Project funding and Systems
Robin Romeo asked where Federal Set-asides (Earmarks) would reside. Robin Romeo explained that the STIP is a snapshot from the LETS program. JJ explained that he referenced the STIP report to illustrate how rollups could work in SAP, the point was that rollups could be used in FM to control budget as well as on reports, such as the STIP. JJ reviewed four options (as a going in position) for TOPS and LETS systems. John Oglesby said that the goal was to replace TOPS and LETS. The response from JJ was that there could be a fifth option to initially interface the LETS and TOPS systems but eventually replace them. The project timeline was identified as the reason for delaying the replacement of the TOPS and LETS systems.
- FP & C discussion
JJ reviewed general concepts in the SAP budget planning process such as the planning year, the use of budget versions, how security would conceptually work, and the budget retraction concept. Carolyn Leblanc asked how the FM dimensions (the six dimensions) presented in the slide would apply to FPC. The reply from JJ was that it would depend on the level of budgeting done by FPC (at what level would projects be budgeted). JJ mentioned real examples that were more meaningful and relevant would be forthcoming at the validation stage of the project.