



2008  
Outstanding Program Awards

### Application Form

Program Title: Iowa School Alerts

Check one:  Individual State Award     State & Private Sector Partnership

If applicable, identify Private Partner

Submitted by: Mollie Anderson

Title: Director

Department or Corporation: Iowa Department of Administrative Services

Address: Hoover State Office Building, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

City: Des Moines                      State: Iowa                      Zip: 50319

Phone: (515) 281-5360                      Fax: (515) 281-6140

Email: mollie.anderson@iowa.gov

### Application Process

When preparing and entering your submission, please follow these guidelines:

1. The application form is available online at [www.nasca.org](http://www.nasca.org).
2. All submissions must be submitted electronically by emailing the information to [nasca@csg.org](mailto:nasca@csg.org). If you have any questions, contact NASCA staff by email at [nasca@csg.org](mailto:nasca@csg.org) or by phone at 859-244-8181.
3. Adobe Acrobat (PDF) documents will **not** be accepted.
4. More than one program may be submitted from the same entity.
5. Deadline: All submissions must be received by April 1, 2008.

### Program Questions

Please provide a one (1)-page summary of the program. Provide a narrative answer for each question listed below. You are limited to two (2) pages, based on regular 8 ½ by 11 inch paper, single spaced in 12 point font. The two page limit does not include the one-page summary. Do **not** send supporting documentation.

1. How long has the program been operational?
2. What was the program's start-up cost? Provide detailed information about specific purchases for this program, including staffing needs and other expenditures, as well as existing materials, technology and staff already in place.
3. What are the program's operational costs?
4. How is the program funded?
5. How do you calculate actual savings, i.e., short-term and/or long-term?
6. How do you measure this program's success? Provide quantitative benefits realized by service recipients, taxpayers and/or state agencies?
7. How has the program grown or changed since its implementation?
8. Describe the program's applicability to other states/local/federal governments?



## Iowa School Alerts Program Summary

Iowa School Alerts is a web-based application developed by the Iowa Department of Administrative Services (DAS) that provides school administrators with a secure, single point of access to initiate the notification process for various school closing events. Notifications are sent via e-mail or short message service to registered media outlets, parents, and other caregivers when schools must close, dismiss early, or start late due to weather or other factors. The notifications are also available as a Rich Site Summary (RSS) feed subscriptions for media, community, school-related organizations, and individuals that wish to see a comprehensive list of school closings.

The Iowa School Alerts design leverages the high societal adoption rates of internet connected personal computers and personal digital communications devices (i.e. digital phones, wireless e-mail devices, other personal communication systems) connected by an extensive wireless network throughout Iowa. DAS used an established and proven in-house authentication and authorization (A&A) application and applied our in-depth knowledge of government operations and citizen-facing web applications to develop Iowa School Alerts.

The Iowa School Alerts website (<https://schoolalerts.iowa.gov/>) provides a secure web-based enrollment service driven by the state developed A&A application for those wishing to receive school closing notifications. Subscriptions to the service are self-administered and updated by participants online. A single account can enroll for notifications from any of the participating schools. The Iowa School Alerts home page also contains a list of the most current notifications, which can be accessed from any internet connected browser.

The objective of Iowa School Alerts was to dramatically improve the efficiency of the school closing notification process. Traditionally, such notifications required the school administrator and several staff from 1 to 2 hours to make such notifications, depending on the size of the school and reason for notification. The list of phone numbers to be called in the event of such notification typically ran to several dozen and, for most parents, the school relied on parents receiving notification from radio and television announcements. It also improves the efficiency of the notifications received. The school closing notification services offered by certain radio and television stations were confined to the larger media markets and were unavailable to rural school districts. They would only allow parents to register for alerts on a school district basis, resulting in multiple notifications to parents who had to read and reject notices not pertaining to the specific school buildings they were interested in.

Within minutes of the decision to close a school early, school administrators can use Iowa School Alerts to make all of the required notifications to a larger number of interested parties in less time and with fewer staff. The same notification message is sent to all interested parties via email, TaskTicker (a small program which runs in the computer's taskbar and pops up an instant message on the computer screen), or a Rich Site Summary (RSS) feed for sites that wish to aggregate the notifications the Schools Out ticker system provides. The messages are customizable and can contain information specific to the event requiring the closing. The service is available at no cost to every school district and school building in the State of Iowa, regardless of population. The notifications are available at no cost to every interested party (i.e. media, parents, caregivers, transportation companies, etc.) and delivers information on a school building by school building basis. This significant improvement in communication gives greater peace of mind to parents and provides the social benefit of improving the safety and well being of our children.



