



MEETING MINUTES

State of Louisiana LaGov Project

FI-BP-007 Capital Budget – Agency Perspective -DOTD

October 22, 2008

DOTD – East Wing IT conference Room # 161

Attendees:

No.	Name	Invited?	Attended?	Comments
1.	Hodges, Beverly	Y	N	LaGov
2.	Hodnett, John	Y	Y	LaGov
3.	Vaught, Sylvia	Y	N	LaGov
4.	Boyd, David	Y	N	LaGov
5.	Kelly, Will	N	Y	LaGov
6.	Jacob-John, Manoj (JJ)	Y	Y	LaGov
7.	Montes, Rene	Y	Y	LaGov
8.	Whyde, Janet	Y	Y	LaGov
9.	Cali, Dom	Y	N	DOTD
10.	Humm, Lori	Y	Y	DOTD –Dye Mgmt.
11.	Davis, John	Y	Y	FPC
12.	Milner, Marty	Y	Y	FPC
13.	Oglesby, John	Y	Y	DOTD
14.	Futch, Lynn	Y	N	FPC
15.	Romeo, Robin	Y	Y	DOTD
16.	Elliott, Mary	Y	Y	DOTD
17.	Parish, Jan	Y	Y	DOTD
18.	Tessier, Robert	Y	Y	DOTD
19.	Schexnaydre, Debbie	Y	Y	DOTD
20.	Duncan, Marsha	N	Y	DOTD- Dye Mgmt.
21.	Lodge, James	N	Y	OSRAP
22.	LeBlanc, Carolyn	N	Y	FPC
23.	Whitmore, Simone	N	Y	FPC
24.	Lee, James	N	Y	DOTD
25.	Bunch, Stephen	N	Y	LaGov
26.	Gerhart, Steve	N	Y	LaGov
27.	Burgess, Eric	N	Y	DOTD
28.	Sanders, Trini	N	Y	DOTD
29.	Lelig, John	N	Y	LaGov
30.	Fernandez, Paul	Y	N	OPB
31.	Collins, Sarah	N	Y	DOTD

32.	Hofstad, Larry	N	Y	LaGov
33.	Procopio, Steven	N	Y	LaGov
34.	Schiro, Michael	N	Y	DOTD
35.	Badon, Curtis	Y	Y	DHH – (FPC agency perspective)
36.	McMenis, James	N	N	DOTD (FPC agency perspective)
37.	Regira, Linda	N	N	FPC agency perspective
38.	Griswold, Rich	N	N	FPC agency perspective
39.	Melius, Cliff	N	N	FPC agency perspective

Agenda Item and Notes	Owner(s)	Action Items & Assignments	Comments / Follow-up
1. Logistics, Ground Rules, & Introduction	John Hodnett	• None	
2. Workshop Objectives	Manoj Jacob-John	• 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	• 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. <u>Action Items</u>	Larry Hofstad/Christine Lee/ JJ	1. To work out details of Summary WBS element that will capture Stage 0 and 1 costs.	
	Mike Schiro/Dom Cali	2. Obtain info re: Environment project that 'die'- so that we take a decision in PS project master data maybe Stage 1 or 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Also consider the number of projects to be created. b. Use of project template c. Archiving strategy to follow d. Conversion implication to follow 	
	Sarah Collins	3. Investigate how PS project # (T.00001) are stored in TRANSPORT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CES –or Web Transport b. Check cross walk possibility 	
	Budget Prep Team	4. Ensure that line item entries are possible for Highway Program (e.g. of details of line item)	
	Gary LeBlanc	5. Action Item 1- FI-BP-006-DOTD	

Sarah Collins/Robin
Romeo/Mary Elliot
Budget Prep Team & PS

Mike Schiro/Larry
Hofstad/Mary
Elliot/Sarah Collins

Susan Zang

Debbie Schexneydre

6. List of LETS reports that are needed developed in BI
7. Functional Classification not in LETS, in TAND
8. During realization to review data fields stored in LETS, to determine the fields not used for BI budget prep and Project Management
9. Check if Quarterly version LETS data needs to be stored as a version – Get sample Report
10. Check on DOTD project data, not in Hwy Program, but submitted as ECORTS into House Bill 2

Day 2

11. Prior funding – Auto update based on the correct Request #
12. Equivalent of copy forward from old request to new request
13. Re-consider the Cost Estimate Source and Type
 - a. useful for new
 - b. Not useful for renovations

Key Decisions

1. Project Finance initiate approval for moving budget to individual projects
 - o For construction based on after each project bid review is complete and each project auth. Is adjusted for over/under
 - o for non-construction, based on signed consulting contracts, RoW = emails (LETS) authorization for **Highway Program Engineering (Mary)**
 2. No system approval needed for above
 3. TAND data need not be consideration for inclusion in BI instead may be considered in Agile Assets
 4. No Needs database is needed in BI instead DOTD
-

will use existing needs database

5. Interface LETS data to BI (custom cube to build DOTD Highway Program Budget data) custom cube and consider replacing in future
Day 2
6. All revision by the agency is captured in one version
7. Dept also approves only one version
8. Agency to submit MOF in SAP account code during submission.

Parking Lot

1. Other/Supplemental funding available for DOTD Highway Program
 - a. From parishes by not necessarily in priority program
2. Future new project created in SAP and its corresponding Old Legacy/Transport
3. Is PS project number available for capital budget prep. Go-Live
4. Exception of State only/Line Item
5. PS Planning component
6. What is the future role of the current Project Finance Committee or Project Delivery Steering Committee (PDSC) With respect to moving budget to individual project?
Day 2
7. Detail breakdown of state fund

Organizational Impacts

- 1.

Policy Impact

- 1.