## 2008 NASCA Outstanding Awards Program Questions

### Iowa School Alerts

#### 1. How long has the program been operational?

Iowa School Alerts was piloted in the last half of the 2006-2007 school year and was fully deployed for the 2007-2008 school year.

#### 2. What was the program's start-up cost? Provide detailed information about specific purchases for this program, including staffing needs and other expenditures, as well as existing materials, technology and staff already in place.

The startup cost for application coding and testing were \$105,000. Iowa School Alerts uses the Lyris List Manager 9.0 for transmitting notifications and relies on IBM Websphere Application Server and MySQL for the enrollment and management processes. Existing staff were used to develop and deploy the application. The coding and testing of the application was done by state staff.

#### 3. What are the program's operational costs?

The total annual operational cost is \$24,140. This includes:

- Web hosting - \$8,640.
- Enterprise user authentication and authorization services - \$3,000.
- Ongoing programming enhancements and maintenance - \$7,500.
- Web service client improvements - \$5,000.

#### 4. How is the program funded?

Funding has been provided by the IOWAccess Revolving Fund. IOWAccess is a state program created to promote and support a wide range of e-Government services to citizens.

#### 5. How do you calculate actual savings, i.e., short-term and/or long-term?

Based on the current number of school districts using Iowa School Alerts, we conservatively calculate the savings by assuming 2 hours of school administration staff time (2.0 FTEs times 1 hour / FTE) per notification (without Iowa School Alerts) at a fully loaded cost of \$25

/ hour times 2,000 notifications statewide per school year = \$100,000 annually. From this we subtract the cost associated with using Iowa School Alerts which is calculated by assuming 15 minutes of staff time per notification at a fully loaded cost of \$25 / hour times 2,000 notifications statewide per school year = \$12,500 annually. The difference is an annual savings of \$87,500.

**6. How do you measure this program's success? Provide quantitative benefits realized by service recipients, taxpayers and/or state agencies?**

Iowa School Alerts has been adopted by 175 school districts (including 7 private schools and 2 Area Education Agencies) statewide covering 595 individual school buildings. This represents just over half of the school districts in Iowa. Through January 2008, there were 5,852 registered users and 21,654 subscribers. The application has processed a total of 597 notifications requiring 40,062 e-mails.

**7. How has the program grown or changed since its implementation?**

Originally, the intent was to provide only an e-mail notification service. Once testing was completed with the pilot school districts, the application supported three ways for staff, parents, guardians, daycare providers and the media to get notifications:

- Email Alerts - Interested parties can choose to receive email notices when a school or district they are interested in closes.
- TaskTicker - TaskTicker is a tiny program which runs in your computer's taskbar. When one of the chosen schools or districts closes, an instant message pops up on the enrollee's computer screen.
- RSS Feed – The Iowa School Alerts website provides a Rich Site Summary (RSS) feed for sites that wish to aggregate the notifications the Iowa School Alerts ticker system provides. This is a great way for the media and school related organizations to publish notifications on their own websites.

**8. Describe the program's applicability to other states/local/federal governments?**

The program can be adapted to work for organizations of various sizes needing to provide electronic tailored, real-time notifications to constituent groups. The limitations on the number of notifications is constrained by the Lyris List Manager software and the information technology infrastructure on which it is deployed.

NASCA 2008  
Outstanding Program Awards

**Application Form**

Program Title: PayMode - Electronic Business -to-Business Payment Electronic Payment System

Check one:  Individual State Award  State & Private Sector Partnership

If applicable, identify Private Partner: \_\_\_\_\_

Submitted by: J. K. Stringer, Jr.

Title: Executive Director

Department or Corporation: Mississippi Department of Finance & Administration

Address: 501 North West Street

City: Jackson State: MS Zip: 39207

Phone: 601-359-3402 Fax: 601-359-

2405

Email: stringer@dfa.state.ms.us.

**Send Submission(s) to: [nasca@csg.org](mailto:nasca@csg.org)**

## **NASCA Award Nomination: Mississippi Department of Finance & Administration PayMode® - Business-to-Business Electronic Payment System**

The Mississippi Department of Finance and Administration (DFA) is one of state government's key control agencies. The agency's primary responsibility is to oversee the State's fiscal affairs and to implement and manage the State's \$14 Billion budget as promulgated by the Mississippi Legislature through appropriation. This function includes operating as the central disbursement authority for over on hundred (100) agencies with annual disbursements of approximately \$1.2B.

In 2001, DFA was faced with the opportunity to address its very costly and inefficient payment processing system. DFA wanted to reduce the amount of paper and staff time involved in its disbursement process by eliminating the mailing of paper checks and remittance documents. DFA's Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) platform could not adequately support the volume or complexity of remittance information associated with all payment types. Plus, the overhead of managing the banking relationships of vendors and other government entities was labor-intensive.

The challenge was to convert a paper-based payment process to a more streamlined electronic process. DFA identified several critical requirements that had to be addressed and resolved before any system could be successfully implemented. These requirements included: (1) enabling the existing Statewide Automated Accounting System (SAAS) to initiate electronic payment disbursement transactions with supporting remittance information without requiring a significant technology investment or system changes and (2) accomplishing this for State payees of all sizes without requiring changes to their existing banking relationships or internal processes.

### **The Situation**

Invoices were processed and approved for payment by each state agency and forwarded to DFA for centralized processing. Checks for most transactions were returned to the agencies to be stuffed with paper remittance documents and mailed to the State payees. ACH payments were initiated via the banking system but support for those payments was still mailed by the paying agencies to the payment recipients. The capabilities did not exist within the State's financial system to capture the detailed remittance data and to support the marrying of the payment data with the remittance data electronically.

### **The Solution**

In 2002, DFA contracted with Bank of America to implement their PayMode® system as the platform for DFA's electronic payment processing. DFA's existing disbursement workflow was documented and SAAS was configured to generate a PayMode® payment endpoint in addition to the existing ACH and paper check endpoints. The endpoint collects both payment details and supporting remittance information. Up-stream agencies now had a real-time view into their payments, as well as, the ability to track payment history. The PayMode® Accelerated Enrollment Program was used to rapidly sign up State payees to receive payments and remittances electronically. A phased approach was followed to incrementally target various types of State payees.

DFA was set up to electronically disburse payments, along with associated remittance information to State vendors, suppliers, service providers and municipalities within its existing accounts payable system environment and process. This work was completed within a period of 8 weeks with a state investment of approximately \$400K. DFA and other agencies experienced no disruption to their operations.

From inception through February 2008, \$29.9B in payments have been made via PayMode®. This represents over 800,000 payments. Year-to-date, over 50% of payments were made via PayMode®.

**NASCA Award Nomination: Mississippi Department of Finance & Administration  
PayMode® - Business-to-Business Electronic Payment System**

**1. How long has the program been operational?**

DFA launched PayMode® in October 2002.

**2. What was the program's start-up cost? Provide detailed information about specific purchases for this program, including staffing needs and other expenditures, as well as existing materials, technology and staff already in place.**

DFA required a product that could be integrated into the existing Statewide Automated Accounting System (SAAS) quickly and without a significant investment of time and money. We achieved those objectives.

The initial professional service fees for the deployment of this ASP based product and the initial vendor enrollment push totaled approximately \$400,000.

DFA utilized existing staff to build the interfaces between PayMode® and SAAS. Minimal changes were required to SAAS.

**3. What are the program's operation costs?**

The initial monthly license fee was \$4,400. With the growth in volume over time, DFA has twice seen a reduction in the base fee. The current base monthly fee is \$1,500.

The original transaction fee schedule was and remains (monthly basis):

0 – 2500	\$.50 / Transaction
2501 – 5000	\$.40 / Transaction
5001 – 7500	\$.30 / Transaction
7501 +	\$.20 / Transaction

The current total average monthly costs are \$7,100.

**4. How is the program funded?**

The DFA office that manages this and other strategic enterprise information systems is the Mississippi Management and Reporting System (MMRS). The projects and operations of this office, including PayMode®, are funded by assessing user agencies fees for the services provided.

**5. How do you calculate actual savings, i.e. short-term and/or long-term?**

Actual savings are calculated in terms of cost avoided per paper check. With an initial investment of approximately \$400K, DFA has realized a net savings of \$2.7M since PayMode® implementation in October 2002.