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

1. Check Quarterly Reports LETS data
Day 2
 2. Agencies to have a report to capture agency
-
-

-
-
- submission and what is approved in HB2, approved funding and prior funding by schedule #
3. Approval tracking and validations from Agency to Dept. and FPC
-
-

Discussion Points:

This blueprint session was a continuation of FI-BP-006-DOTD. The discussion started with a review of slides that were presented in the previous blueprint session, for meeting participants who were not part of the last session.

DOTD System Replacement -The topic of systems to be replaced was discussed at length. Systems in particular included TOPS and LETS.

Note: Since this meeting was held, Larry Hofstad and John Oglesby have presented the DOTD systems replacement issue to the LaGov project management. Separate meetings are being held to determine which systems would be replaced.

Important: The to-be business processes are based on interfacing to the LETS system and consider replacing LETS in the future. (Key Decision 5)

Robin Romeo said that there were no decisions to have interfaces to any of the DOTD systems. The option was only to be added. The options were as follows:

- Option-1 E-CORTS entry using Front-end Layouts:
 - One-line entry of the Lump-sum for Highway projects; and
 - Individual project entries
- Option-2 Direct entry into HB2 consolidation, using front-end custom Layout
- Option-3 Build BI interfaces for DOTD system data (i.e. data from LETS, STIP, etc) and any other system data, used for DOTD capital projects
- Option-4 Consider replacing and managing of some of DOTD system data (e.g. STIP, LETS, etc.) within BI system
 - Budget Partition, etc to be derived from BI system

Option-5 Build BI interfaces for DOTD system data (to meet Budget time-lines) and consider replacing some of DOTD system data within BI system in future.

Mike Schiro joined the meeting and commented on the DOTD budget build process. Mike Schiro said that the process of building the DOTD was a top down process. Mike Schiro said they start with a bottom line and work backwards; the number is given to DOTD and projects are assigned to the categories in the budget partition. The group discussed other House Bill II line items that were not part of the highway priority program but were projects that were related to DOTD. The group said that there was difficulty in finding funding sources for DOTD projects that were line items in House Bill II. Eric Burgess brought up projects that were not given priority which may or may have not been part of the high priority program (i.e. XX list).

Project Creation - The topic of project creation was discussed and Mike Schiro had a question about why projects would start at stage 2. Mike Schiro said the concern was that a summary WBS element to capture beginning projects costs at stage 0 could grow. Mike Schiro suggested creating the project at Stage 1; because the earlier you capture the project number. Mike Schiro continued by saying that there were not many projects that stayed in stage 1(only earmarks). Mike Schiro said the longer you wait to assign a project number, the more trouble it is to capture total project costs; only one (1) to two (2) percent of the projects die. JJ said that project creation in stage 0 zero was something for project systems to consider (with due respect to project systems blueprint sessions) Larry Hofstad said that one of the main issues is to identify funding. Mike Schiro said that

bond funded projects are very few (maybe 10 bond jobs per year). Mary Elliott brought up the fact that currently the bond project listing is very long. Mike Schiro said that old projects should be taken off the list. An action item was captured to address this and validate the decision to create projects in stage 2.

Lump Sum Retraction - The discussion to determine the group that would be responsible for moving budget to individual projects from a lump sum in the to-be scenario was brought up by JJ. A key decision was made (Key Decision 1) to assign the responsibility of moving the budget to each project to the project finance group. There was a considerable amount of discussion around the current and future role of the project finance group. Mike Schiro said that the authorization should be based on the STIP (State Transportation Improvement Program); if the project is not in the STIP then it should be the program manager that provides the authorization to initiate the budget for eventual funding. At this point it was not clear to the group if and when an approval step would be required in the future. A key decision was made to not require any system approval for the movement of budget to individual projects. (Key Decision 2)

Reporting Requirements - There was discussion about specific reporting requirements for DOTD. Robin Romeo said that currently she uses Microsoft Access to create reports, but that it is difficult to maintain since the links and sources of data could change. Robin Romeo said that there is not enough expertise around their current system. Robin said the current system is difficult to use and query for information. JJ said the SAP BI (Business Intelligence) solution would provide the ability to query. Sarah Collins that there were many DOTD reports that would be required.

Needs Database – JJ presented the concept of a needs database. It was determined that the information in TAND database would be considered for inclusion in Agile Assets, the DOTD linear asset solution. There was a Key Decision that was made (Key Decision 3). Additionally it was decided by the group that a needs database was not required in SAP BI, instead existing DOTD needs databases would be used (Key Decision 4)

Day 2 Capital Budget Agencies' Perspective

The session started with an overview of objectives which primarily focused on the improvements to the ECORTS submission form. Only Curtis Badon from DHH (Department of Health and Hospitals) Engineering and Simone Whitmore of FPC attended the session. Curtis Badon said that he was relatively new to the capital outlay submission process.

JJ reviewed the FPC to be process for the capital outlay request #.

ECORTS Form Improvements identified:

- Inflation should be added to factor the increase in cost estimates between the time of submission and project acceptance into House Bill II
- Estimates should be for construction
 - without Design Cost, Planning etc
- Percentage added on should be able to be changed (formula calculation for planning/contingency is only 10%)
- ECORTS – Input page numbering should match the output printed pages.
- Prior funding on form should be pre-filled (automatically)
- In general, re-sequence the order of fields
- ECORTS Page 1
 - Pre-populate total project count for the agency or department
 - Duplicate entry for agency
- ECORTS Page 2
 - Add Yes/No planning button
- ECORTS Page 3
 - Auto Estimate Button with override

Budget Versions as approval stages – There was discussion and concern regarding the use of versions to meet the approval stages requirement of the ECORTS form submission. Simone Whitmore brought up the point that it would difficult to keep up with so many versions and which the approved version was going to be. Will Kelly asked if there would be a version of the capital outlay request.