**6. How do you measure this program's success? Provide quantitative benefits realized by service recipients, taxpayers, and/or state agencies?**

Benefits include money in the hands of the payees within two days of final approval of the payment. In the past, the lag between production of the warrant and receipt of the funds could be over a month. There is no maintenance of banking relationship information and only limited servicing of payment related questions from vendors now supported by DFA. Agencies save postage and commodity costs, time required to stuff and mail payments, and time for copying and filing the payment data that previously was sent in paper form to the vendors.

**7. How has the program grown or changed since its implementation?**

A phased enrollment plan was created to incrementally target various types of state payees. The first group targeted included Mississippi-domiciled municipalities and educational institutions (required by law to be paid electronically). The second phase included vendors in the State's technology and general expense categories. Other targeted campaigns were completed to enroll program function specific vendors such as those of the Mississippi Department of Transportation and DFA's Bureau of Building, Grounds, and Real Property Management, as well as vendors receiving medical services payments that required compliance with standards set for in the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA).

In December 2006, DFA expanded the PayMode System to include the receipt of electronic invoices from vendors into the PayMode system. This new process allows agency finance staff to approve, reject or dispute invoices from vendors via a web-based entry into the PayMode system. Approved invoices are interfaced directly into SAAS as payment vouchers. Purchase order information and other key payment data are included without action required by agency staff and are ready for immediate agency payment approval. It is now possible to receive and e-invoice, approve it and issue the payment and have the funds received by the vendor in a minimum of three business days. The pilot project for e-invoicing is wrapping up and full deployment is expected in FY2009.

**8. Describe the program's applicability to other states/local/federal governments?**

At the time that DFA launched this project, the State of Maine was the only other public entity using PayMode. Since that time, numerous other public and private entities have become PayMode disbursers. The State of South Carolina has recently implemented a similar model to that in use today in Mississippi.

There are specific considerations that need to be worked through such as public funds depository guidelines and statutes. However, this project offers the portability of a web based end-user system that may require some back-end programming to integrate into an entity's existing accounts payable system. The impact is minimal and the results far reaching.

► **Application Form**

Program Title: Guaranteed Energy Savings Act (GESA)

Check one:  Individual State Award       State & Private Sector Partnership

If applicable, identify Private Partner: \_\_\_\_\_

Submitted by: James P. Creedon

Title: Secretary of General Services

Department or Corporation: Department of General Services

Address: 515 North Office Building

City: Harrisburg      State: PA      Zip: 17125

Phone: (717) 787-5996      Fax: (717) 772-2026

Email: jacreedon@state.pa.us

► **Application Process**

When preparing and entering your submission, please follow these guidelines:

1. The application form is available online at [www.nasca.org](http://www.nasca.org).
2. All submissions must be submitted electronically by emailing the information to [nasca@csg.org](mailto:nasca@csg.org). If you have any questions, contact NASCA staff by email at [nasca@csg.org](mailto:nasca@csg.org) or by phone at 859-244-8181.
3. Adobe Acrobat (PDF) documents will **not** be accepted.
4. More than one program may be submitted from the same entity.
5. **Deadline:** All submissions must be received by April 1, 2008.

► **Program Questions**

Please provide a one (1)-page summary of the program. Provide a narrative answer for each question listed below. You are limited to two (2) pages, based on regular 8 ½ by 11 inch paper, single spaced in 12 point font. The two page limit does not include the one-page summary. Do **not** send supporting documentation.

1. How long has the program been operational?
2. What was the program's start-up cost? Provide detailed information about specific purchases for this program, including staffing needs and other expenditures, as well as existing materials, technology and staff already in place.
3. What are the program's operational costs?
4. How is the program funded?
5. How do you calculate actual savings, i.e., short-term and/or long-term?
6. How do you measure this program's success? Provide quantitative benefits realized by service recipients, taxpayers and/or state agencies?
7. How has the program grown or changed since its implementation?
8. Describe the program's applicability to other states/local/federal governments?

► **Deadline - April 1, 2008**

The application package must be received no later than April 1, 2008 for consideration.

► **Send Submission(s) to: [nasca@csg.org](mailto:nasca@csg.org)**

## Guaranteed Energy Savings Act Program Summary

Pennsylvania's Guaranteed Energy Savings Act (GESA) is a procurement tool that allows governmental agencies/entities (the customer) to facilitate energy savings-related construction work with no up-front capital dollars.

Using the GESA program, one of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's qualified Energy Service Companies (ESCO) is selected to complete a project. A third-party lender pays the ESCO, and over a period not to exceed fifteen years, the customer repays the third-party lender through the ESCO guaranteed energy savings that the project captures in its utility budget.

This is a real "win" for the customer because 15% of the project can be non-energy related (deferred maintenance work), the project is budget neutral, and project award is based on best value rather than low bid.

The Department of General Services has established a pool of qualified ESCO's and provides program services along with standardized procurement and contracting documents, making the process user-friendly. The department has also established an outreach program to help local and county governments, K-12 schools, and other governmental entities.

Once a project is approved, the selected Energy Service Company (ESCO) conducts a thorough assessment of the building's needs, establishes baseline energy consumption, and determines what Energy Conservation Measures (ECM's) should be implemented along with their associated energy savings; this process is called an Investment Grade Audit (IGA). When the customer and the ESCO agree on what work is to be done, the contract and finance agreements are signed and work begins with the following benefits:

- A sound technical project, including equipment and ongoing energy services
- Project engineering and design
- Tax-exempt project financing options
- Construction bonding complying with Commonwealth requirements
- Extensive training for building operators
- Complete project installation and project management
- Guaranteed savings for the life of the project
- Project Monitoring and Savings Verification (M&V) for the life of the project

Overall, the GESA program accomplishes a number of results. First, it reduces environmental emissions and conserves natural energy resources. The program facilitates quick tax-exempt financing, allowing scarce public dollars to be used for other services and activities. It provides a third-party lender for needed capital energy improvements that are paid for from energy savings (budget neutral.) GESA reduces frequent repairs and high maintenance costs due to inadequate, aging, or obsolete equipment. A managed program is offered with Energy Service company (ESCO) accountability. Productivity of building occupants is increased through improved building comfort conditions. Local economies are enhanced through the use of local subcontractors by ESCO's. Lastly, the GESA program creates incentives for the ESCO's to develop highly efficient projects by linking their selection to project savings.

## Program Questions

1. The Guaranteed Energy Savings Act (GESA) program has been operational since the year 2000.
2. The GESA program start-up cost was approximately 150 thousand dollars. The cost is actually an annual consultation fee that was needed to start the program and has been paid every year thereafter offering expertise in project development and energy monitoring. Our office team currently consists of a program manager, an assistant program manager, office assistant and one engineer. The payroll is approximately 200 thousand dollars per year. We have a LEED-EB (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design for Existing Buildings) specialist on hand to help with LEED certification. Our team also works with the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and the Governor's Green Government Council (GGGC) of Pennsylvania. We work and collaborate with our consultants *Donahue and Associates* and *Penn State Facilities Engineering Institute* on a regular basis. Our main software consists of a utility database called *Utility Manager Pro*.
3. The programs operational cost for current projects under contract is 286.1 million dollars, the project's repayment amount.
4. The program is budget neutral; therefore it isn't necessarily "funded." The project costs are paid through ESCO guaranteed utility and operational savings which are a result of building upgrades (both utility and operational.)
5. Actual savings are calculated through comparing energy use to the historic baseline use of the particular site. Each year is compared to the historic baseline for length of project guaranteed savings. Savings are calculated through standard Measurement & Verification (M&V) in relation to the International Performance Measurement & Verification Protocol (IPMVP.) The GESA program's 26 projects under contract have a guaranteed savings of \$323.4 million with possible maximum savings of \$359.7 million.
6. This program's success is measured in various ways. Its success is determined by avoided emissions (CO<sub>2</sub>, greenhouse gases, mmBTU's), conservation of natural energy resources, capital avoidance (deferred maintenance), utility (electric, steam, water, natural gas) and operational savings (labor, material, maintenance contracts.) Currently, with our 26 projects under contract, we have eliminated an annual amount of 111,442 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>, 112,406 tons of greenhouse gas, and 857,354 mmBTU's. The eliminated CO<sub>2</sub> would be the equivalent of removing 19,634 passenger vehicles from the road per year. The avoided mmBTU's would power 23,574 average residential homes per year.
7. Since the GESA program began in 2000, it has grown considerably. We have added staff and will continue to as needed. The number of participating agencies has increased to its current eleven. The number of qualified Energy Service Companies (ESCOs) has also increased. We now have 18 qualified companies. Also, the number of projects and projects under contract has steadily increased. There are currently 45 projects under way, 26 of which are under contract.
8. The GESA program is under Commonwealth of Pennsylvania legislation and is available to all Pennsylvania governmental entities. The program may be applicable to any other state, local or federal government entities dependent upon the legislation in that area. Performance contracting is available nationwide, but specific legislation varies by state. Varying versions of the GESA program may be offered.

NASCA  
2008 Outstanding Program Awards  
Application Information

Program Title: "Purchasing Decision Model"  
Check One: Individual State Award  
Submitted by: Sam Lee  
Title: Deputy Director  
Department: State of Utah  
Department of Administrative Services  
Division of Fleet Operations  
Address: 4120 State Office Building  
City: Salt Lake City  
State: Utah  
Zip: 84114  
Phone: (801) 538-3452  
Fax: (801) 538-1773  
Email: [samlee@utah.gov](mailto:samlee@utah.gov)

<http://www.nasca.org/awards/awards.cfm>

## **“One Page Summary of the Program”**

The idea for the purchasing decision model came as fleet directors met with cabinet leadership and representatives from the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget to determine vehicle purchasing policy in relation to alternative fuel and hybrid vehicle choices for model year 2008. Fleet directors explained to cabinet leadership and the governor’s staff that a policy to purchase a single technology among alternative fuel, hybrid, and traditional fuel vehicles may completely exclude a particular interest among those identified as a priority for the coming replacement year. For example, a decision to purchase a hybrid vehicle as the standard will have direct implications to the state’s ability to comply with the federal Energy Policy Act, and may require additional capital spending for vehicles that may not be made up over the life of the vehicle in fuel savings. The decision makers soon realized that every competing interest could not be satisfied in a narrow purchasing policy. The model came as a natural compromise to the discussion when various members of the committee assigned to create the vehicle purchasing policy argued for the interest they thought to be most important.

**Who developed the model?** -- The purchasing decision model was created by Rich Amon from the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget. Rich was asked to participate on the informal vehicle purchasing policy committee aimed at creating new policies for the State of Utah fleet that reflected Governor Huntsman’s interests in improving air quality and green house gas emissions. All members on the informal committee (Kim Hood, Marvin Dodge of Administrative Services and Margaret Chambers, Sam Lee Division of Fleet Operations) also participated in a substantial way to the final model that reflected the committees various perspectives.

**What steps were taken to develop and implement the model?** -- Rich Amon presented the final format of the purchasing model to Sam Lee in September 2007. Sam used the documentation provided by Rich Amon to train Anne Stehno (Vehicle Purchasing Agent, Division of Fleet Operations) concerning the state’s new purchasing perspective that reflected the Governor’s priorities broken down into individual weighted percentages. Anne Stehno gathered the necessary data on potential vehicle choices to plug into the model during the months of October and November of 2007. Vehicle purchase orders beginning in December 2007, reflected the states priorities as it relates to the seven competing interests identified by the committee. Each year state fleet directors will use the purchasing model to reevaluate the priorities in the current administration to ensure the vehicles purchased by the state fleet reflect the leadership decisions provided by the Governor’s office and his/her staff.

### **What are the core steps in the purchasing decision model?**

- 1.** Fleet directors and policy decision makers determine the list of “competing categories” or interests to be used in the vehicle decision-making process (Utah identified 7 categories).
- 2.** The fleet manager creates a series of questions comparing the competing categories against each other in every possible way.
- 3.** The fleet manager determines the actual weighted percentages for the competing categories based on the responses from step 2.
- 4.** The fleet purchasing agent collects the designated vehicle performance and cost data for the vehicle types to be purchased (in the categories identified).
- 5.** The fleet purchasing agent develops conversion tables that will move the vehicle performance and cost data into a score that ranges from 1 to 9.
- 6.** The fleet purchasing agent creates a final tally spreadsheet that combines the calculated vehicle performance and cost data against the 1-9 score tables from Step 5. The final spreadsheet ranks the vehicles in order based on a high score of nine points possible per vehicle.

## **Narrative Answers to the 8 Questions**

### **1. How long has the program been operational?**

The purchasing decision model was completed in September 2007 and was used by fleet staff to make purchasing decisions beginning in model year 2008 (October 2007 to August 2008).

### **2. What was the program's start-up cost? Provide detailed information about specific purchases for this program including staffing needs and other expenditures, as well as existing materials, technology and staff already in place.**

The start up costs were very minimal as the model is a tool used to make fleet purchasing decisions and not a "program" requiring additional staff, materials, and technology. The total amount of time spent by Rich Amon and the committee to create and refine the purchasing model was approximately 60 hours. The committee met several times during the months of August and September of 2007 to discuss the details of the model and how it would be implemented during the coming replacement year. Rich Amon spent approximately 30 hours himself creating and refining the format and math formulas contained in the purchasing decision model.

### **3. What are the program's operational costs?**

There are no operational costs associated with this new purchasing decision model. The purchasing agent for Fleet Operations is not paid any additional hourly wage to purchase state vehicles according to the new model. The only additional "soft" cost to the state is the extra time required by the purchasing agent each year to research the specific vehicle data figures in the seven different categories identified by the state to have an impact on the vehicle purchase decision.

### **4. How is the program funded?**

The actual decision model doesn't have any one time or on-going funding. However, the results of the model in 2008 pointed to a decision to buy hybrid vehicles where they are available from the major auto manufacturers. This required state fleet staff to request additional capital spending authority in fiscal year 2008 to cover the incremental capital cost of the hybrid vehicles. During the 2008 legislative session (January to March 2008) Fleet Operations was given approval by the Utah State Legislature to spend up to 1.3 million in incremental capital spending for hybrid vehicles in fiscal year 2008 to cover the estimated incremental spending required to purchase hybrid vehicles in the current market.

### **5. How do you calculate actual savings, i.e., short-term and/or long-term**

The purchasing decision model is not built on just on actual dollar savings but a comprehensive view of the total impact of the vehicle choice (based on the weighted priorities or percentages). This year the "competing interests" identified by fleet directors (and their associated weighted percentage) for model year 2008 are the following:

- Cost Effectiveness of the Vehicle 34%
- Air Quality Controls on the Vehicle 25%
- Greenhouse Gas Emission Controls on the Vehicle 11%
- Fuel Infrastructure Availability for the Vehicle 12%
- Decreasing US Dependence on Foreign Oil 7%
- Energy Policy Act Compliance with the Federal Government 7%
- American Made Purchasing Preference 5%

As you can see above, cost effectiveness remains the primary factor in the vehicle purchase in the State of Utah fleet with a weighted percentage of 34%. New this year is a higher priority placed on air quality controls or scores on the vehicle as reflected by the EPA's 10 point scale available at [fuelconomy.gov](http://fuelconomy.gov). While the model is still in its beginning stages as a tool for state fleet directors, managers, and policy decision makers it does provide a comprehensive perspective on all issues related to the vehicle purchase with a particular focus on cost performance over the life of the vehicle.

**6. How do you measure this program's success? Provide quantitative benefits realized by the service recipients, tax payers and/or state agencies?**

The model's success is its ability to allow policy makers and fleet directors to work together in a constructive way to make the very best fleet purchase decision. The purchasing model will save significant fleet staff time in the future as the debate of the competing interests will be a non issue as fleet directors use the purchasing model to evaluate if the current vehicle choices meet the current executive branch wishes as it relates to the management of state vehicle purchases. This new model also gives fleet staff and directors increased credibility in the state among leasing agency fleet managers because the data points to specific vehicle model selections for a known purpose where the model itself may be an unpopular choice.

**7. How has the program grown or changed since its implementation?**

This is the first year the decision model has been implemented in the state fleet so the baseline has been established this year and will allow for comparisons in years to come.

**8. Describe the program's applicability to other states/local/federal governments?**

The purchasing model developed by the State of Utah could be used by other federal, state, and local government fleets in the same way it has been used by the state fleet. At every level fleet managers must determine the purchasing criteria that will be used in a particular buying cycle. This model provides an excellent guide to the current fleet purchasing environment where there are significant pressures to make vehicle choices that are environmentally friendly, cost effective, performance based, and that allow for specific purchase requirements like the Federal Energy Policy Act.

In summary the State of Utah is proud of the model developed during the last year and would be delighted to share the concepts and formulas contained in the model to help other governmental fleets in their search to make solid fleet purchase decisions in an environment that sometimes seemingly pulls them in opposite directions.